TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Friday, September 19, 2008
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• PUBLIC HEARING: 2008 - 2012 COORDINATED PLAN

• DRAFT 2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

• STATUS REPORT ON MID-CITY RAPID BUS 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF AUGUST 1, 2008, MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

**CHAIR’S REPORT (3)**

| 3.     | STATE ROUTE 905/11 STATUS UPDATE (Chairman Jim Madaffer, Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans) |

Chairman Jim Madaffer and Pedro Orso-Delgado will provide the monthly update of what was discussed by the State Route 905 strike team.

**REPORTS (4 through 13)**

| +4.    | PUBLIC HEARING: 2008 – 2012 COORDINATED PLAN (Phil Trom) | RECOMMEND |

A public hearing will be held on the Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP) and Coordinated Plan for 2008 – 2012. The Coordinated Plan provides a blueprint for the development of transit and human services transportation in San Diego for the next five years. The Draft Coordinated Plan was presented and circulated for public comment at the Transportation Committee on August 1, 2008. The Transportation Committee is asked to conduct a public hearing on the 2008 – 2012 Coordinated Plan. After considering public comments, the Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the final plan, as shown in Attachment 2.

| +5.    | FUNDING RECOMMENDATION FOR FY 2008 NEW FREEDOM AND FY 2009 SENIOR MINI-GRANT PROJECTS (Danielle Kochman) | RECOMMEND |

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) interpret Board Policy No. 033 as exempting from that Policy the FY 2009 Senior Mini-Grant projects; and (2) approve funding for the list of Senior Mini-Grant and New Freedom Projects as outlined in Attachment 1.
+6. **JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA**
   (Danielle Kochman)

   At the August 1, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting, staff proposed amending the evaluation criteria used for the Job Access And Reverse Commute (JARC) competitive process to incorporate the Coordinated Plan priorities for funding and implementation. The Transportation Committee requested to be presented with alternatives for different weightings of these evaluation criteria. Alternatives were developed in conjunction with the Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, FACT, and a representative of social service agencies. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the evaluation criteria outlined in Alternative 3 in Attachment 1 for the JARC Grant Program fall 2008 competitive process.

+7. **CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET TRANSFER** (John Haggerty)

   The Transportation Committee is asked to approve a Memorandum of Understanding with the Metropolitan Transit System for a fund transfer in an amount not to exceed $150,000, in substantially the same form as Attachment 1, and approve a new capital project for these funds. The new project would demolish the existing El Cajon Transit Center building and replace the building with bus platform paving.

+8. **SORRENTO VALLEY COASTER CONNECTION UPDATE** (Dan Levy)

   The Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection routes operated by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) are facing a significant loss of funding. This item will provide a status report on current efforts to develop longer-term funding through public-private partnerships and development of other possible service options. A verbal report on the impact of the new Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection fare on ridership also will be given.

+9. **TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM AMENDMENTS: COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM, AND THE CITIES OF DEL MAR, EL CAJON, ESCONDIDO, LEMON GROVE, NATIONAL CITY, POWAY, SAN DIEGO, SAN MARCOS, SANTEE, SOLANA BEACH, AND VISTA**
   (Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin)

   The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Resolution No. 2009-04, as shown in Attachment 1, approving revisions to TDA Article 3.0 claims for various County of San Diego and Cities of Del Mar, El Cajon, Escondido, Lemon Grove, National City, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, and Vista completed bicycle and pedestrian projects; and TDA Article 4.0 Claim No. 08031000 for the Metropolitan Transit System.
+10. AGREEMENT WITH CALTRANS FOR PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING ON THE INTERSTATE 5/STATE ROUTE 56 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (Richard Chavez)

Caltrans has asked to use SANDAG on-call engineering consultants for preliminary engineering for the Interstate 5 (I-5)/State Route 56 (SR 56) Interchange improvement project. The consultant costs are estimated at $830,000. Capacity up to $1,000,000 is recommended as part of this agreement. SANDAG TransNet funds would be used to cover costs. There are currently no TransNet funds on the I-5/SR 56 project. All costs, including administrative costs, would be reimbursed by Caltrans. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors authorize that the Executive Director to sign an agreement with Caltrans for preliminary engineering for the Interstate 5/State Route 56 Interchange improvement project. The agreement would allow Caltrans to utilize the SANDAG on-call engineering consultants. The agreement would be in substantially the same form as Attachment 1.

+11. DRAFT 2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (Heather Werdick)

SANDAG is required by state law to prepare and update every two years a Congestion Management Program (CMP). The purpose of the CMP is to monitor the region's transportation system and propose strategies to mitigate congestion. A draft 2008 CMP Update has been prepared, and the Transportation Committee is asked to accept for distribution the Draft 2008 CMP Update for a 30-day public comment period and schedule a public hearing for the November 7, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting. The Transportation Committee will be asked to adopt the 2008 CMP Update at the November 7, 2008, meeting. Additionally, the Transportation Committee is asked to provide direction regarding options to be considered for future CMP updates and discuss potential future additions to the CMP arterial network.

+12. STATUS REPORT ON MID-CITY RAPID BUS PROJECT (Miriam Kirshner)

This item will include a status report on the Mid-City Rapid project, including recent funding approval from the Federal Transit Administration, completion of preliminary engineering, public outreach efforts, release of a draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, and a schedule for future work.

+13. SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT (Jim Linthicum)

This item provides a status report on the SPRINTER rail project, including the projected final costs and the risks to budget.

14. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for October 3, 2008, at 9 a.m.

15. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING OF AUGUST 1, 2008

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) at 9:02 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Pro Tem Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) and a second by Councilmember Matt Hall (North County Coastal), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the July 18, 2008, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Don Stillwell, a member of the public submitted written comments and letters regarding MTS bus and trolley connections and service at the Grantville station, specifically bus route #14.

Lorraine Leighton, a member of the public, made comments regarding the homeless population and the debris they leave behind. She commented that during Comic-Con security was not present when a barefoot person walked across the railroad tracks.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public submitted written comments which he read into the record regarding educating the region’s population on the importance of a one cent sales tax to support transit.

Joy Sunyata, a member of the public commented regarding a statement made by the Chair of the SANDAG Board of Directors at the July 25, 2008, Board meeting. She stated that in response to Mr. Stillwell’s comments the Chair used the term “complex”. Ms. Sunyata requested that SANDAG work toward simplifying language and acronyms to make issues and projects easier for the public to understand.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) stated that he was impressed with the response MTS provided to Mr. Stillwell and that the response was comprehensive and did not just address bus route 14 but how the route interrelates with other routes and the system as a whole.
Charlene Zettel expressed her thanks to SANDAG for leading the recent meetings in Sacramento on AB 3034, the High Speed Rail bond, and for getting regional cooperation for this issue.

Chair Madaffer requested Gary Gallegos, Executive Director provide an update to the Committee members on the status of AB 3034.

Mr. Gallegos stated that status AB 3034 is on the Senate floor and requires a 2/3 vote. He stated that SANDAG is working to add language to the bill that would include an allocation for the San Diego Region to fund improvements to the LOSSAN Corridor that would support High Speed Rail. Mr. Gallegos stated that the bond will be on ballot as Proposition 1 if it passes the Senate and Assembly. He stated that the existing language is bad for our region because it dedicates the entire funding to the Los Angeles and San Francisco Corridor.

Ms. Zettel stated that perhaps SANDAG and other agencies could write a reference manual of frequently used terms and acronyms so the public can better understand.

Chairman Ed Gallo (North County Transit District [NCTD]) reiterated the need for funding for improvements to the LOSSAN corridor.

Chair Madaffer stated that he attended a meeting with OCTA this past week to continue dialogue on integrating transit and transportation related projects in the LOSSAN Corridor and along Interstate 5 (I-5). He stated that we need to have regional cooperation to better integrate rail lines that serve both the Los Angeles and the San Diego regions to better support the region as a whole.

CONSENT ITEM

3. SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE (APPROVE)

On June 13, 2008, the Executive Committee acted to consolidate the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) and the Transit Access Advisory Committee. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve an amendment to the SSTAC membership structure and charter to include the additional responsibility of advising staff on transit facilities accessibility and compliance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Title 24 requirements.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Hall and a second by Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Item 3.

REPORTS

4. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING FEDERAL SECTION 5310 PROGRAM APPLICATIONS (APPROVE)

The federal Section 5310 program provides funding for social service agencies to purchase vehicles used to transport seniors and persons with disabilities. These funds are available
through a statewide competition. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Resolution No. 2009-02 endorsing the scores for the 37 eligible projects awarded by the Local Review Committee for FY 2007-2008 Federal Section 5310 program funding and find that the applications are in conformance with the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.

Chairman Gallo requested clarification regarding the ineligibility of the application from Mountain Shadow Support Group for wheelchair restraint systems and Danielle Kochman, Assistant Transit Service Planner II stated that the organization applied for funding to purchase vehicles under this program and those vehicles are already outfitted with wheelchair restraint systems.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Chairman Gallo and a second by Vice Chair Jack Dale (East County), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Item 4 including Resolution No. 2009-02.

5. **FUNDING RECOMMENDATION FOR FY 2008 NEW FREEDOM AND FY 2009 TransNet SENIOR MINI-GRANT PROJECTS**

This item was postponed to the September 19, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting.

6. **DRAFT 2008-2012 COORDINATED PLAN (APPROVE/RELEASE FOR PUBLIC COMMENT)**

Phil Trom, Associate Transit Service Planner presented the item. He stated that SANDAG is responsible for developing a Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP) each year in accordance with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RSRTP provides a five-year blueprint of how the transit concepts described in the RTP are to be implemented in the region. In addition, the federal government, through the Safe Accountable Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires that each region prepare a Locally Developed Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan). Since the RSRTP and Coordinated Plan requirements include several areas which overlap, the two documents were combined starting with the 2007-2011 Plan. The combined plan is known as the Coordinated Plan.

Mr. Trom provided some background regarding the Coordinated Plan and stated that the intent of the Coordinated Plan is to improve coordination in transportation planning and operations among public transit and human service transportation providers. As such, the development of the Coordinated Plan brings all publicly available transportation services under a single unified plan. Transportation services included in the plan are those services offered by private companies, nonprofit organizations, public transit agencies, SANDAG, and human services agencies. Given this broad approach, the Coordinated Plan represents a significant expansion of transportation planning activities conducted in the region and, as a result, brings forth a "one region – one network – one plan" concept of public transit and human services transportation.

The Coordinated Plan is a “passenger-centered” approach to finding transportation solutions. This means that the Plan identifies mobility needs first, and then looks to determine which mode – transit or human services is best suited to meet the specific need. The Coordinated Plan draws upon a vast tool kit of transportation solutions ranging from
conventional public transit to other programs such as ridesharing services, technological solutions, and volunteer programs. The Coordinated Plan looks at transportation needs, gaps, deficiencies and solutions on a regional basis without being constrained to service areas or specific modes.

The Coordinated Plan has also been developed around a central tenet of system coordination to address the issues of rising transportation costs and improving productivity. The coordination among agencies actively involved in transportation has the potential to reduce inefficiencies caused by redundant or duplicative services, which in turn creates more sustainable solutions for the region. From a passenger perspective, this objective is also linked directly to helping individuals find the best transportation solution possible to meet their needs.

The major change to the Plan from the version approved in FY 2007 is the inclusion of priorities for funding of transportation services for seniors, persons with disabilities and persons of limited income. The inclusion of priorities was a new mandate from the federal government.

The draft Coordinated Plan was prepared in collaboration with staff members from the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), North County Transit District (NCTD), and the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency for San Diego County (CTSA), along with input from social service agencies, stakeholders and other transportation service providers.

Mr. Trom stated that the approval of the Coordinated Plan will enable the distribution of federal funding under the New Freedom (transportation for people with disabilities), Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) (commute transportation for individuals with limited means), and 5310 (seniors and persons with disabilities) programs. The plan also is also used to guide the distribution of local funding for projects targeted at improving transportation for seniors (Senior Mini-Grant program) which was created through the TransNet Extension.

Mr. Trom stated that a public comment period will be held between August 1 and September 19, 2008, culminating in a public hearing and approval of the Plan scheduled for the September 19, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting. The final approved Coordinated Plan will then be submitted to the state and federal departments of transportation.

Chairman Gallo requested clarification on how the Full Access Coordinated Transportation (FACT) would be incorporated into the Coordinated Plan. He also asked if Item 5 was pulled so that the Coordinated Plan would be reviewed first so that FACT could be incorporated into the Plan.

Mr. Trom stated that FACT is a component of the Coordinated Plan because this is the first time that social services transportation has been included in the Coordinated Plan which is one of the missions of FACT. This Plan also looks at social service providers and mobility management agencies. Mr. Trom stated that Item 5 was pulled for a policy issue reason and not any reason associated with the Coordinated Plan.
Vice Chair Dale requested clarification regarding whether an inter-modal center was considered for the Coordinated Plan.

Mr. Trom stated that the Coordinated Plan did base some of its prioritized projects on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Plan focuses on transit and social service and an inter-modal component would be in smart growth opportunity areas and ensuring transit is available. The Plan encourages development of inter-modal centers at locations with regional service needs.

Dan Levy, Senior Regional Planner, stated that the Coordinated Plan addresses transit services and social service transportation not capital facilities.

Clive Richard, a member of the public, expressed his support for the item.

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Pro Tem Emery and a second by Chairman Gallo, the Transportation Committee accepted and released for public review and comment the Draft Coordinated Plan, and scheduled a public hearing at the September 19, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting.

7. JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA (APPROVE)

Ms. Kochman presented the item. She stated that SANDAG was selected by the Governor of California to be the designated recipient of the JARC and New Freedom federal funding programs for the San Diego urbanized area. The responsibilities with this designation include developing the evaluation criteria and competitive selection process, holding the competitive selection process, and recommending to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) which projects should be funded.

Ms. Kochman stated that it is a federal requirement that all projects to be funded by the JARC program must be derived from the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Plan (Coordinated Plan).

On December 14, 2007, the Transportation Committee approved the JARC grant awards for FY 2008. At this meeting, the Transportation Committee also raised several questions regarding the JARC evaluation criteria, and asked that they be reviewed prior to the next competitive selection process to address concerns that some projects received a low ranking even though they were addressing important needs in the community. Updating the JARC evaluation criteria to reflect the draft Coordinated Plan priorities will address these concerns since these priorities identify transportation needs in San Diego County based on detailed empirical research and feedback obtained through public outreach that was undertaken with the Coordinated Plan planning process.

Some examples of high priorities identified in the draft Coordinated Plan are: develop or expand service in areas with little or no other transportation options; reverse commute services; employment related week night transportation services; development of centralized ride scheduling; dispatching and mobility center; improve transportation services to rural areas; and increase coordination efforts among transportation providers. Incorporating these priorities into the proposed JARC evaluation criteria will provide an
effective method of addressing the concerns of the Transportation Committee by ensuring that projects being funded are responding to the priorities of the community.

Ms. Kochman stated that staff is proposing changes to the scoring criteria to add the new Coordinated Plan Priority criterion. Staff also will strive to continue improved collaboration with applicants during the competitive process, with the aim of having applicants submit clearly outlined applications that are responsive to the JARC program requirements.

Ms. Kochman reviewed the proposed schedule for the competitive process and grant award for the fall competitive cycle of FY 2008 JARC funding. She stated that since the Coordinated Plan is scheduled to be adopted at the September 19, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting, any changes to the draft priorities for funding and implementation listed in the draft Coordinated Plan will be provided to prospective applicants at the preproposal meetings in late September.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification regarding the Coordinated Plan addressed in this item.

Ms. Kochman stated that the Coordinated Plan is the same plan addressed in the previous agenda item. She stated that the Coordinated Plan incorporates the social service transportation elements along with transit operators and is very similar to FACT’s mission to look at all options available to the user and to find the most appropriate transportation mode. FACT was very involved in the development of the Coordinated Plan and in developing the strategies and priorities for funding in the entire region.

Councilmember Monroe stated that this program is addressing reverse commutes and transportation to employment on a regular basis. FACT’s mission is to provide transportation to doctor’s appointments, grocery shopping and other types of fluctuating transportation needs. He stated that he would like clarification on how the phrase Coordinated Plan is being used.

Mr. Levy stated that the phrase “Coordinated Plan” is a federal designation for the coordination of public transit and human services transportation. FACT coordinates the different social services transportation providers.

Ms. Kochman stated that the Federal requirement is that three funding programs be derived from the Coordinated Plan, one of which is the JARC program. The Coordinated Plan looks at four elements: transportation for seniors, transportation for the disabled, transportation for low income individuals for employment related purposes, and transportation for reverse commuters regardless of income. The Plan looks at strategies for coordination of those four categories and for addressing the needs and prioritization of each category.

Councilmember Monroe stated that FACT does not separate the need for transportation into those four categories. The categories can be restrictive and complicate the FACT mission.
Mr. Levy stated that the Coordinated Plan addresses both public transit and social services transportation. The market for reverse commute may be too small for public transit to address but SANDAG can identify the need and ask FACT to coordinate with the social service agencies to fill the need.

Chair Pro Tem Emery asked if the guidelines addressed funding levels that could be applied for such as a maximum or minimum amount.

Ms. Kochman stated that the amount of total funding available has not been determined and no maximum amount of requested funds was set. MTS was awarded a contingency allocation of $150,000. MTS was going to apply for state funding to backfill this contingency. Currently, approximately $209,000 is available and if MTS is successful with state funding $150,000 would return to the pool of funds available for this program.

Chair Pro Tem Emery requested clarification of what agencies would be eligible to apply for funding and Ms. Kochman stated that any private or public transportation provider was eligible to apply, including tribal governments, private-for-profit agencies, and nonprofit agencies.

Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer of MTS, stated that the criteria of program effectiveness and performance indicators should have a higher value than 10 points. He commented that with limited dollars for projects, we should be awarding funding to programs that are most effective.

Mayor Art Madrid (East County) stated that the criteria of innovation should have a higher value than 5 points and SANDAG should focus more on programs that break the mold.

Chairman Gallo stated that one of the bullet points for the program is the development of centralized ride scheduling, dispatching and mobility center and asked if the LOSSAN Corridor could be incorporated into the program.

Ms. Kochman stated that this program focuses specifically on low-income passengers and reverse commuters.

Vice Chair Dale requested clarification regarding why staff recommends only 10 points for program effectiveness criteria.

Ms. Kochman stated that the Coordinated Plan Priority was considered the most important criteria. Staff used the process of both empirical studies and public outreach to determine what the most important needs were and placed the highest point value on those needs. Staff did not discount the program effectiveness criteria.

Vice Chair Dale stated that the program should focus on moving people and program effectiveness should have a higher priority.

Mr. Gallegos stated that staff can take the Committee’s comments and revise the criteria. Staff can return with different scoring options for the criteria that the Committee could review.
Mr. Jablonski stated that the criteria of Coordinated Plan Priority should be absolute criteria. If the program is not compatible with the Coordinated Plan it should not even be considered. Staff could take the 20 points and add them to the effectiveness criteria or innovation.

Councilmember Hall stated that changing the proposed criteria point values would affect all the applications and make some less competitive. He stated his concerns that FACT might be one of the programs that become less competitive.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification of the Coordinated Plan Priorities and asked that the list of priorities be added to the staff briefing. He stated that the criterion of effectiveness should be higher rated.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Chair Pro Tem Emery and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee referred the item back to staff and directed staff to return with different scoring options based on the Committee's comments for the criteria for the fall 2008 JARC Competitive Process.

8. **SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY MAJOR INVESTMENT STUDY UPDATE (DISCUSSION)**

Mayor David Druker (North County Coastal) introduced the item. He stated that he is the Board's representative for the South Orange County Major Investment Study (SOCMIS). The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) is currently conducting an assessment of various strategic alternatives for improving travel between the San Diego County border and State Route 55 (SR 55) in south Orange County. Mayor Druker introduced Charlie Larwood, OCTA Project Manager, for SOCMIS who presented the item.

Mr. Larwood stated that three committees provide feedback and oversight to the SOCMIS. The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) was formed to keep elected officials within the project area informed about the progress of the study and seek their input on policy direction to help guide the study process. The 21-member PAC consists of 18 voting members representing each city and supervisor district in the study area, and a public member from the OCTA Board of Directors, and three nonvoting members, representing SANDAG, Caltrans, and Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA).

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is the second oversight committee. Each city within the study area, as well as the County of Orange, Caltrans, TCA, Federal Highway Administration, and SANDAG, has a designated staff member to serve on TAC. The TAC provides the study team with detailed technical analysis and feedback on every element of the study.

And finally, the Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) provides feedback throughout the study process. Each SWG member represents a constituency and is charged with helping to build consensus for regional transportation solutions. SWG members represent a broad range of interest groups, including: business, environmental, public safety, developers, homeowner associations, transportation, and the community.
Mr. Larwood stated that the study objectives for SOCMIS were developed based on feedback from elected officials, agency staff, and stakeholders in the study area. These objectives are critical to assure that SOCMIS provides solutions for transportation issues in south Orange County. The objectives are to address the “transportation problem”: reduce freeway congestion in the study area, minimize freeway travel times, provide continuity of facilities along south Orange County freeways, improve freeway access at the interchanges, improve rail corridor constraints, and evaluate public transit options.

Mr. Larwood described the SOCMIS process and said that the SOCMIS is part of OCTA strategic efforts to keep Orange County moving over the next 25 years and beyond. The study includes a comprehensive public participation process and is divided into the following components: identify I-5 corridor deficiencies, develop the purpose and need for the corridor improvements, develop initial transportation alternatives, evaluate initial transportation alternatives, select a reduced set of transportation alternatives, evaluate a reduced set of transportation alternatives, and recommend a locally preferred transportation strategy.

Mr. Larwood stated that the study began in early 2006 and is expected to be completed in fall 2008. The study team developed 14 initial multimodal transportation alternatives. The evaluation results for the 14 alternatives were presented to TAC, SWG, and PAC in July/August 2007 for feedback. The PAC recommended that the 14 initial alternatives be reduced to six alternatives for further study. The six alternatives include a mixture of roadway, arterial, and transit/rail improvements at various investment levels. This reduced set of alternatives was approved for further study by the OCTA Board in October 2007. The reduced set of alternatives was evaluated with the findings on benefits, impacts, and costs presented to the TAC, PAC, and SWG this spring.

Mr. Larwood stated that based on this evaluation, the TAC developed a draft locally preferred strategy that included the best performing arterial, freeway/toll road, and transit system elements from the remaining six alternatives. The PAC reviewed the key technical findings and accepted a recommendation from the TAC on a draft multimodal locally preferred strategy in May 2008. On July 16, 2008, the PAC selected a final multimodal locally preferred strategy to recommend to the OCTA Board.

The final locally preferred strategy includes a combination of arterial, freeway/toll road, and transit improvements. Freeway/toll road improvements include adding general purpose lanes to sections of I-5 and I-405, extending the high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane to the San Diego county line, and reduced tolls and improvements to the toll roads. Proposed transit features include increased local, express, and bus rapid transit services and double tracking the Los Angeles – San Diego – San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor with increased passenger service between Orange and San Diego Counties.

Mr. Larwood reviewed the next steps and stated that the OCTA Board will be asked to approve the locally preferred strategy in September 2008. OCTA staff is currently making presentations to City Councils and other agencies. SANDAG staff has conveyed some initial comments to OCTA staff concerning the draft locally preferred strategy. These comments include pursuing high occupancy toll lane improvements throughout the corridor versus general purpose lane improvements and supporting improvements to the LOSSAN corridor.
and other transit investments. Mr. Larwood stated that comments received from SANDAG members will be presented to the OCTA Regional Highway Committee and Board.

**Action:** This item was presented for discussion/information.

9. **REGIONAL TRANSIT FARE STRUCTURE AND REVENUE SHARING STUDY UPDATE (INFORMATION)**

Dan Levy, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item and stated that in September 2006, in accordance with the adopted FY 2007 Budget and Overall Work Program, SANDAG retained the consulting services of TranSystems to prepare a Regional Transit Fare Structure and Revenue Sharing Study for the San Diego Region. The overall goal of the study was to develop a fare structure for the Region that was consistent with SANDAG Board Policy No. 029, Regional Fare Policy and Comprehensive Fare Ordinance. The study is a collaborative effort among SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD. Staff provided an update regarding this study to the Transportation Committee at its May 18, 2007, meeting, where the specific objectives of the study were set forth. These objectives are to develop a new regional fare structure designed to simplify the current MTS and NCTD fare systems, to recommend new fare products that take advantage of the investment the region is making in the Compass Card, and to develop a new regional transit fare revenue sharing methodology.

Mr. Levy stated that as work on the study progressed, it became clear that maintaining existing revenue levels (revenue neutral) was not sufficient due to the transit agency budget shortfalls, and the consultant was directed to develop proposals that would generate specific revenue targets. The original scope of work also was later amended to include a review of fares for paratransit services, and to expand the public outreach efforts to solicit input on possible fare structure changes. Five public outreach sessions are now planned. A joint SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staff committee was created to work with the consultant team and has met several times to review the consultant work efforts.

Mr. Levy reviewed the progress of the study and stated that responsibility for regional fare setting and fare policy was transferred to SANDAG as part of the transition agreements following passage of Senate Bill 1703 in 2003. In 2004, the SANDAG Board adopted the first Regional Transit Fare Policy (Board Policy No. 029) and in 2005 the Board adopted the first Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance which incorporated the current revenue sharing arrangements.

Mr. Levy stated that work on the Regional Transit Fare Structure and Revenue Sharing Study began in fall 2006 and was originally expected to be completed by spring 2007. However, major fare changes for MTS in January 2007 and MTS/NCTD in the summer of 2008 resulted in significant delays in this study, due to the need for the project consultant to provide assistance in testing the revenue implications of various fare alternatives, and then factoring the adopted fare changes into the study work tasks. In addition, in May 2008, the Joint Committee on Regional Transit (JCRT) submitted a letter to Transportation Committee Chairman Madaffer requesting that the study be put on hold until after July 1, 2008, so that the transit agencies could devote their attentions to fare increases needed to resolve the transit agencies budget shortfalls. The project is now scheduled to be completed in fall 2008.
Mr. Levy provided an overview of work to date on the Regional Transit Fare Structure and Revenue Sharing Study. The consultant team conducted extensive consultations with staff at SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD, as well as the public through interviews and a series of open house meetings. The consultants also have completed a peer review of fares and revenue sharing arrangements. A computer model was constructed to assess the ridership and revenue impacts of potential fare products and prices. As noted above, MTS made extensive use of the fare consultant and the fare model to test potential impacts of the fare changes it requested in 2007 and 2008. The model forecasts the amount of revenue and number of passengers to be expected at different fare levels. The model will also be used for future fare analyses. SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD developed a number of alternatives that have been tested and evaluated, including the fare changes requested by the transit operators. The results of these alternatives were incorporated into the recent fare changes adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2007 and 2008 to ensure their consistency with the direction of the fare study as well as meeting the revenue needs of the transit operators.

However, with each fare structure change it was necessary for the consultant to rebuild and test the computer model, a contributing factor to the delay in completing the fare study. The consultant held five open houses across the county to provide members of the public with an opportunity to comment on what they like and dislike about the existing fare system and to provide input on the concepts under consideration. The concepts raised by the consultants at the public open houses were generally well received by the public and some of the proposed changes have now been adopted. The specific concepts that were discussed included: rolling monthly passes, a single day pass for the entire region (excluding COASTER and Premium Express), a premium day pass valid on all services in the region, the same fare for the same type of service and a unified fare structure for MTS and NCTD, 14-day regional pass, and elimination of floating trolley zones - flat fare. The elimination of MTS bus transfers and the floating trolley zones with the recent fare changes have contributed greatly in simplifying the regional fare system and increasing consistency between the MTS and NCTD fare structures. The number of exceptions and special fare provisions has been reduced and fares have generally been simplified.

Mr. Levy stated that current work efforts are focused on two key areas. First, the consultant is now working on revenue sharing concepts and the scope of work requires development of at least two alternatives to the existing arrangements. The proposed revenue sharing arrangements must be based on a verifiable methodology for determining the allocation and the allocation must provide for an equitable sharing of fares.

The second key area is that a number of fare options are being evaluated, including several fare concepts discussed at the June 6, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting. These concepts include the creation of a region wide premium service day pass, the examination of the ridership and revenue impacts of a “Best Fare System” using the Compass Card technology, the evaluation of a 30-day versus calendar month rolling pass, the fare levels for future new BRT services, exploration of market-based fares for high-end premium services such as the COASTER and BRT services, and a recommended policy or mechanism for future fare adjustments.

Mr. Levy stated that the development of a consolidated fare structure for San Diego will result in a more user-friendly and consistent fare policy for the San Diego region; one that will facilitate transit use and reduce the potential for fare evasion and ensure a fair and equitable distribution of revenues to MTS and NCTD. It should be noted that the Compass
Card has the flexibility to address any of these fare policy and pricing options: however, additional funding resources maybe required to implement recommended changes. The draft report is anticipated to be ready in September 2008, and presentations will be made to the two transit boards as well as the Transportation Committee.

Teresa Quiroz, a member of the public, commented that long range planning was taken from MTS and given to SANDAG because fares are a big part of the economic stability of the region. Increased fares have a significant impact to the low income residents and we need to look at how fare changes affect the region and economic growth.

Stephen Russell, a member of the public representing the City Heights Community Development Corporation (City Heights CDC) and Chair of the I-15 Mid-City BRT Stations Working Group. He stated that the Working Group is working hard to develop alternatives for the BRT stations. He stated that while SANDAG considers the BRT as a premium regional service, the City Heights CDC considers the BRT as an economic necessity for residents to get to their employment. He requested that SANDAG not base fares on a market pricing but consider price sensitivity. Mr. Russell stated that the report on the Fare Study was professional but cold. The language to make transit friendly and consistent and to level or increase fares have caused passengers to quit using transit. These changes are not friendly and impact low-income passengers so that they can’t afford to use transit. He commented that now SANDAG has three different opportunities to fund these transit systems. He stated that a recent article indicated that the highway trust fund is under funded because driving has dropped due to high gas prices and they plan to raid the surplus funds in the federal transit trust fund. SANDAG should find a way to get some of those surplus funds. Secondly, SANDAG could build three BRT systems and operate them for 30 years for the same cost as the mid-coast rail. Finally, the SANDAG Board can override the guaranteed TransNet funding formula with a 2/3 vote. The TransNet Ordinance anticipated that there might be a time of extraordinary regional circumstances when the formula for funding transit and transportation projects might not meet the needs of the region. Mr. Russell stated that now is that time.

Michelle Luellen, a member of the public and of the City Heights CDC stated that BRT projects should not be considered choice ridership services or high-end premium fares. These projects should be seen as necessary infrastructure for the region that will provide transportation to employment for low-income persons. The BRT should remain affordable for all people in the region.

Chair Pro Tem Emery expressed his disagreement with the public’s perception that SANDAG only considers what the best thing for ridership is and does not consider how changes in transit affect people. He stated that the transit agencies are charged with providing the best services to the largest number of people and the largest number of people is the low income riders. The transit agencies also have to look at operational issues and what can be funded with the limited amount of money available. The only alternative to raising fares or changing service is to eliminate routes. Chair Pro Tem Emery stated that the transit agencies face difficult decisions for changes to ensure service can continue for the greatest number of riders and make those changes painfully and with very serious consideration to how it affects the people.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) expressed her appreciation to the speakers who came to support transit and transit passengers. She reiterated that the transit agencies
and this Committee reluctantly make difficult decisions out of necessity. She stated that providing services for high income or premium routes helps keep the service running. Transit is being cut everywhere and we are fighting for funds for capital needs as well as operational needs. The legislature needs to know that cutting transit affects how people get to their employment – affects health care costs and other services. Councilmember Atkins stated that the state is facing water shortages, an affordable housing crisis, and now transit emergencies. If there is flexibility in our funding choices that does not affect long term capital needs SANDAG needs to look at how we can support transit more. Councilmember Atkins stated that a prime example would be with the Senior Mini Grant Program. SANDAG should consider how that program might be able to fund transit.

Deputy Mayor Jerry Rindone (South County) stated that this is an opportunity to appeal to choice riders. He stated that the region needs to appeal to the state not to balance the budget by taking local jurisdictions’ funds from Proposition 42. He stated that the fare and service changes are caused in part because this funding has been eliminated at the state level and are necessary to avoid elimination of service completely.

Mr. Jablonski stated that the Proposition 42 raids would take another $9 million in transit funding from MTS alone and that would mean even more fare and service changes and even elimination of services.

Vice Chair Dale stated that the fare study considers gaps that need to be filled but also what are responsible and affordable fares for riders. We understand that we can’t provide mass transit to all four corners of the region. We need to have a dependable system whether the funding is there or not. He stated that we need to plan for this to happen again and find dependable funding sources for transit.

Councilmember Monroe asked whether the revenue sharing agreement was progressing and whether the draft study would be based on agreements between MTS and NCTD or would propose two separate alternatives for MTS and NCTD.

Mr. Levy stated that the consultant will look at different options for revenue sharing and bring back alternatives for the Committee to consider. The consultant will propose alternatives that calculate revenue sharing in different methods but the objective is to produce the same revenue regardless of the method.

Mr. Gallegos stated that staff will work to create a consensus concept from SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD. Staff recommendation would be what would be best for the region and hopefully that recommendation will be one that the three agencies worked out together.

Councilmember Monroe stated that representatives from the Board of Directors from the three agencies need to meet together to discuss the revenue sharing agreement.

Councilmember Monroe stated that the staff report states that a number of the fare options are being evaluated including several concepts discussed by this Committee at its June meeting, and that that implementation of these concepts is not currently included in the current scope. He asked for clarification regarding whether the Committee had to take action today to have those concepts included in the fare study.
Mr. Levy stated that staff has asked the consultant to include these fare options in the study and are processing an amendment for that.

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, stated there is budget and funding for the analysis but if any of these ideas change the operation of the compass card it could trigger a budget item in the future.

Deputy Mayor Rindone stated that in anticipation of raids on transit funding in the future, SANDAG needs to consider a possible measure for a full cent local sales tax for transit.

Mayor Madrid stated that this Committee must consider a consolidation of transit agencies in the near future and that SANDAG would be the best agency to manage transit funding and operations.

Chair Madaffer stated that he has requested the SANDAG General Counsel to research some areas regarding consolidation and that he would be presenting some pros and cons of consolidation for the Committee’s consideration. He stated that nationwide funding for transit is decreasing and yet demand is increasing. We owe it to the commuters of our region to maximize transit and not just keep focus on highway programs.

Mr. Jablonski asked whether staff intends to rely on the compass card ridership data when resolving the revenue sharing issues and asked whether the compass card would be available in time to meet a revenue sharing agreement schedule.

Mr. Levy stated that after the already approved changes made to fare structure are implemented, there are few products left that involve revenue sharing. The paper day pass is the one product that is not on the compass card.

James Dreisbach-Towle, Systems Integration, stated that staff will use one year of manual counts along with the compass card data but the model is to use the compass card data when it is available.

Mr. Jablonski stated that if the compass card is not operational by the time the consultant needs the data, this may cause problems with the revenue sharing agreement.

Mayor Druker stated that the NCTD Board of Directors has made the decision that the revenue sharing agreement would be delayed until the implementation of the compass card. He stated that the Joint Commission on Regional Transit (JCRT) is comprised of Board members from the two transit agencies and the JCRT should be considering the revenue sharing agreement. He commented that NCTD would lose approximately $3 million in funding from a raid on Proposition 42. Mayor Druker commented NCTD has always had a reserve fund but after the past two years that reserve fund is almost depleted.

Councilmember Bob Campbell (North County Inland) stated that the complexities of discussing a consolidation would be too disruptive at this time. The Committee needs to focus on cooperation on solvable issues such as revenue sharing.
Councilmember Monroe requested staff to define how manual counts will be done for revenue sharing agreements purposes. He stated that previous manual counts were based on data from one or two counts in a year which does not accurately reflect the ridership. He requested that staff develop a good method for manual counts.

Vice Chair Dale asked whether the Committee members would consider making changes to TransNet Ordinance funding priorities with a 2/3 vote.

Mr. Gallegos stated that under the new TransNet there are three unfinished projects are locked in for funding, the Mid-Coast BRT, the SR 52 and the SR 76 projects. The balance of the Extension Ordinance is adaptable by a 2/3 vote of the Board of Directors. He stated that the Ordinance also provides mandatory reviews at 10 years to evaluate status of projects and funding.

Chair Madaffer clarified that he would not support any push for consolidation until he was sure that the result would be the most efficient operating system in the region. He stated that SANDAG needs to study consolidation and determine if it makes sense. There are two current systems; one that supports suburban areas and one that supports urban areas. We have a fiduciary responsibility to study consolidation to see if it is the best possible solution for the region and to have the most efficient transit operations system for our region.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

10. UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMPASS CARD PROGRAM (INFORMATION)

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle presented the item and stated that SANDAG, in conjunction with its regional transit partners MTS and NCTD, has deployed the regional Automated Fare Collection (AFC) system. The AFC system has centralized fare collection, passenger reporting, and revenue apportionment to a single system. The AFC system is now responsible for collecting and distributing approximately $81 million of fare revenues annually.

The AFC system is the backbone on which the Compass Card operates. The Compass Card is a non-contact electronic smart card which has an imbedded microprocessor chip and a radio antenna. The Compass Card is capable of storing either transit products like monthly passes or dollar values. This latter feature known as stored value is very similar to how gift cards work except that the money is actually stored on the card and not in a central system.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that SANDAG, NCTD, and MTS are now ready to begin a full public deployment of the Compass Card system. In order to deliver a universal fare system and to allow uniform access to all transit patrons, the Compass Card has been deployed in 920 regional buses including both MTS and NCTD direct operated services as well as all contract bus services. All revenue operating fixed-route vehicles have been outfitted with Compass Card readers including van-type services such as the Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection (SVCC). Compass Card has deployed ticket vending machines (TVMs) to all three rail services in the region: Trolley, COASTER, and SPRINTER. The new TVMs will vend the plastic Compass Card as well as allow patrons to buy and load products and/or value to their existing cards.
Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that SANDAG also has deployed as part of the Compass project ticket office equipment which allows the transit agency and a select few third-party contractors to sell new Compass Cards and reload existing cards. Currently NCTD operates three ticket offices located in Oceanside, Vista, and Escondido. MTS operates the Transit Store in downtown San Diego. SANDAG will deploy additional equipment to San Ysidro and Old Town to third-party contractors and we are currently looking for a suitable vendor in East County.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that the Compass Card program has opened a new call center and staffed that center with a call center manager and three customer service representatives. The region’s transit passengers can now call 511 and say “Compass” and they will be able to talk directly to a Compass representative who will assist them with purchasing a new card, checking the status of an existing account, or answering general questions or concerns about the Compass Card program. These services will be available five days a week Monday through Friday from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that later this month SANDAG is planning to deploy an account management web site which can be reached by going to the regional travel information portal at www.511sd.com and selecting the Compass Card option. We have updated the existing Compass Card Web site with additional information and plan to continue to build and improve that site to include detailed “how to use” graphics and text. The account management site will give the user all the familiar features of online banking and allow the user to purchase a new card, register an existing Compass Card, or reload passes and value to an account over the Internet.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle described the different types of equipment deployed on the rail system and on the bus system that support the compass card. He also reviewed the web ticketing process.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle reviewed the plans to deploy and market the compass card. The proposed plan is to completely eliminate printed paper monthly passes by July 1, 2009, and replace those passes with a re-loadable Compass Card. In order to accomplish this goal, SANDAG is planning a careful and gradual approach to deploying the Compass Card and we will target market our customer education to the various group segments to match the deployment plan.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that the first phase of the Compass Card roll out began on July 1, 2008, by reaching out to a cross-section of the transit population and asking them to participate in our public pilot program. We have currently attracted approximately 2,500 interested users and have given them a Compass Card. The card holders purchased their normal monthly pass via our call center. To help orient these early adopters, we have developed an introductory mailer explaining the basics of the system and requesting their assistance in testing the system and crafting our public messages. We will conduct follow up interviews and focus groups with this market segment from which we will refine both our delivery and our message.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that Phase II targets the COASTER and stored value on the compass card. He stated that beginning on September 1, 2008, the Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection (SVCC) will start a $1.00 fare per trip charge as outlined in the June 13, 2008,
adopted fare ordinance. SANDAG will be offering the ability to combine a COASTER monthly pass with either a new SVCC monthly pass or stored value on the Compass Card to support this rider group. We have already begun reaching out to this population consisting of approximately 500 riders. Passengers using the Compass Card will not have to worry about carrying exact change. SANDAG has also been working with large employers in the region to deploy compass cards.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that Phase III targets the rolling passes. The SANDAG Board of Directors and the Transportation Committee have directed staff to begin offering a 30-day rolling pass as a replacement for the region’s entire existing calendar monthly passes beginning on January 1, 2009. The Compass Card will be used to make this directive happen. The rolling pass will allow the user to purchase their pass at anytime and it will become active for 30 days when the card is first tapped.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that this phase will begin the migration from the paper pass to the Compass Card. For a period of time patrons will have a choice of either paper or plastic until the transition period is completed on July 1, 2009. SANDAG in partnership with NCTD and MTS is proposing a stepped approach to eliminating the paper passes. Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that the $90 Premium Express Pass will be phased to plastic by January 2009, all COASTER Passes by March 2009, the Breeze/Sprinter Pass by May 2009, and the $68 Regional Pass by July 2009. At each step, a specific education and market effort will be developed to communicate the change as well as the benefits of the new system. Each target group will require a specific message. SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD retained a marketing consultant and developed a marketing plan that identifies each target market and the necessary communication effort to successfully reach that audience.

Mayor Druker requested clarification regarding why the schedule is so delayed between the public pilot program and full implementation for the regional pass.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that staff wants to make sure that the public is educated and our message is clear without shocking the public with this radical change. He stated that one of the major objectives of the public pilot is to refine the marketing message. Staff will be collecting data, giving public workshops and surveys to find out if the message was helpful and clear.

Clive Richard, a member of the public stated his support for the compass card and his appreciation to the staff for the work they have done.

Councilmember Campbell asked if the public pilot project was limited to a specific geographic area and Mr. Dreisbach-Towle replied that the project encompassed the entire county and every rider class in order to obtain information from a variety of riders.

Councilmember Campbell stated that fare evasion will become a larger problem as transit budgets become constrained. He asked how close the compass card had to be to the reader in order to work and register the passenger.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that the message is “tap and go” and the card must actually be tapped against the reader to be registered. The reader will beep with a green light that says go, a red light and beep means there is a problem with the card and the yellow light beep
will indicate that the funds are low or the pass will expire soon. He stated that Transit Security will have a hand held reader that registers the card status within a second.

Councilmember Campbell asked whether an expanded use of the system would be potential use by FACT vendors for multimodal transportation services and Mr. Dreisbach-Towle responded that it would be a possibility.

Mayor Druker stated that SANDAG needs to implement the compass card program much faster than the current plan. People understand the technology behind this type of card and he stated that as important as the compass card is to the region, we need to accelerate the program.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification regarding the elimination of paper passes and how that affects the day pass.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that the paper day pass would still be used but all paper monthly passes would be eliminated and sold only on compass cards.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle commented that every type of pass will be available on the compass card in October giving people option of self-change over to the compass card. SANDAG will highly encourage that but won’t push the compass card.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

11. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The Transportation Committee meetings, originally scheduled for Friday, August 15, and Friday, September 5, 2008, have been cancelled. The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, September 19, 2008, at 9 a.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Madaffer adjourned the meeting at 11:08 a.m.
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Action Requested: RECOMMEND

PUBLIC HEARING: 2008 – 2012 COORDINATED PLAN

File Number 3002300

Introduction

SANDAG is responsible for developing a Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP) each year in accordance with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RSRTP provides a five-year blueprint of how the transit concepts described in the RTP are to be implemented in the region. In addition, the federal government, through the Safe Accountable Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires that each region prepare a Locally Developed Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan). Since the RSRTP and Coordinated Plan requirements include several areas which overlap, the two documents were combined starting with the 2007 – 2011 Plan. The combined document is known as the Coordinated Plan.

The intent of the Coordinated Plan is to improve coordination in transportation planning and operations among public transit and human service transportation providers. As such, the development of the Coordinated Plan brings all publicly available transportation services under a single unified plan. Transportation services included in the plan are those services offered by private companies, nonprofit organizations, public transit agencies, SANDAG, and human services agencies. Given this broad approach, the Coordinated Plan represents a significant expansion of transportation planning activities conducted in the region and, as a result, brings forth a “one region – one network – one plan” concept of public transit and human services transportation planning.

On August 1, 2008, the Transportation Committee released the Draft Coordinated Plan for public comment through September 19, 2008. This item highlights key items covered by the Coordinated Plan and summarizes the comments received to date on the draft Plan. Following holding the public hearing, the Transportation is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the final Coordinated Plan.

Discussion

Background

The Coordinated Plan follows the guidance set out in SANDAG Board Policy No. 018, “Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation,” for the RSRTP and the Federal Register for the Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan. Board Policy No. 018 states that SANDAG staff are to prepare, on an annual basis, a five-year RSRTP that:
• Establishes the goals and objectives for short-range transit services;
• Defines the existing transit system;
• Sets the framework for a transit operations performance monitoring program as required by the Transportation Development Act;
• Identifies service gaps and deficiencies;
• Evaluates existing services and programs;
• Establishes parameters for short-range (0 to 5 years) new and revised service developments, as well as regionally significant and all other service adjustments;
• Defines a methodology for evaluating proposals for new and revised service;
• Identifies and prioritizes regional and subarea transit planning studies; and
• Evaluates and prioritizes new and revised services for implementation, including the adoption of an annual Regional Service Implementation Plan.

The federal government, through SAFETEA-LU, requires that SANDAG prepare a Coordinated Plan with the following four elements:

• An assessment of available services that identifies current providers (public, private, and nonprofit);
• An assessment of transportation needs for individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes. This assessment can be based on the experiences and perceptions of the planning partners or on more sophisticated data collection efforts, and gaps in service;
• Strategies and/or activities to address the identified gaps and achieve efficiencies in service delivery; and
• Relative priorities for implementation based on resources, time, and feasibility for implementing specific strategies/activities identified.

The 2008 – 2012 Coordinated Plan includes the required elements of both the RSRTP and Coordinated Plan with the exception of RSRTP components involving the development of new services. To do this, SANDAG will need to have the Service Improvement Plans (SIP) from both transit operators. SIPs were not prepared by either operator this year due to lack of available funding and anticipation that the development of new service would not be feasible under the current budget constraints. However, the intent is for future Coordinated Plans to evaluate and prioritize new and revised services for implementation, along with SANDAG TransNet projects, such as Bus Rapid Transit, Rapid Bus and Light Rail Extensions, and include those projects in the Regional Service Implementation Plan.

Public Comments

On August 1, 2008, the Transportation Committee released the Draft Coordinated Plan for public comment through September 19, 2008. Attachment 1 summarizes the comments received up until September 2, 2008, including staff responses to the comments. The comments received were minor in nature and did not result in any changes to the main Coordinated Plan (Attachment 2) document.
itself. However, one comment suggested that the Technical Appendix be expanded to include additional locations where there is an identified need for social service transportation. As a result, the Technical Appendix was updated to include these additional areas. Any additional comments that are received between September 2 and September 18 will be provided to the Transportation Committee at the September 19, 2008, meeting.

**Next Steps**

The approval of the Coordinated Plan will enable the continued distribution of federal funding under the New Freedom (transportation for people with disabilities), Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) commute transportation for individuals with limited means), and 5310 (seniors and persons with disabilities) programs. The plan also will be used to guide the distribution of local funding under the Senior Mini-Grant program which was created through the TransNet Extension. New Freedom, JARC, and Senior Mini-Grant funding will be awarded through a competitive process following the plan’s approval by the Board of Directors.

Copies of the approved Coordinated Plan will be forwarded to Caltrans to enable it to hold the competitive process for statewide New Freedom and JARC grants in the rural areas of the San Diego region. A copy of the Final Coordinated Plan also will be forwarded to the Federal Transit Administration. Printed copies of the Technical Appendix will be available at the Transportation Committee meeting and also are available at www.sandag.org/coordinatedplan.

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

**Attachments:**  

**Key Staff Contact:** Philip Trom, (619) 699-7330, ptr@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/05/2008</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Helen Elias/ Southwestern College</td>
<td>&quot;I definitely support the new component to prioritize funding of transportation services for seniors, persons with disabilities and persons with limited incomes.&quot;</td>
<td>No response required.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/22/2008</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase/ Move San Diego</td>
<td>Concerned about the absence of Census Tract maps in the Title VI discussion included in Appendix H</td>
<td>The Title VI information in the Coordinated Plan was intended to provide an annual update of the Triennial Title VI report statistics in order to identify any issues as early as possible. In this way, the inclusion of Title VI information in the Coordinated Plan is a proactive approach to identify any Civil Rights issues so that solutions can be implemented or addressed in the short term. However, Appendix H does not include a complete triennial analysis since the Census Tract maps do not change in the short term. Those maps are and will continue to be available in the Triennial Title VI report which can be downloaded from the SANDAG Web site.</td>
<td>Appendix H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8/26/2008</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Lisa Kramer/ Cheneweth Foundation</td>
<td>&quot;Just looking at gaps in service identified for disabled (Appendix O-13) which states there are no gaps in service for suburban or rural areas. While there may be access for transport to job sites or Adult Day Programs during the week, I am not aware of adequate services for disabled in rural or suburban areas, especially those who need door-to-door transportation, to access low-cost, accessible transportation by appointment (non-emergency medical appts, recreation, shopping, visit family, friends, etc.). For real independence these individuals would have accessible transportation options with reasonable wait-times, low cost, and night and weekend access.&quot;</td>
<td>The identification of service gaps was revised to include several additional areas without sufficient social service transportation that match the existing population densities. Additional areas were added to the existing text in Appendix O and P based on this re-evaluation for disabled individuals, seniors, and persons with limited incomes.</td>
<td>Appendix O and P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8/28/2008</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Joan Elizabeth Jarc</td>
<td>Citizen concerned with what she sees as the need to get creative to solve the transportation problems faced by the region. Believes that smaller buses may be a solution to save money. Also believes that some transit dependent persons could benefit from moving to more transit oriented developments but many cannot afford to make this move.</td>
<td>SANDAG staff has been proactively working with interested citizens, health and human service agencies, and transit providers to work toward creative solutions to solve the transportation and budget dilemmas and appreciates her input in furthering this process.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9/5/2008</td>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>Barbara Bernard</td>
<td>Citizen concerned about the lack of senior, disabled and low-income transportation in Ramona. States that it is important that transportation be provided in Ramona to enable people to travel to doctors appointments and to other areas of the County.</td>
<td>The identification of service gaps was revised (see response to comment #3 above) which included the specific addition and mentioning of Ramona to rural areas with deficient social service transportation for seniors, disabled and persons with low incomes.</td>
<td>Appendix O and P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Printed copies of the 2008 - 2012 Coordinated Plan (Attachment 2) and Technical Appendix may be obtained from the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/coordinatedplan or by contacting the SANDAG Public Information Office at (619) 699-1950.
FUNDING RECOMMENDATION FOR FY 2008 NEW FREEDOM AND FY 2009 SENIOR MINI-GRANT PROJECTS

File Number 3002300

Introduction

SANDAG was selected by the Governor of California to be the designated recipient of the New Freedom federal funding programs for the San Diego urbanized area. The New Freedom program is eligible to fund operating, capital, and mobility management projects providing new or expanded transportation services and facilities for persons with disabilities. The TransNet Extension ordinance includes the provision for a competitive grant program for senior transportation programs, which seeks to fund operating and capital projects providing specialized transportation services for seniors.

Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and the TransNet Extension ordinance require that SANDAG conduct a competitive selection process to distribute the funds. Eligible applicants include private non-profit organizations, governmental authorities, private and public transportation providers, and the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA). The purpose of this competitive selection process is to evaluate potential projects and recommend which projects should be funded. A total of 18 proposals for 28 individual projects were received requesting Senior Mini-Grant funding, and seven proposals from six agencies were received requesting New Freedom funds. An amendment will be added to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) to include all Senior Mini-Grant and New Freedom projects approved by the Board of Directors before the New Freedom projects are forwarded to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board approval for funding of the Attachment 1 list of projects for: Senior Mini-Grant projects totaling $1,268,557 in TransNet funding for FY 2009, and $2,405,638 for FY 2010 and FY 2011 as option years contingent upon satisfactory project performance in FY 2009; and New Freedom projects totaling $1,201,001 in FTA funds the FY 2008 and FY 2009 two year period. The Transportation Committee also is asked to recommend an exemption from Board Policy No. 033 for the current Senior Mini-Grant competitive process given an inconsistency regarding the applicability of the policy to the TransNet Senior Mini-Grant Program.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors:

1) interpret Board Policy No. 033 as exempting from that Policy the FY 2009 Senior Mini-Grant projects; and
2) approve funding for the list of Senior Mini-Grant and New Freedom Projects as outlined in Attachment 1.
Discussion

Senior Mini-Grant Program Process

On February 15, 2008, the Transportation Committee approved the competitive process and evaluation criteria for allocating FY 2009 Senior Mini-Grant funds (Attachment 2). A five-member outside review committee was established composed of individuals and agencies that work closely with seniors. In addition to two seniors familiar with transportation issues, the panel had representatives from Adult Protective Services, American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), and Caltrans. The members of this review committee scored each project against the adopted evaluation criteria and not relative to other projects. These scores were then used to rank the projects.

Recipients must provide a 20 percent local match for operating costs and an 80 percent local match for capital projects. Applicants are eligible to apply for up to three years of funding, however, grants will be awarded for only one year with up to two, one-year options. The extension of the grant into the option years will be contingent upon the performance of the project. If the performance of a particular project is not adequate to continue the grant into the option years, the applicant may reapply for funding during the next competitive selection process.

Based on the recommendations described below, a total of $1,268,557 out of the $1,278,000 projected available is recommended for funding in FY 2009. Because the amount available is a projection based on estimated sales tax revenues over the course of the next fiscal year, the actual amount of funding available for FY 2009 may differ from the estimate. If the amount available for Senior Mini-Grant funding is lower than the estimated amount, adjustments will be made to the lowest ranked project being funded or equally distributed among all successful applicants. If the actual amount available is higher than the amount apportioned, any unallocated monies will be rolled over into future funding cycles.

SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

SANDAG Board Policy No. 033, Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Memorandum, is designed to provide an incentive-based approach to encourage local jurisdictions to address the region's housing needs. Board Policy No. 033 requires that any discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG must be awarded based on compliance with an adopted housing element and the production of affordable housing, unless an exemption to the policy applies.

Within Board Policy No. 033 there appears to be an inconsistency regarding the applicability of the policy to the TransNet Senior Mini-Grant Program. Attachment 2 of the policy lists discretionary funding programs that are subject to Board Policy No. 033, and specifically includes the TransNet Senior Mini-Grant Program. However, Section 2.2 of the policy describes the types of funding that are exempt from the policy, including “funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions (e.g., TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Regional Habitat Conservation Fund).”

The Senior Mini-Grant Program originally was listed in Attachment 2 because at the time it was prepared, staff believed that only local jurisdictions would apply for Senior Mini-Grant funds. However, when the program guidelines were developed, it was determined that other agencies...
should be allowed to receive these funds. As a result, the majority of the Senior Mini-Grant funds are proposed to be awarded to agencies other than local jurisdictions, including nonprofit agencies. Based solely Section 2.2, Board Policy No. 033 would not apply to this funding program, but Attachment 2 makes the exemption unclear as to the Senior Mini-Grant funds.

These inconsistencies regarding the Senior Mini-Grant Program will be resolved in a review of Board Policy No. 033 to be undertaken by the Regional Planning Committee, Executive Committee, and Board at their meetings in October. In an effort to avoid possible delays in this year’s funding allocations, however, the Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board that the Senior Mini-Grant program be exempted from Board Policy No. 033 for the FY 2009 cycle.

**Senior Mini-Grant Funding Recommendations**

A total of 18 applications were received for 28 individual projects. The review committee met on May 20, 2008, and scored and ranked each application to develop a list of recommended projects. The evaluation committee recommended funding the top 13 projects based on their scores.

For this first competitive selection cycle for the Senior Mini-Grant program, there was no maximum amount set for the grant request. As a result the grant requests ranged from less than $21,000 to more than $320,000. The review committee recommended that staff negotiate with the applicants requesting the three highest amounts in order to maximize the number of grants awarded. Staff met with each of these three agencies and was able to work with them to adjust their project budgets and scope and lower the grant request amount. For future Senior Mini-Grant competitive processes, staff will evaluate setting a maximum grant award amount.

The review committee also was interested in funding the proposal submitted by Full Access & Coordinated Transportation (FACT); however, the committee did raise some concerns regarding their submission. The project proposed by FACT involves using Senior Mini-Grant funds to reimburse existing transportation programs to provide trips for seniors who contact FACT but do not have any means of transportation and are not able to afford expensive private providers. This will be a preliminary step toward the FACT vision of a countywide coordinated transportation system. By matching riders with the most appropriate available transportation option, FACT will be able to take advantage of existing excess capacity on already operating vehicles with the expectations that greater ridership will lead to lower per-trip costs and ultimately result in more economical transportation options. Staff worked with FACT to respond to the two concerns that were raised by the review committee:

1. **Securing Partners.** The success of the FACT project is contingent upon being able to secure partners. At the time of the submission of the original application, there was no written commitment from transportation providers to supply rides for the FACT senior clients. After the review committee met, FACT was able to secure written agreement from the North County Transit District (NCTD) and Redwood Elderlink, a private nonprofit transportation provider, to enter into contract negotiations once FACT is awarded the grant.

2. **Non-Duplicative Scheduling Effort.** The review committee was concerned that, in the FACT role in matching the rider to a provider, FACT may incur additional administrative costs over the rider contacting the provider directly. FACT submitted a letter to SANDAG as an
addendum to the application explaining the process FACT will use to schedule and how it will create economies of scale as opposed to additional administrative costs.

Since FACT was able to fully address the concerns raised by the review committee, staff is recommending a modification to the review committee's recommendations to include fully funding the FACT project.

The review committee also reviewed an application submitted by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) for ten fixed-route services and one demand responsive service. MTS believes that these projects should be funded through this program because given the current budget issues facing MTS, the routes proposed for funding may be facing service cuts which will have a negative impact on seniors throughout the region. The routes MTS is proposing to be funded through the Senior Mini-Grant program include routes that either serve many seniors, serve areas where a high concentration of seniors live, serve areas where gaps for senior transportation are identified in the Coordinated Plan, or serve hospitals or other destinations frequented by seniors. Based on the data provided by MTS in its application, seniors account for a total of 12.5 percent of the ridership on the routes proposed for funding, ranging between 7.5 percent and 20 percent on the fixed-route services in the package, and 89 percent for the demand responsive service. The applications were reviewed and scored by an outside committee of seniors and persons involved with senior transportation and each member independently came to the same conclusion that public transit services are not a specialized transportation service as specified for funding through the Senior Mini-Grant Program in the TransNet Ordinance. Consequently, the review committee ranked these projects low and did not recommend them for funding. SANDAG staff concurs with the recommendations of the Review Committee, and the funding recommendation was supported by the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC).

Attachment 1 includes the list of 14 projects recommended to receive Senior Mini-Grant funding. Fully funding these 14 projects would result in allocating $1,268,557 out of the $1,278,000 estimated to become available in FY 2009. Attachment 1 also includes the amounts recommended to be funded as option years (FY 2010 and FY 2011) for the grant. The 14 projects included in Attachment 1 were recommended for funding by a 4-2 vote by the ITOC at its July 16, 2008, meeting.

**New Freedom Program Process**

On January 18, 2008, the Transportation Committee approved the competitive process and evaluation criteria for allocating FY 2008 and FY 2009 New Freedom funds (Attachment 2). A New Freedom review committee was established composed of five members including representatives of social service agencies that work closely with seniors, and representatives from MTS and Caltrans. The members of this review committee met on June 30, 2008, and scored each project against the adopted evaluation criteria and not relative to other projects. These scores were then used to rank the projects.

The Federal Guidance for the New Freedom permits applicants to apply for funding appropriated to three different fiscal years at one time. However, since funding for this program is only authorized through FY 2009, the applicants only had the opportunity to apply for two years of funding at this time.
For New Freedom projects, recipients must provide a 50 percent local match for operating costs, and a 20 percent local match for capital and mobility management projects. For this program all remaining funds authorized under SAFETEA-LU are recommended for funding totaling $1,201,001 over the next two years. The amount of available funding for FY 2009 is an estimate provided by FTA. If the amount appropriated when the Federal appropriations bill is passed differs from the estimates, adjustments will be made to the lowest ranked project being funded.

**New Freedom Program Recommendations**

Attachment 1 includes the list of six projects recommended to receive New Freedom funding. These six projects recommended for funding represent the top projects based on the ranking of projects performed by the scoring committee. For FY 2008, the scoring committee is recommending these projects be funded for a total of $531,709. Through the scoring committee process, two projects tied with the same ranking: the Accessible Paths of Travel project submitted by NCTD, and the Mobility Management project submitted by FACT. There was not enough of FY 2008 money available to fully fund both of these projects. The applicants of these two projects agreed to revise their scope and budget to match the amount of funding that was available, which will provide funding to cover approximately 75 percent of both projects in FY 2008.

For FY 2009, there is a greater level of funding available than in FY 2008. This increased funding allowed the remaining FACT and NCTD project funding requests described above to be funded fully in FY 2009, and also allowed for partial funding of the next highest ranked project, the Accessible Tourism and Transportation Information Network project submitted by Accessible San Diego. Accessible San Diego also has revised its budget and scope to match the $132,960 available.

A summary of each of the projects recommended for funding is available in Attachment 1.

**Next Steps**

If the funding allocations outlined in Attachment 1 are recommended to the Board by the Transportation Committee, approval of the funding requests is scheduled for the September 26, 2008, Board of Directors meeting.

Upon approval by the Board, projects will be amended to be included in the RTIP prior to submitting the New Freedom projects to the FTA for final approval and executing contracts with recipients.

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

Attachments: 1. Senior Mini-Grant and New Freedom Project Descriptions and Rankings  
2. Senior Mini-Grant and New Freedom Evaluation Criteria

Key Staff Contact: Danielle Kochman, (619) 699-1921, dko@sandag.org
## Senior Mini-Grant Program Project Descriptions and Rankings (in Alphabetical Order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Requested Grant $</th>
<th>Req’d Match</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Congregations Together (ACT)</td>
<td>ComLink Transportation: The proposed project would provide a shuttle service for non-emergency medical and social trips for residents of five senior centers in Chula Vista and National City.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $158,877, FY 2010 - $174,783, FY 2011 - $187,073, TOTAL - $520,733</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding. Staff worked with ACT to reduce the requested grant amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Project</td>
<td>Senior Transportation Program: The proposed project would provide shuttle service for homeless and extremely low-income seniors living in downtown San Diego and low-income seniors in Escondido and Oceanside. The shuttle service would provide trips directly to medical appointments, shopping/food banks, salons and barbershops, social activities, religious services, recreation and entertainment, as well as other destinations upon request.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $195,806, FY 2010 - $195,806, FY 2011 - $195,806, TOTAL - $587,418</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding. Staff worked with Alpha Project to reduce the requested grant amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Rides4Neighbors: This project proposes to expand the City of La Mesa’s volunteer driver program into the neighboring communities of Mt. Helix and other unincorporated areas, Spring Valley, parts of El Cajon and Lemon Grove, San Carlos, and Del Cerro. Additional elements of this project include the expansion of a small bus flexible route for shopping and medical trips, the distribution of subsidized taxi vouchers, the development of a travel training program, and hosting a Transportation and Mobility Expo event.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $80,000, FY 2010 - $80,000, FY 2011 - $80,000, TOTAL - $240,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Solutions for Seniors on the Go: This project proposes to provide a taxi voucher program, a door-to-door shuttle program, and a free door-through-door volunteer driver program.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $105,456, FY 2010 - $234,131, FY 2011 - $299,328, TOTAL - $638,915</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Out &amp; About Vista: This project proposes to fund a door-to-door senior shuttle service and a volunteer driver program.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $76,464, FY 2010 - $0, FY 2011 - $0, TOTAL - $76,464</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ElderHelp</td>
<td>This project proposes to expand ElderHelp’s current volunteer driver program to serve more low-income seniors who need transportation in the mid-city area. Currently, ElderHelp only provides transportation for their care management clients. The expansion will allow them to provide transportation to seniors who do not need to be enrolled in their care management program, however, still have a need for transportation services.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $117,421, FY 2010 - $111,110, FY 2011 - $117,406, TOTAL - $345,937</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Requested Grant $</td>
<td>Req’d Match</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>The project proposed by FACT involves using Senior Mini-Grant funds to reimburse existing transportation programs to provide trips for seniors who contact FACT with no means of transportation and are not able to afford expensive private providers.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $24,000 FY 2010 - $42,240 FY 2011 - $59,040 TOTAL - $125,280</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITNSanDiego</td>
<td>This project proposes to launch a new affiliate community of the national Independent Transportation Network program (ITN). ITN is a membership organization offering rides around the clock, seven days a week, for any purpose within the service area. Fares are generally half or less than the price of a taxi, and rides are provided by volunteer or paid drivers using private automobiles only.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $75,000 FY 2010 - $0 FY 2011 - $0 TOTAL - $75,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Family Services</td>
<td>Rides &amp; Smiles: This project proposes to expand Rides &amp; Smiles volunteer driver program to other areas of North County Inland which currently have limited or no service from this program, including the Carmel Mountain Ranch and Mira Mesa areas of San Diego County.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $72,942 FY 2010 - $76,469 FY 2011 - $79,363 TOTAL - $228,774</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Given the addendums that were submitted after the original proposal, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District (NCTD)</td>
<td>Mobility/Travel Training Program: This project proposes to expand the program currently provided by NCTD. The training programs help individuals learn how to use the NCTD Rider’s Guide and its contents, create and plan travel options, and achieve independence through an individualized or group training where a trainee navigates the transit system on the BREEZE buses, FAST demand response service, COASTER commuter rail, and the SPRINTER light rail.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $116,483 FY 2010 - $40,474 FY 2011 - $43,108 TOTAL - $200,065</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding. Staff worked with NCTD to reduce the requested grant amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Shepherd Senior Center</td>
<td>This project proposes to provide a door-through-door volunteer driver program and a weekly shopping shuttle service. An additional element of this project is to update and distribute a senior transportation option brochure.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $42,144 FY 2010 - $43,877 FY 2011 - $45,680 TOTAL - $131,701</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Elderlink</td>
<td>The proposed project is to expand the current services to be able to meet the existing demand. Redwood Elderlink provides numerous different transportation programs in North County, however, this request pertains specifically to Elderlink’s “Out &amp; About” Escondido program, a shuttle service providing seniors with medical and shopping related trips.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $52,003 FY 2010 - $52,003 FY 2011 - $52,003 TOTAL - $156,009</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Senior Mini-Grant Program Project Descriptions and Rankings (in Alphabetical Order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Requested Grant $</th>
<th>Req'd Match</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Community Center</td>
<td>This project proposes using Senior Mini Grant funds to match a New Freedom grant already received for the Senior Community Center to purchase and operate a medium bus to transport its clients for various appointments and activities.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $57,600</td>
<td>80% and 20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelers Aid Society</td>
<td>SenioRide: This project proposes to provide a taxi voucher program, a volunteer driver program, and develop a ride sharing program serving low- and fixed-income seniors.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $94,361</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>The proposed project is to provide a shuttle service one day a week to the west side of Santee, which lost fixed-route services last year due to MTS service changes. The service will be along a general route with optional door-to-door service within a certain distance of the route.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $20,500</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is not recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar Community Connections</td>
<td>This project proposes to expand its current shopping shuttle service in Del Mar to provide service to seniors outside the city limits.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $51,910</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is not recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Social Services</td>
<td>Caring Neighbors and Senior Companion Program: This project proposes to expand Lutheran Social Services two existing transportation programs, a shuttle service providing medical and shopping trips, and a senior volunteer driver program.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $75,600</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is not recommended for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)</td>
<td>MTS proposes to use the Senior Mini Grant program to fund the following services: Rancho Bernardo DART and fixed-routes 25, 41, 83, 86, 704, 854, 871/872, 904, 921A, and 967/968.</td>
<td>FY 2009 - $1,114,185</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is not recommended for funding. The members of the evaluation committee scored these projects low because they believed they did not fit the intent of the Senior Mini-Grant program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New Freedom Program Project Descriptions and Rankings (in Alphabetical Order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Requested Grant $</th>
<th>Recommended Grant $</th>
<th>Req'd Match</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Accessible San Diego                 | Accessible Tourism Transportation Information Network: This program would develop and expand (starting in central San Diego) and would include: the promotion, enhancement, and facilitation of access transportation services, including the integration and coordination of services for travelers with disabilities, older adults, and veterans with disabilities; support for short term management activities to plan and implement coordinating services between accessible transportation stakeholders; support of state and local coordination policy bodies and councils including FACT; the development and operation of a one-stop transportation call center to coordinate transportation information on all travel tourism modes and to provide Paratransit certification information to travelers with disabilities; and the research of public and private accessible tourism lift transportation providers and vehicles in the San Diego region. | FY 2008 - $424,000  
FY 2009 - $424,000  
TOTAL - $848,000 | FY 2008 - $0  
FY 2009 - $132,960  
TOTAL - $132,960 | 20% | All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for partial funding with FY 2009 funds. |
| Full Access & Coordinated Transportation (FACT) | This project will provide FACT with the funds to continue the development and growth of the FACT Mobility Management Center. The FACT Mobility Management Center will be used to match the customer’s individual need with the most appropriate mode of transportation. The Mobility Management Center also will act as a one-stop-shop for all information on all modes of transportation in the community and as a centralized ride scheduling center. | FY 2008 - $285,635  
FY 2009 - $287,521  
TOTAL - $573,156 | FY 2008 - $212,315  
FY 2009 - $287,521  
TOTAL - $499,836 | 20% | All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for partial funding in FY 2008 and full funding in FY 2009. |
| Jewish Family Services                | This project proposes to use the model of Jewish Family Service’s successful volunteer driver program in the North Inland area of San Diego County, the Rides & Smiles program, and expand the program to the University City community. This program provides dependable, friendly, and personal transportation to disabled seniors in need. | FY 2008 - $47,097  
FY 2009 - $0  
TOTAL - $47,097 | FY 2008 - $47,097  
FY 2009 - $0  
TOTAL - $47,097 | 50% | All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding. |
| North County Transit District (NCTD) Bus Stop Accessibility | This project provides opportunities for people with disabilities in northern San Diego County to increase mobility options and independence in their daily lives, through trip-planning that includes accessibility information on bus stops and adjacent paths of travel in the NCTD service area. In phase one of this program, NCTD will develop a database of the approximately 2,200 bus stops in its service area, to include all accessibility information, including photographs. In phase two, the travel trainer and accessibility specialist will assist people with disabilities in their trip planning by determining which routes are accessible for a successful trip. In phase three, a Web-based tool will be developed so that riders who desire to be more independent, and have access to the internet, can determine which routes to their destination are accessible and plan their own trips. | FY 2008 - $96,534  
FY 2009 - $76,378  
TOTAL - $172,912 | FY 2008 - $70,400  
FY 2009 - $76,378  
TOTAL - $146,778 | 20% | All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for partial funding in FY 2008 and full funding in FY 2009. |
| NCTD Travel Training                 | This project provides opportunities for people with disabilities in northern San Diego County to increase mobility options and independence in their daily lives, through Mobility/Travel Training. These training programs help individuals learn how to use the NCTD Rider’s Guide and its contents; create and plan travel options; and achieve independence through an individualized or group training where a trainee navigates the transit system on the Breeze buses and COASTER commuter rail and the SPRINTER light rail. | FY 2008 - $161,897  
FY 2009 - $172,433  
TOTAL - $334,330 | FY 2008 - $161,897  
FY 2009 - $172,433  
TOTAL - $334,330 | 20% | All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding. |
| Southwest Community College District (SCCD) | This project proposes to purchase a lift-equipped accessible van. SCCD currently owns vehicles that can be reserved to transport students to off-campus activities. Currently, these vehicles do not accommodate persons in wheelchairs. With the acquisition of an accessible van, students with mobility disabilities will enroll in programs and join activities based on their educational goals and interests, and not on the availability of transportation. | FY 2008 - $40,000  
FY 2009 - $0  
TOTAL - $40,000 | FY 2008 - $40,000  
FY 2009 - $0  
TOTAL - $40,000 | 20% | All requirements were met for this project. Based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is recommended for funding. |

### Projects Not Recommended For Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Requested Grant $</th>
<th>Recommended Grant $</th>
<th>Req'd Match</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cal-Diego PVA | This project proposes to purchase a small bus to expand the Cal-Diego PVA transportation program. The program currently has two vehicles and four drivers who transport wheelchair-bound paralyzed veterans and others with spinal cord dysfunctions. | FY 2009 - $36,000  
FY 2010 - $0  
TOTAL - $36,000 | FY 2009 - $0  
FY 2010 - $0  
TOTAL - $0 | 20% | All requirements were met for this project. However, based on the scores of the evaluation committee, this project is not recommended for funding. |
TransNet Senior Mini-Grant
Scoring Criteria

The following information and scoring criteria were used to score and rate project applications for Senior Mini-Grant funding.

A. Project Need (20 points): ........................................................................................................ 20 points
The project should directly address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified in the 2008 – 2011 Short Range Transit Plan and Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan (The Coordinated Plan), and demonstrate how the project was derived from the strategies identified in the Coordinated Plan.

B. Goals and Objectives.............................................................................................................. 10 points
Project application should clearly state the overall program goals and objectives. Project should serve appropriate communities and populations.

K. Implementation Plan............................................................................................................. 15 points
For projects seeking funds to support program operations, applicants must provide a well-defined service operations plan, including days and hours of operation for operating grants. The applicant must describe implementation steps and timelines for carrying out the plan. The project application should indicate the number of persons expected to be served, and the number of trips (or other units of service) expected to be provided. The service operations plan should identify key personnel assigned to this project and their qualifications. Project sponsors should demonstrate their institutional capability to carry out the service delivery aspect of the project as described.

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

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

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

**Cost Efficiency**

*Operating Cost in Dollars per Vehicle Service Hour*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Proposed/1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4+ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt; 70</td>
<td>&gt; 65</td>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>&gt; 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65&lt;x\leq70</td>
<td>60&lt;x\leq65</td>
<td>55&lt;x\leq60</td>
<td>50&lt;x\leq55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60&lt;x\leq65</td>
<td>55&lt;x\leq60</td>
<td>50&lt;x\leq55</td>
<td>45&lt;x\leq50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>\leq 60</td>
<td>\leq 55</td>
<td>\leq 50</td>
<td>\leq 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost Effectiveness**

*Operating Cost in Dollars per Passenger*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Proposed/1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4+ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt; 32</td>
<td>&gt; 29</td>
<td>&gt; 26</td>
<td>&gt; 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29&lt;x\leq32</td>
<td>26&lt;x\leq29</td>
<td>23&lt;x\leq26</td>
<td>20&lt;x\leq23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26&lt;x\leq29</td>
<td>23&lt;x\leq26</td>
<td>20&lt;x\leq23</td>
<td>17&lt;x\leq20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>\leq 26</td>
<td>\leq 23</td>
<td>\leq 20</td>
<td>\leq 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Effectiveness**

*Passenger Utilization in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Proposed/ 1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4+ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15\leq x&lt;25</td>
<td>20\leq x&lt;30</td>
<td>25\leq x&lt;35</td>
<td>30\leq x&lt;40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25\leq x&lt;35</td>
<td>30\leq x&lt;40</td>
<td>35\leq x&lt;45</td>
<td>40\leq x&lt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>\geq 35</td>
<td>\geq 40</td>
<td>\geq 45</td>
<td>\geq 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N. Program Effectiveness .................................................................................................................. 5 points

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

O. Innovation ............................................................................................................................................... 5 points

The project provides new or innovative service concepts or facilities, including the use of green technology, that have the potential for improving access and mobility for the senior population and may have future application elsewhere in the region.

P. Project Budget ....................................................................................................................................... 15 points

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

The following information and scoring criteria were used to score and rate project applications for Senior Mini-Grant funding.

A. **Project Need (20 points):** The application should directly address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified in the 2008 – 2011 Short Range Transit Plan and Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan), and demonstrate how the project was derived from the strategies identified in the Coordinated Plan.

B. **Goals and Objectives (10 points):** The application should clearly state the overall program goals and objectives, and demonstrate how the project is consistent with the objectives of the JARC and New Freedom grant programs, as described in the Federal Transit Administration’s circulars. The application should clearly describe the project’s purpose and scope.

C. **Implementation Plan (15 points):** For projects seeking funds to support program operations, applicants must provide a well-defined service operations plan, including days and hours of operation for operating grants. The applicant must describe implementation steps and timelines for carrying out the plan. The application should indicate the number of persons expected to be served, and the number of trips (or other units of service) expected to be provided. The service operations plan should identify key personnel assigned to this project and their qualifications. Applicants should demonstrate their institutional capability to carry out the service delivery aspect of the project as described.

For projects seeking funds for capital purposes, the applicant must provide a solid rationale for use of New Freedom funds and demonstrate that no other funding sources are appropriate to meet this need, as well as provide an implementation plan and timelines for completing the capital project.

D. **Project Budget (15 points):** Applicants must submit a clearly defined project budget, indicating anticipated project expenditures and revenues, including documentation of matching funds. Applications should address long-term efforts and identify potential funding sources for sustaining the service beyond the grant period. Applicant shall demonstrate how using this funding leverages resources to the maximum possible extent.

E. **Financial and Environmental Sustainability (10 points):** The highest point scores will be awarded to that have a high probability of becoming self-sufficient (e.g. not require Jobs Access and Reverse Commute funding) in future years. Points also may be awarded for projects that are environmentally sustainable or promote good environmental stewardship.

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

G. **Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators (10 points):** The project will be scored based on the applicant’s ability to demonstrate that the proposed project is the most appropriate match of service delivery to the need, and is a cost-effective approach. Applicants
also must identify clear, measurable outcome-based performance measures to track the effectiveness of the service in meeting the identified goals. If an organization operates similar services, it must show how this service compares in terms of efficiency and cost-effectiveness with other services currently being offered. For grants that involve providing a transportation service, the cost per passenger trip must be indicated, as well as the estimated typical trip length.

A plan should be provided for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the service, and steps to be taken if original goals are not achieved. Applicant should describe its steps to measure the effectiveness and magnitude of the impact that the project will have on disabled residents.

**H. Innovation (5 points):** Applicants should provide new or innovative service concepts or facilities that have the potential for improving access and mobility for the target populations and may have future application elsewhere in the region.
Introduction

SANDAG was selected by the Governor of California to be the designated recipient of the Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom federal funding programs for the San Diego urbanized area. The responsibilities with this designation include developing the evaluation criteria and competitive selection process, holding the competitive selection process, and recommending to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) which projects should be funded.

It is a federal requirement that all projects to be funded by the JARC program must be derived from the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Plan (Coordinated Plan). The evaluation criteria that were used for the JARC and New Freedom Competitive Process in 2007 were approved by the Transportation Committee on August 3, 2007. This approval was prior to the development to the latest update to the Coordinated Plan which was prepared to comply with Federal regulations, requiring priorities for funding and implementation. On August 1, 2008, staff proposed an update to the JARC evaluation criteria to incorporate the new content in the Coordinated Plan. At this meeting, members of the Transportation Committee expressed interest in increasing the weighting of the “Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators” and “Innovation” Criteria. Following the discussion regarding the proposed criteria, the Transportation Committee requested that staff return with additional alternatives for evaluating JARC proposals.

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the evaluation criteria outlined in Alternative 3 below and in Attachment 1 for the JARC grant program fall 2008 competitive process.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the evaluation criteria outlined in Alternative 3 in Attachment 1 for the JARC Grant Program fall 2008 competitive process.

Discussion

The criteria used to evaluate JARC projects has evolved throughout the period that SANDAG has been the designated recipient for the San Diego urbanized area. The original evaluation criteria developed by SANDAG were adapted from the evaluation criteria developed by Caltrans for its rural and small community JARC program. The SANDAG revisions included adding a criterion for “innovation.” The SANDAG Coordinated Plan Ad Hoc Group, composed of representatives of the public, social service transportation providers, the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), and the transit operators, provided feedback, and ultimately supported the criteria that were presented to and approved by the Transportation Committee. After each competitive selection cycle, adjustments have been made to the evaluation criteria and their weighting to
respond to lessons learned and comments made by the Transportation Committee. Additional adjustments have also been made to respond to any new federal requirements. This evolution resulted in the evaluation criteria presented to the Transportation Committee on August 1, 2008, which included seven individual criteria whose total scoring adds to 100 points:

- Assigned the “Coordinated Plan Priority” criterion (the level of priority that the project is has in the Coordinated Plan) as the most heavily weighted of the seven criteria (20 points).

- Assigned the next highest weighted criteria (up to 15 points) to:
  - “Implementation Plan” (operating plans, tasks and timelines, number of persons served, and the capability of the applicant to carry out the project)
  - “Coordination and Program Outreach” (the ability of the applicant to coordinate with other agencies, stakeholder involvement, and marketing plan)
  - “Project Budget” (inclusion of anticipated project expenditures and revenues, matching funds, and leveraging of JARC funding to the maximum extent possible)

- Weighted three criteria at 10 points each:
  - “Goals and Objectives” (project purpose and scope, and level of consistency with the federal JARC program objectives)
  - “Financial and Environmental Sustainability” (potential of project to be financially self-sufficient in future years, and promotion of environmental stewardship)
  - “Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators” (demonstrating the project is matches the need, is a cost effective approach, has clear, measurable outcome-based performance measures, ongoing monitoring/evaluation plan)

- Assigned up to 5 points for the “Innovation” criterion (level of project innovation and ability to apply the innovations to other regional services)

As noted in the introduction, at the August 1, 2008, meeting, some members of the Transportation Committee expressed interest in increasing the weighting of the “Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators” and “Innovation” criteria and requested that staff return with additional alternatives for evaluating JARC proposals.

**Evaluation Criteria Alternatives**

In order to develop the additional alternatives for the Transportation Committee, a stakeholder ad hoc group was created, composed of representatives from the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS), the North County Transit District (NCTD), Full Access & Coordinated Transportation (FACT), and the International Rescue Committee (IRC). The IRC is a social service agency that provides resettlement services, including transportation for refugees to participate in job training and job searching activities and has expressed interest in applying for JARC funding in the future.
This ad hoc group met on August 19, 2008, and reviewed research done by staff on evaluation criteria used by twenty different agencies across the nation. Through the process of examining the many different criteria used in other jurisdictions, the ad hoc group provided staff with input regarding the development of the alternatives. One of the most difficult challenges in developing a set of evaluation criteria is that a single set of criteria must be used to evaluate and recommend projects as diverse as operations, capital, or planning services. The input from the ad hoc group, along with the feedback given at the August 1, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting, was used to develop the three alternatives presented below. Once the three alternatives were developed, they were distributed back to the ad hoc group for additional comment.

Alternative 1 - The first alternative would allow any project derived from the Coordinated Plan to be eligible regardless of its priority ranking, with projects eligible to receive up to 20 points in this category if derived from a very high priority. This alternative is very similar to the criteria presented to the Transportation Committee on August 1, 2008; however the weightings of the criteria are redistributed based on the input received from the Transportation Committee on August 1. The “Program Effectiveness & Performance Indicators” criterion weighting was increased from 10 to 20 points and the “Innovation” criterion was increased from 5 to 10 points. In order to accommodate these increased weightings, the “Implementation Plan,” “Financial and Environmental Sustainability,” and “Project Budget” criteria’s weighting were each reduced by 5 points. Additionally, the “Coordination and Program Outreach” criterion is split into two separate criteria based on the suggestion by the ad hoc stakeholder group.

Alternative 2 - The second alternative eliminates the “Coordinated Plan Priority” as a project evaluation criterion and turns it into an eligibility requirement, only allowing projects to apply if they are derived from either the very high priority or high priority lists in the Coordinated Plan. The 20 points that were previously allocated to the “Coordinated Plan Priority” criteria are then redistributed among some of the other criteria in this alternative, increasing the weightings of “Program Effectiveness & Performance Indicators” by 10 points, “Innovation” by 5 points, and “Goals and Objectives” by 5 points.

Alternative 3 - This alternative is similar to Alternative 2 requiring projects to be derived from either a very high or high priority list in the Coordinated Plan in order to be eligible for funding. This alternative takes the evaluation process a step further by dividing each criterion further into five point subcriteria. Evaluating the proposals against these smaller scoring increments would require a greater focus on all the various aspects within each criterion.

The table below displays the weightings for each of the alternatives discussed above, comparing them to the alternative presented to the Transportation Committee on August 1, 2008.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>August 1 Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Plan Priority</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Outreach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Effectiveness &amp; Performance Indicators</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Budget</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stakeholder ad hoc group also discussed a final option would not include any specific evaluation criteria to be scored. Instead, the evaluation committee would be provided with a list of questions that would be used to help guide them in determining the quality of the proposal. After measuring each of the proposals responsiveness to the list of questions, the evaluation committee would determine the relative ranking of each of the projects and then reach a consensus on which projects should be funded. This was a method utilized by some of the other jurisdictions that were researched; however, was not included as an alternative due to lack of support by the stakeholder ad hoc group.

Alternative 3 is recommended for adoption because it lays out the evaluation criteria more definitively, ensuring that the evaluation committee evaluates all aspects of the proposals. While each member of the ad hoc stakeholder group initially had a different preferred alternative, subsequent discussions led to general support for Alternative 3 among all members.
**Proposed Schedule for Fall 2008 Competitive Process**

The proposed schedule for the competitive process and grant award for the fall competitive cycle of FY 2008 JARC funding is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Tentative Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of process and criteria by Transportation Committee</td>
<td>September 19, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement of Request for Proposals for JARC</td>
<td>October 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public preproposal meetings</td>
<td>October 20 – 24, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing date for receipt of JARC proposals</td>
<td>October 31, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Committee Approval of New Freedom Grants</td>
<td>December 19, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. FY 2008 Jobs Access and Reverse Commute Program Evaluation Alternatives

Key Staff Contact: Danielle Kochman, (619) 699-1921, dko@sandag.org
SANDAG has been selected by the Governor of California to be the designated recipient of the Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) federal funding for the San Diego County urbanized area. SANDAG will distribute approximately $1.25 million in JARC funds to San Diego County programs. These programs fund transportation services and facilities for persons with disabilities or transportation to work for low-income users.

The JARC program provides funding to support the development and maintenance of projects to transport welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals to and from jobs and activities related to their employment. Approximately $1.25 million in JARC funds will be available for FY 2006 for the urbanized area of the region. Examples of projects that may be funded by JARC include, but are not limited to:

- late night and weekend fixed-route service;
- guaranteed ride home service;
- ridesharing – including vanpool and carpool activities;
- bicycling programs;
- information and dispatch systems; and
- promotion, marketing, and pass programs.

The JARC program is funded by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Both programs require a 50 percent local match for operating projects, and a 20 percent local match for capital projects.

Alternative #1

The information and scoring criteria below will be used to score and rate project applications for JARC funding.

a. **Coordinated Plan Priority (20 points):** The application should directly address one of the Coordinated Plan Priorities for funding and implementation. Depending on the priority being addressed, points will be awarded as follows:

- → Very High Priority 20 points
- → High Priority 15 points
- → Medium Priority 10 points
- → Low Priority 5 points

If the project is not derived from a Coordinated Plan Priority, **it must be derived from one of the Coordinated Plan Strategies in order to be eligible for funding**

b. **Goals and Objectives (10 points)**

The applicant should directly address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified in the 2008-2011 Regional Short Range Transit Plan and Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Plan. The application should clearly state the overall program goals and objectives, and demonstrate how the project is consistent with the objectives of the JARC and New Freedom grant programs, as described in the Federal Transit Administration’s circulars. The application should clearly describe the project’s purpose and scope.

c. **Implementation Plan (10 points)**

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

For projects seeking funds for capital purposes, the applicant must provide a solid rationale for use of New Freedom funds and demonstrate that no other funding sources are appropriate to meet this need, as well as provide an implementation plan and timelines for completing the capital project.
d. **Financial and Environmental Sustainability (5 points)**
The highest point scores will be awarded to those that have a high probability of becoming self-sufficient (e.g., not require JARC funding) in future years. Points also may be awarded for projects that are environmentally sustainable or promote good environmental stewardship.

e. **Coordination (10 points)**
Proposed projects will be evaluated based on their ability to coordinate with other community transportation and/or social service resources.

f. **Program Outreach (5 points)**
Applicants should clearly identify project stakeholders, and how they will keep stakeholders involved and informed throughout the project. Applicants also should describe how they would promote public awareness of the project.

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

g. **Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators (20 points)**
The project will be scored based on the applicant’s ability to demonstrate that the proposed project is the most appropriate match of service delivery to the need, and is a cost-effective approach. Applicants also must identify clear, measurable outcome-based performance measures to track the effectiveness of the service in meeting the identified goals. If an organization operates similar services, it must show how this service compares in terms of efficiency and cost-effectiveness with other services currently being offered. For grants that involve providing a transportation service, the cost per passenger trip must be indicated, as well as the estimated typical trip length.

A plan should be provided for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the service, and steps to be taken if original goals are not achieved. Applicant should describe its steps to measure the effectiveness and magnitude of the impact that the project will have on disabled residents.

h. **Innovation (10 points)**
Applicants should provide new or innovative service concepts or facilities that have the potential for improving access and mobility for the target populations and may have future application elsewhere in the region.

i. **Project Budget (10 points)**
Applicants must submit a clearly defined project budget, indicating anticipated project expenditures and revenues, including documentation of matching funds. Applications should address long-term efforts and identify potential funding sources for sustaining the service beyond the grant period. Applicant shall demonstrate how using this funding leverages resources to the maximum possible extent.
SANDAG has been selected by the Governor of California to be the designated recipient of the Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) federal funding for the San Diego County urbanized area. SANDAG will distribute approximately $1.25 million in JARC funds to San Diego County programs. These programs fund transportation services and facilities for persons with disabilities or transportation to work for low-income users.

The JARC program provides funding to support the development and maintenance of projects to transport welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals to and from jobs and activities related to their employment. Approximately $1.25 million in JARC funds will be available for FY 2006 for the urbanized area of the region. Examples of projects that may be funded by JARC include, but are not limited to:

- late night and weekend fixed-route service;
- guaranteed ride home service;
- ridesharing – including vanpool and carpool activities;
- bicycling programs;
- information and dispatch systems; and
- promotion, marketing, and pass programs.

The JARC program is funded by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Both programs require a 50 percent local match for operating projects, and a 20 percent local match for capital projects.

**Alternative #2**

**Minimum Eligibility Criteria:** Must answer Yes to each question to be eligible.

1. Is the agency a local governmental agency, (private or public) operator of public transportation, non-profit agency, or a tribal government?
2. Is your project derived from a Very High or High Priority in the 2008–2012 Coordinated Plan?

**Very High**

→ Develop or expand transit and non-agency client transportation services in areas with little or no other transportation options based on identified gaps in transportation services included in Chapters 6 and 7; or

→ Develop or expand transportation solutions in areas with sufficient densities to support shared ride or coordinated services based on identified gaps in transportation services included in Chapters 6 and 7.

**High**

→ Develop a centralized ride scheduling, dispatching, a mobility center;

→ Improve transportation services to the rural areas;

→ Increase coordination efforts by combining resources such as vehicles, riders, funds for rides, vehicle maintenance, drivers, driver training, insurance coverage, general ride subsidies, dispatching equipment, software, and gas cards for volunteers;

→ Increase work-based weekday and weekend service based on identified gaps in service included in Chapters 6 and 7;

→ Increase work-based weeknight service based on identified gaps in service included in Chapters 6 and 7; and

→ Provide travel training to encourage more individuals to ride regular transit

The information and scoring criteria below will be used to score and rate project applications for JARC funding.
a. **Goals and Objectives (15 points)**
   The application should clearly state the overall program goals and objectives, and demonstrate how the project is consistent with the objectives of the JARC and New Freedom grant programs, as described in the Federal Transit Administration’s Circulars. The application should clearly describe the project’s purpose and scope.

b. **Implementation Plan (15 points)**
   For projects seeking funds to support program operations, applicants must provide a well-defined service operations plan, including days and hours of operation for operating grants. The applicant must describe implementation steps and timelines for carrying out the plan. The application should indicate the number of persons expected to be served, and the number of trips (or other units of service) expected to be provided. The service operations plan should identify key personnel assigned to this project and their qualifications. Applicants should demonstrate their institutional capability to carry out the service delivery aspect of the project as described.

   For projects seeking funds for capital purposes, the applicant must provide a solid rationale for use of New Freedom funds and demonstrate that no other funding sources are appropriate to meet this need, as well as provide an implementation plan and timelines for completing the capital project.

c. **Financial and Environmental Sustainability (10 points)**
   The highest point scores will be awarded to that have a high probability of becoming self-sufficient (e.g. not require Jobs Access and Reverse Commute funding) in future years. Points also may be awarded for projects that are environmentally sustainable or promote good environmental stewardship.

d. **Coordination (10 points)**
   Proposed projects will be evaluated based on their ability to coordinate with other community transportation and/or social service resources.

e. **Program Outreach (5 points)**
   Applicants should clearly identify project stakeholders, and how they will keep stakeholders involved and informed throughout the project. Applicants also should describe how they would promote public awareness of the project.

   **Letters of support from key stakeholders should be attached to the grant application.**

f. **Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators (20 points)**
   The project will be scored based on the applicant’s ability to demonstrate that the proposed project is the most appropriate match of service delivery to the need, and is a cost-effective approach. Applicants also must identify clear, measurable outcome-based performance measures to track the effectiveness of the service in meeting the identified goals. If an organization operates similar services, its must show how this service compares in terms of efficiency and cost-effectiveness with other services currently being offered. For grants that involve providing a transportation service, the cost per passenger trip must be indicated, as well as the estimated typical trip length.

   A plan should be provided for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the service, and steps to be taken if original goals are not achieved. Applicant should describe its steps to measure the effectiveness and magnitude of the impact that the project will have on disabled residents.

g. **Innovation (10 points)**
   Applicants should provide new or innovative service concepts or facilities that have the potential for improving access and mobility for the target populations and may have future application elsewhere in the region.

h. **Project Budget (15 points)**
   Applicants must submit a clearly defined project budget, indicating anticipated project expenditures and revenues, including documentation of matching funds. Applications should address long-term efforts and identify potential funding sources for sustaining the service beyond the grant period. Applicant shall demonstrate how using this funding leverages resources to the maximum possible extent.
SANDAG has been selected by the Governor of California to be the designated recipient of the Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) federal funding for the San Diego County urbanized area. SANDAG will distribute approximately $1.25 million in JARC funds to San Diego County programs. These programs fund transportation services and facilities for persons with disabilities or transportation to work for low-income users.

The JARC program provides funding to support the development and maintenance of projects to transport welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals to and from jobs and activities related to their employment. Approximately $1.25 million in JARC funds will be available for FY 2006 for the urbanized area of the region. Examples of projects that may be funded by JARC include, but are not limited to:

- late night and weekend fixed-route service;
- guaranteed ride home service;
- ridesharing – including vanpool and carpool activities;
- bicycling programs;
- information and dispatch systems; and
- promotion, marketing, and pass programs.

The JARC program is funded by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Both programs require a 50 percent local match for operating projects, and a 20 percent local match for capital projects.

Alternative #3

Minimum Eligibility Criteria: Must answer Yes to each question to be eligible.

1. Is the agency a local governmental agency, (private or public) operator of public transportation, non-profit agency, or a tribal government?

2. Is your project derived from a Very High or High Priority in the 2008 - 2012 Coordinated Plan?

- **Very High**
  - Develop or expand transit and non-agency client transportation services in areas with little or no other transportation options based on identified gaps in transportation services included in Chapters 6 and 7; or
  - Develop or expand transportation solutions in areas with sufficient densities to support shared ride or coordinated services based on identified gaps in transportation services included in Chapters 6 and 7

- **High**
  - Develop a centralized ride scheduling, dispatching, a mobility center
  - Improve transportation services to the rural areas
  - Increase coordination efforts by combining resources such as vehicles, riders, funds for rides, vehicle maintenance, drivers, driver training, insurance coverage, general ride subsidies, dispatching equipment, software, and gas cards for volunteers
  - Increase work-based weekday and weekend service based on identified gaps in service included in Chapters 6 and 7
  - Increase work-based weeknight service based on identified gaps in service included in Chapters 6 and 7
  - Provide travel training to encourage more individuals to ride regular transit

The information and scoring criteria below will be used to score and rate project applications for JARC funding.
a. **Goals and Objectives (maximum 15 points)**

→ Will the project serve the appropriate population? Does the proposal provide pertinent demographic data and/or maps? *(5 points)*

→ Will the proposed program increase or enhance the availability of transportation for low income individuals for job related trips? *(5 points)*

→ To what extent is the proposed project consistent with the goals and objectives of the JARC program? *(5 points)*

b. **Operational/Implementation Plan (maximum 15 points)**

→ How thorough is the implementation plan? Does the proposal include project tasks, timelines, benchmarks, key milestones, key personnel, deliverables, and routes and schedules as applicable? Does the implementation plan and timeline seem feasible? *(5 points)*

→ Does the applicant demonstrate the technical ability to manage the project? Has the applicant effectively implemented projects using federal or state funds in the recent past; has the applicant managed similar projects; has the applicant had sufficient experience in providing services for the targeted clientele? Does the agency have adequate staff to resources to handle the project? If applicable, are drivers properly trained? If applicable, does the agency display the ability to maintain vehicles? *(5 points)*

→ Does this project relate to other services or facilities provided by the agency or firm? Does the operational plan correspond with the project goals/objectives? *(5 points)*

c. **Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators (20)**

→ Does the project make use of JARC funds in an efficient and cost effective manner? *(5 points)*

→ Does the proposal describe efforts to ensure the project’s cost-effectiveness (and other measurable units of service)? Will the project experience increasing efficiencies over time? If applying for a capital project, does the applicant demonstrate that the purchase is the most cost-effective product for the service being provided? *(5 points)*

→ Does the proposal provide measurable performance indicators to measure and evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed project in meeting the identified goals? For capital-related projects, does the applicant establish milestones and methods for reporting the status of project delivery? *(5 points)*

→ Does the applicant describe methodologies and procedures for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the project or service, and steps to be taken if original goals are not achieved? *(5 points)*

d. **Coordination and Program Outreach (15 points)**

→ Does the proposal describe how key stakeholders will remain involved and informed throughout the process? Did the applicant attach three letters of support from stakeholders to the grant application? *(5 points)*

→ How thorough are the applicant’s proposed strategies for marketing the project and promoting public awareness? *(5 points)*
To what extent does the project demonstrate coordination among various entities?
(5 point maximum - 1 point per type of coordination)

- Shared use of vehicles
- Dispatching or scheduling
- Maintenance
- Back up transportation
- Staff training programs
- Joint procurement of services and supplies
- Active participation in local social service transportation planning process
- Coordination of client trips with other transportation agencies

e. **Project Budget (15 points)**

- Was a clearly defined budget submitted for the proposed project? (5 points)
- Does the project appear to be feasible as described? (5 points)
- Is the source of local share stable? (5 points)

f. **Sustainability (10)**

- Does the applicant demonstrate a long-term commitment to the project to continue the effort beyond the availability of the requested grant resources? Is this applicant financial capable of sustaining operations after the initial grant funding is expended? (5 points)
- Does the applicant provide sufficient justification as to why JARC funding is needed for this project? (5 points)

g. **Innovation (10)**

- Is the proposed project an innovative solution to addressing the need, and could the innovations be applied to other services in the region? (5 points)
- Are there elements of the project that are environmental sustainable (including the use of alternative fuels and clean air vehicles)? (5 points)
San Diego Association of Governments

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

September 19, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 7

Action Requested: APPROVE

CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET TRANSFER

File Number 1129500

Introduction

SANDAG implements projects for the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) that require construction contracting. These projects are included in the SANDAG Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Program Budget. SANDAG policy requires Transportation Committee approval for budget transfers in amounts between $100,000 and $500,000 cumulative. This item recommends approval of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with MTS to transfer funds from an MTS CIP project to SANDAG to fund the demolition of the El Cajon Transit Center (ECTC) building and replacement bus platform paving.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve a Memorandum of Understanding with the Metropolitan Transit System for a fund transfer in an amount not to exceed $150,000, in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 1, and approve a new capital project for these funds. The new project would demolish the existing El Cajon Transit Center building and replace the building with bus platform paving.

Discussion

In its current condition, the ECTC building requires major repairs. At the MTS Board meeting on April 10, 2008, MTS staff presented a report on the building’s current conditions, and several options and costs for repair or removal of the structure. After considering all options and costs, the MTS Board directed MTS staff to take steps to demolish the building at the East County Transit Center using funds in the MTS CIP 11217 (Blue and Orange Line Station Improvement Project).

MTS discussed the project implementation with SANDAG construction staff. Since the project is construction in nature, the consensus was that SANDAG is organizationally prepared to implement the project. In addition, the most expeditious and cost effective approach to completing the work is to use a Job Order Contract (JOC) through the SANDAG agreement with the County of San Diego. In order to fund this project, staff recommends approval of an MOU with MTS to transfer $150,000 in MTS capital funds to SANDAG to fund the administration, construction management, actual construction, and project contingency costs for demolition of the building and replacement bus platform paving.

The transfer and MOU were approved by the MTS Board at its August 21, 2008, meeting (Attachment 2). The MOU being recommended for approval between MTS and SANDAG outlining the scope and cost of the project is attached (Attachment 1). The fund transfer is summarized in Table 1.
Table 1
Budget Change Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project (CIP #)</th>
<th>FY 09 Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Budget Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECTC Center Building Demolition Project (1129500)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS - Blue and Orange Line Station Improvement Project (11217)</td>
<td>$250,012</td>
<td>$100,012</td>
<td>-$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Implementation

Attachments: 1. Memorandum of Understanding between San Diego Association of Governments and Metropolitan Transit System Funding and Construction of El Cajon Transit Center Building Demolition Project
2. MTS Agenda Item No. 12, August 21, 2008

Key Staff Contact: John Haggerty, (619) 699-6937, jhag@sandag.org
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AND METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
REGARDING FUNDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF EL CAJON TRANSIT CENTER
BUILDING DEMOLITION PROJECT

This Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) is made and entered into effective as of this ______ day of September, 2008, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments (“SANDAG”) and the Metropolitan Transit System (“MTS”).

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Agreement:

WHEREAS, MTS Board at its April 10, 2008, meeting approved demolition of an existing El Cajon Transit Center building (the “Project”) and use of MTS Capital project “Blue and Orange Line Station Improvement” project funds to pay for the Project; and

WHEREAS, MTS desires to utilize SANDAG’s contract with San Diego County using the San Diego County Job Order Contracting (JOC) agreement to carry out the Project for expediency; and

WHEREAS, MTS currently does not have resources to manage the construction contract for the Project; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has resident engineers available to help manage the Project; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG, under its current policies, may provide construction management services to its member agencies on a reimbursement basis; and

WHEREAS, at its August 21, 2008, meeting, the MTS Board approved the transfer of funds from MTS capital project 11217 to SANDAG Capital Project 1129500 (El Cajon Transit Center Demolition) for construction and construction management of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the parties wish to memorialize their agreement in this MOU to carry out the purposes set forth above;

AGREEMENT

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

SANDAG AGREES:

1. To negotiate and issue a Task Order under the JOC agreement to hire a contractor with building demolition experience for demolition of El Cajon Transit Center building and replace it with a concrete pad with water and electric utility enclosures to maintain existing services to the station and parking lot.
2. That the not-to-exceed amount referenced below in this MOU consists of the current project cost estimated by SANDAG, which includes the administration, construction, construction management and construction contingency and administration, for a total of $150,000. In the event SANDAG believes this amount will be exceeded, it will notify MTS, and the parties will meet to discuss whether an amendment to this MOU is appropriate.

3. To provide construction management services, including a Resident Engineer (RE), to manage the Project Task Order on a time and materials basis.

4. To designate Dennis Wahl as RE for the project unless otherwise agreed to by MTS.

5. That the maximum amount it will charge MTS for SANDAG construction management and administrative services shall not exceed $35,000 without prior written approval from MTS.

6. To use any funds provided by MTS under this MOU exclusively for the Project and to return any remaining Project funds to MTS upon completion of the Project.

7. Neither MTS nor any director, officer, agent, or employee thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by SANDAG under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to SANDAG under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, SANDAG shall fully defend, indemnify, and save harmless MTS, its officers, directors, agents, 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 SANDAG under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to SANDAG under this MOU.

MTS AGREES:

1. To fund the full and actual cost the Project up to the maximum amount of $150,000. MTS shall transfer the amount of $150,000 to SANDAG within 30 days of execution of this MOU and any remaining funds after Project closeout and resolution of any claims shall be returned to MTS. In the event SANDAG notifies MTS that this amount will be exceeded, MTS will meet with SANDAG to discuss whether an amendment to this MOU is appropriate. In no event shall SANDAG have responsibility to move forward with the Project until the parties are able to identify sufficient funds to complete the work.

2. To SANDAG’s use of a qualified contractor for demolition work under the JOC agreement.

3. To provide staff support on the Project at no cost to SANDAG, including but not limited to, any staff support or cooperation needed to defend any contractor claims that may arise on the Project.

4. Neither SANDAG nor any director, officer, agent, or employee thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by MTS under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to MTS under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, MTS shall fully defend, indemnify, and save harmless SANDAG, its officers, directors, agents, 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 any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to MTS under this MOU.

THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE:

8. That all obligations of the parties under the terms of this MOU are subject to the appropriation of the required resources by parties and the approval of their respective Boards of Directors.

9. Any notice required or permitted under this MOU may be personally served on the other party, by the party giving notice, or may be served by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the following addresses:

For SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
Attn: Office of General Counsel

For MTS
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101
Attn: Office of General Counsel

10. That unless it is amended by the parties in writing, this MOU shall terminate on March 31, 2009, or on such earlier or later date as the parties may agree to in writing. This MOU shall continue in effect unless and until a party to the MOU gives 60 (sixty) days' written notice of its desire to withdraw from the MOU. If such notice is given, the MOU shall continue to be binding on those parties who have not formally withdrawn.

11. The indemnification provisions of this MOU shall survive termination of the MOU.

12. This MOU shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California. If any action is brought to interpret or enforce any term of this MOU, the action shall be brought in a state or federal court situated in the County of San Diego, State of California.

13. All terms, conditions, and provisions hereof shall inure to and shall bind each of the parties hereto, and each of their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns.

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

15. No alteration or variation of the terms of this MOU shall be valid unless made in writing and signed by the parties hereto, and no oral understanding or agreement not incorporated herein shall be binding on any of the parties hereto.

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

17. This MOU may be executed in any number of identical counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, and all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument when each party has signed one such counterpart.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this MOU effective on the day and year first above written.

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  MTS

_________________________  __________________________
GARY L. GALLEGOS            PAUL JABLONSKI
Executive Director          Chief Executive Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_________________________  __________________________
Office of General Counsel    Office of General Counsel
Agenda

JOINT MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
for the
Metropolitan Transit System,
San Diego Transit Corporation, and
San Diego Trolley, Inc.

August 21, 2008

SUBJECT:

MTS: EL CAJON TRANSIT CENTER DEMOLITION MOU AND BUDGET TRANSFER

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Directors:

1. authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (in substantially the same form as Attachment A) with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) for the El Cajon Transit Center building demolition work to be done under the SANDAG/San Diego County Job Order Contracting (JOC) Agreement and for providing construction management services; and

2. approve a fund transfer from the MTS Blue and Orange Line Station Improvement Project Capital Improvement Program (CIP) 11217 to SANDAG’s El Cajon Transit Center Demolition Project CIP 1129500 (in substantially the form as shown on Attachment B - Budget Transfer Summary).

Budget Impact

No change to the overall CIP amount. $150,000 would be transferred from MTS CIP 11217 (Blue and Orange Line Station Improvement) to SANDAG’s CIP 1129500 (El Cajon Transit Center Demolition).
DISCUSSION:

In its current condition, the El Cajon Transit Center building requires major repairs. At the MTS Board meeting on April 10, 2008, staff presented a detailed report of current conditions, options available, and associated costs for each option. After considering all options and costs, the Board directed staff to take steps to demolish the building at the East County Transit Center using funds in CIP 11217 (Blue and Orange Line Station Improvement Project) and negotiate the relocation of the existing tenants.

Current negotiations with the tenants for their relocation are expected to conclude in the next several weeks. MTS and SANDAG staffs have worked together to determine the most effective approach to raze the building. Staff concluded that use of SANDAG’s JOC Agreement with the County of San Diego would be the most expeditious and effective approach. Two main advantages of using the JOC are:

1. The County of San Diego has competitively bid and selected several contractors with expertise in different disciplines for its JOC program, and it has allowed SANDAG to piggyback on its program while SANDAG develops its own JOC program. These JOC contractors have agreed to do previously defined construction tasks at fixed unit prices. MTS would not need to go out for separate bids, which would save two months in procurement processing time allowing the project to move faster at very competitive prices.

2. Since unit prices for the type of work needed are already in place, an informal process of negotiating with the selected contractor with the right expertise to fit the project scope would replace the detailed design that otherwise would be required for a construction project to go out for competitive bids. Design generally costs 10% to 15% of the construction.

Staff has discussed the project scope with SANDAG construction staff. After reviewing the requirements of the project, SANDAG staff provided an estimate of $150,000, which includes project and construction management and construction contingency. An MOU between MTS and SANDAG outlining the scope and cost of the project (Attachment A) is attached for information.

Therefore, staff recommends transferring $150,000 from total budget of $250,012 in MTS’s CIP 11217 to SANDAG CIP 1129500 as summarized in Attachment B.

Paul C. Jabionski
Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff Contact: Russ Desai, 619.595.4908, rshikest.desai@sdmts.com

AUGUST21-08.12.ETTC MOU FUND TRANSFER.RDESAL.doc

Attachments: A. MOU
B. Budget Transfer Summary
SORRENTO VALLEY COASTER CONNECTION UPDATE

Introduction

The Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection (SVCC) is a Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)-operated service that provides short distance shuttle connections on nine routes between the Sorrento Valley COASTER station and businesses in the Sorrento Valley, Sorrento Mesa, Carroll Canyon, University City, and Torrey Pines, serving about 900 to 1,000 passengers each day. Previously, nearly 70 percent of the annual costs to operate SVCC services were subsidized by funds from the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and Interstate 805 (I-805)/I-5 construction mitigation funds from Caltrans. Neither of these funding sources, which totaled nearly $732,000 in FY 2008, is available after July 1, 2008.

In order to help make up for the loss of these revenues, the Board of Directors at its June 13, 2008, meeting approved charging a fare for all SVCC passengers (previously, passengers were allowed to transfer free of charge from the COASTER to the COASTER Connection). Effective September 1, 2008, a one-way fare of $1.00 ($0.50 Seniors/Disabled/Medicare) is now charged; a $40.00 monthly SVCC pass also is available ($10.00 Seniors/Disabled/Medicare, $20.00 youth) per month. Regional and Premium passes are accepted; however, COASTER passes are not accepted. SANDAG has projected that the new fare will cover about 25 percent of the operating costs of the SVCC. Staff will provide an update on the impact of the new fare on SVCC ridership at the September 19, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting.

Even with the fare implementation, additional funding sources will be needed to ensure long-term operation of SVCC services. The discussion below outlines the current funding for the SVCC, along with a status report on current efforts to develop longer-term funding through public-private partnerships and development of other possible service options.

Discussion

FY 2009 SVCC Cost Overview

MTS indicates that the FY 2009 cost to operate the SVCC services is $1.05 million. Current revenues to fund the services are:

- SVCC Fares $218,000
- COASTER Service Revenue Sharing $109,000
  (portion of COASTER revenues paid to MTS by North County Transit District)
- MTS Transportation Development Act $300,000

Total: $627,000
MTS staff reported to its Board of Directors on August 21, 2008, that they believe they have enough funding identified to continue operating all nine SVCC until the third quarter of FY 2009. Additional funds will be needed to ensure continued SVCC services beyond the third quarter.

**Status of Efforts on Longer-Term Funding and Alternative Service Options**

Three significant initiatives are currently underway to preserve linkages between the Sorrento Valley COASTER station and job sites.

1. MTS, in conjunction with Move San Diego, a nonprofit agency, has been meeting with employers to identify service that would be viable with employer financial participation. The result could be a network of routes that is less comprehensive in terms of service coverage depending on employer participation, but one that would provide long-term financial sustainability for those services that remain. While no agreements have been finalized, and continuation of all the nine SVCC routes remains questionable, potential interest has been expressed.

2. Four of the current SVCC routes do not serve areas where major employers are located, and so the ability to secure public-private partnerships is doubtful. SANDAG RideLink staff is investigating the feasibility of offering short distance van pools to serve job sites where public-private partnerships are not likely to occur. A RideLink consultant is making contact with smaller employers in the areas now served by the SVCC to assess the feasibility of shifting rides to vanpools.

3. SANDAG currently has about $150,000 available in federal Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) funding for which the SVCC-type services are eligible. This money can be awarded only through a competitive process and a competition is anticipated to be held this fall. An additional $180,000 may be available for the competitive process if a grant application to Caltrans for rural JARC funds is approved.

Staff will report back to Transportation Committee on new developments as they occur.

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

Key Staff Contact: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
**TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

September 19, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 9

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

**TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM AMENDMENTS: COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM, AND THE CITIES OF DEL MAR, EL CAJON, ESCONDIDO, LEMON GROVE, NATIONAL CITY, POWAY, SAN DIEGO, SAN MARCOS, Santee, SOLANA BEACH, AND VISTA**

File Number 4000500

**Introduction**

TDA claim amendments are being proposed for a decrease of $776,414 for Article 3.0 bicycle and pedestrian projects and an increase of $249,000 for Article 4.0 transit projects.

**Discussion**

Each year, SANDAG undertakes a review of bicycle and pedestrian projects funded under Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3.0 programs. The purpose of the review is to identify projects that have been completed by the sponsoring agency. The review has been completed for all projects. After a final accounting, unexpended funds from the County of San Diego and the Cities of Del Mar, El Cajon, Escondido, Lemon Grove, National City, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, and Vista projects remain, and the allocations for these TDA claims must be reduced by a total of $776,414 as listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Current Allocation</th>
<th>Recommended Adjustment</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>LED Crosswalk System</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>($15,500)</td>
<td>$49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>Greenfield Drive</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>($125,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Country Club Lane Bike Lane</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
<td>($9,860)</td>
<td>$1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Federal Boulevard Bike Lanes</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>($1,595)</td>
<td>$5,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Federal Boulevard/Broadway</td>
<td>$19,710</td>
<td>($2,585)</td>
<td>$17,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Massachusetts Avenue</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Federal Boulevard/Broadway</td>
<td>$116,671</td>
<td>($13,305)</td>
<td>$103,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Kempf Street/Skyline Drive</td>
<td>$168,015</td>
<td>($55,996)</td>
<td>$112,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Central Sidewalk Feasibility</td>
<td>$27,250</td>
<td>($249)</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Sweetwater River Bike Path</td>
<td>$13,915</td>
<td>($13,915)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>($2,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>Garden Road Bike Lane/Sidewalks</td>
<td>$21,325</td>
<td>($21,325)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, City</td>
<td>Bikeway Spot Improvement</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>($3,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, City</td>
<td>Bicycle Safety Program</td>
<td>$41,118</td>
<td>($1,118)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, City</td>
<td>Camino Ruiz Bike Lane</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
<td>($5,700)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Resolution No. 2009-04, as shown in Attachment 1, approving revisions to TDA Article 3.0 claims for various City of San Diego and Cities of Del Mar, El Cajon, Escondido, Lemon Grove, National City, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, and Vista completed bicycle and pedestrian projects; and TDA Article 4.0 Claim No. 08031000 for the Metropolitan Transit System.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Current Allocation</th>
<th>Recommended Adjustment</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, City</td>
<td>Bus Bike Retrofit (MTS)</td>
<td>$38,800</td>
<td>($300)</td>
<td>$38,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, City</td>
<td>Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Sweet Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Sweet Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Sweet Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Sweet Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Sweet Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Sweet Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Sweet Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Sweet Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Sweet Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Sweet Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TDA Article 3.0 unexpended funds are in the Local Transportation Fund and will be available, subject to Transportation Committee approval, for use on other bicycle and pedestrian projects. Allocations for other TDA Article 3.0 approved projects under these claims remain unchanged.

Additionally, on March 21, 2008, the Transportation Committee approved Resolution No. 2008-18, which authorized a decrease to Claim 08031000 of $4,584,000. Based on the FY 2008 revised apportionments approved by the Board of Directors on February 22, 2008, Claim No. 08031000 required a reduction of $4,335,000. An increase to TDA Article 4.0 Claim No. 08031000 of $249,000 will correct the March 21, 2008, action.

The attached resolution would increase the actual TDA Article 4.0 Claim amount to be consistent with the payment instructions previously submitted. No additional payment to MTS is required, as the appropriate payments have already occurred.

RENNÉE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Attachment: 1. Resolution No. 2009-04: Approving Revisions to TDA Claims

Key Staff Contact: Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, (619) 699-1942, lko@sandag.org
RESOLUTION NO. 2009-04

APPROVING REVISIONS TO TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIMS

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims listed below require revisions; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors delegated the authority for Transportation Development Act amendments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has analyzed the allocations and has found that the revisions are warranted pursuant to Section 6659(c) of Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR); NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Transportation Committee as follows:

1. That the Transportation Committee, pursuant to CCR Section 6659(d) does hereby approve revisions to the claims as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Current Allocation</th>
<th>Adjustment +/-</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>LED Crosswalk System</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>($15,500)</td>
<td>$49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>Greenfield Drive</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>($125,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Country Club Lane Bike Lane</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
<td>($9,860)</td>
<td>$1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Federal Boulevard Bike Lanes</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>($1,595)</td>
<td>$5,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Federal Boulevard/Broadway</td>
<td>$19,710</td>
<td>($2,585)</td>
<td>$17,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Massachusetts Avenue</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Federal Boulevard/Broadway</td>
<td>$116,671</td>
<td>($13,305)</td>
<td>$103,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Kempf Street/Skyline Drive</td>
<td>$168,015</td>
<td>($55,996)</td>
<td>$112,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Central Sidewalk Study</td>
<td>$27,250</td>
<td>($249)</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Sweetwater River Bike Path</td>
<td>$13,915</td>
<td>($13,915)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>($2,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>Garden Road Bike Lane/Sidewalk</td>
<td>$21,325</td>
<td>($21,325)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>San Diego, City</td>
<td>Bikeway Improvement Program</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>($3,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>San Diego, City</td>
<td>Bicycle Safety Program</td>
<td>$41,118</td>
<td>($1,118)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>San Diego, City</td>
<td>Camino Ruiz Bike Lane</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
<td>($5,700)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>San Diego, City</td>
<td>Bus Bike Retrofit (MTS)</td>
<td>$38,800</td>
<td>($300)</td>
<td>$38,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>San Diego, City</td>
<td>Home Avenue Bike Path</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>($44,500)</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive Bike Lane</td>
<td>$66,196</td>
<td>($4,427)</td>
<td>$61,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Jamacha/Sweetwater/Paradise Valley</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Secure Storage</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>($24,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>San Diego, County</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 II</td>
<td>$363,895</td>
<td>($75,826)</td>
<td>$288,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Mission Road</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
<td>($55)</td>
<td>$16,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Mission Road (North Side)</td>
<td>$66,906</td>
<td>($24,406)</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Claim No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Original Cost</td>
<td>Adjusted Cost</td>
<td>Final Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>345 Center Drive Sidewalk</td>
<td>$44,024</td>
<td>($3,588)</td>
<td>$40,436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>179 Cuyamaca Street</td>
<td>$85,467</td>
<td>($6,300)</td>
<td>$79,167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>192 San Diego River Bikeway</td>
<td>$46,447</td>
<td>($837)</td>
<td>$45,610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>204 Prospect Avenue</td>
<td>$62,833</td>
<td>($62,833)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>204 Cuyamaca Street</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>($42,324)</td>
<td>$47,676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>214 Cuyamaca Street</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>($36,975)</td>
<td>$23,025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>233 Cuyamaca Street Bike Path</td>
<td>$47,400</td>
<td>($47,400)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>305 El Nopal</td>
<td>$931</td>
<td>($461)</td>
<td>$470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>305 Settle Drive</td>
<td>$4,253</td>
<td>($3,523)</td>
<td>$730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>314 Magnolia Avenue/Shadow Hill Bikeway</td>
<td>$2,268</td>
<td>($2,268)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>256 Loop Detectors</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>($14,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>270 Nonmotorized Facilities Plan</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>293 Olive Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>$277,930</td>
<td>($60,000)</td>
<td>$217,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>326 Sweetwater Road</td>
<td>$317,218</td>
<td>($11,243)</td>
<td>$305,975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>08031000</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$74,378,802</td>
<td>$249,000</td>
<td>$74,627,802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. That the other approved projects under these claims shall remain unchanged.

3. That the Transportation Committee does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit allocation instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for adjustment of these claims. Instructions for TDA Article 4.0 Claim No. 08031000 should include no new payments or returns associated with this claim adjustment since the prior payments were based on the increased amount.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of September, 2008.

CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and Mexico.
AGREEMENT WITH CALTRANS FOR PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING ON THE INTERSTATE 5/STATE ROUTE 56 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Introduction

Caltrans has asked to use SANDAG on-call engineering consultants for preliminary engineering for the Interstate 5 (I-5)/State Route 56 (SR 56) Interchange improvement project. The consultant costs are estimated at $830,000. Capacity up to $1,000,000 is recommended as part of this agreement. SANDAG TransNet funds would be used to cover costs. All costs, including administrative costs, would be reimbursed by Caltrans.

Discussion

The I-5/SR 56 Interchange improvement project is a TransNet project; however, this project is not included in the Early Action Program and is therefore not covered by the Master Agreement between SANDAG and Caltrans. The Master Agreement, among other things, allows Caltrans to utilize the SANDAG on-call engineering consultants.

Caltrans is requesting the execution of an agreement that would allow Caltrans to use the SANDAG on-call engineering consultants for preliminary engineering necessary for the I-5/SR 56 Interchange improvement project. A project alternative includes the construction of the missing south to east and west to north connectors. The current cost estimate for the project alternative that includes the construction of the missing connectors is $150 million. Current funding on the project totals $9.5 million and includes a combination of federal demonstration grant funds, state funds, and funding from the City of San Diego. There are no TransNet funds on the project currently. The draft environmental document is scheduled for release to the public in spring 2010.

SANDAG has recently executed engineering consultant contracts totaling $175 million and has the capacity to accommodate Caltrans’ request. The SANDAG administrative costs will be minimal and will be fully reimbursed by Caltrans.

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to sign an agreement with Caltrans for preliminary engineering for the Interstate 5/State Route 56 Interchange improvement project. The agreement would allow Caltrans to utilize the SANDAG on-call engineering consultants. The agreement would be in substantially the same form as Attachment 1.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachment: 1. Proposed Cooperative Agreement between SANDAG and Caltrans

Key Staff Contact: Richard Chavez, (619) 699-6989, rch@sandag.org
COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT, ENTERED INTO EFFECTIVE ON _________________, 2008, is between the STATE OF CALIFORNIA, acting by and through its Department of Transportation, referred to herein as “STATE,” and

San Diego Association of Governments, a legislatively created regional government agency of the State of California, referred to herein as “SANDAG.”

RECITALS

1. STATE and SANDAG, pursuant to Streets and Highways Code sections 114 and 130, are authorized to enter into a Cooperative Agreement for improvements to State Highways System (SHS) within County of San Diego’s jurisdiction.

2. STATE desires to have completed Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) for State Highway and local street improvements consisting of interchange improvements on Interstate 5/State Route 56 (I-5/SR-56), referred to herein as “PROJECT.”

3. STATE is willing to fund one hundred percent (100%) of all capital outlay and support costs, including the costs of STATE’s Independent Quality Assurance (IQA) of PROJECT, and STATE’s costs incurred as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Lead Agency and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Lead Agency, if applicable, in the review and approval, if appropriate, of the PROJECT PA&ED to an amount not to exceed $1,000,000.

4. To expedite delivery of PROJECT, STATE desires SANDAG, through SANDAG CONSULTANTS to prepare the PA&ED, referred to herein as “WORK” in order to bring about the earliest possible construction of PROJECT. A SANDAG CONSULTANT is a prime or subcontractor firm under contract with SANDAG that provides Architecture & Engineering (A&E) services.

5. STATE is agreeable to reimburse SANDAG the cost of WORK performed using SANDAG CONSULTANTS, including but not limited to applicable SANDAG administrative costs.

6. STATE and SANDAG mutually desire to cooperate in WORK and desire to specify the terms and conditions under which WORK is to be prepared and financed.
SECTION I

SANDAG AGREES:

1. To provide CALTRANS access to SANDAG CONSULTANTS for completion of WORK.

2. All WORK performed by SANDAG CONSULTANTS shall be performed in accordance with all State and Federal laws, regulations, policies, procedures, and standards that SANDAG would normally follow. All such WORK shall be submitted to STATE for STATE’s review.

3. SANDAG CONSULTANTS will furnish STATE with written quarterly progress during the period when WORK is being prepared.

4. To invoice STATE no more often than monthly for SANDAG staff and SANDAG CONSULTANT expenditures for WORK.

5. To retain or cause to be retained for audit by STATE or other government auditors for a period of three (3) years from date of FHWA payment of final voucher, or four (4) years from date of final payment under the contract, whichever is longer, all records and accounts relating to construction of PROJECT.

6. SANDAG Point of Contact: Richard Chavez, PE
   401 B Street, Suite 800
   San Diego, CA 92101
   Tel: (619) 699-6989

SECTION II

STATE AGREES:

1. To manage the scope, cost, and schedule to ensure the timely completion of WORK and provide a qualified STATE’s representative who shall have authority to accept or reject SANDAG CONSULTANT WORK.

2. To actively manage and direct SANDAG CONSULTANTS. Prior to taking on such management functions, STATE shall identify the STATE employees that will participate in the procurement or contracting process with SANDAG CONSULTANTS and those STATE employees shall provide a completed disclosure of financial interests form (Form 700) to SANDAG that establishes that the STATE employee does not have any conflicts of interest.

3. To make payments to SANDAG within twenty-five (25) days of receipt of invoice submitted by SANDAG pursuant to Article 4 of Section I of this Agreement, up to an amount not to exceed $1,000,000. In the event SANDAG notifies STATE that this amount will be exceeded, STATE will meet with SANDAG to discuss whether an amendment to this Agreement is appropriate. SANDAG may direct SANDAG CONSULTANTS to discontinue WORK on the PROJECT until the parties are able to identify sufficient funds to complete the WORK.

4. All applicable expenses incurred by SANDAG for WORK, including CLAIMS as defined in Article 7 of Section II, shall be reimbursed by STATE. SANDAG shall not mark up the rates charged by SANDAG CONSULTANTS to carry out the WORK.
5. To provide Independent Quality Assurance (IQA) over WORK at no cost to assure that WORK is in accordance with STATE policies, procedures, standards, and practices. This IQA function includes both the obligation and authority to reject non-compliant work on WORK.

6. At no cost SANDAG, to complete STATE review as CEQA Lead Agency and Responsible Agency and NEPA Lead Agency, of the environmental documents and to provide IQA of all work necessary for completion of the PA&ED for PROJECT.

7. STATE acknowledges that it will be the owner of the PROJECT and shall have responsibility for the quality and oversight of the PROJECT and the WORK. STATE agrees to indemnify and save SANDAG harmless against all claims, litigation, or other liability (CLAIMS) arising out of execution of the WORK whether by a SANDAG CONSULTANT or a third party. At its own expense, STATE shall defend any suit or action brought against SANDAG founded upon a CLAIM.

8. STATE Point of Contact: Arturo Jacobo, Project Manager
   4050 Taylor Street
   San Diego, CA 92110
   Tel: (619) 688-6816
   Email: Arturo_jacobo@dot.ca.gov

SECTION III

IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED:

1. All obligations of STATE under the terms of this Agreement are subject to the appropriation of resources by the Legislature, the State Budget Act authority, and the allocation of resources by the California Transportation Commission.

2. All obligations of SANDAG under the terms of this Agreement are subject the appropriation and allocation of resources by the SANDAG Board of Directors.

3. Nothing in the provision of this Agreement is intended to create duties or obligations to or rights in third parties not party to this Agreement or affect the legal liability of either party to the Agreement by imposing any standard of care with respect to the maintenance of State highways different from the standard of care imposed by law.

4. Preparation of environmental documentation and related investigative studies and technical environmental reports for PROJECT shall be performed in accordance with all applicable Federal and STATE standards and practices current as of the date of performance. Any exceptions to applicable design standards shall first be considered by STATE for approval via the processes outlined in STATE’s Highway Design Manual and appropriate memoranda and design bulletins published by STATE. In the event that STATE proposes and/or requires a change in design standards, implementation of new or revised design standards shall be done as part of the WORK on PROJECT in accordance with STATE’s current Highway Design Manual Section 82.5, “Effective Date for Implementing Revisions to Design Standards.”
5. STATE will be the CEQA Lead Agency and Responsible Agency, and the NEPA Lead Agency if applicable. STATE will direct SANDAG CONSULTANTS working on the PROJECT to ensure that the environmental documentation and necessary associated supporting investigative studies and technical environmental reports are prepared in order to meet the requirements of CEQA and NEPA.

6. STATE, as a PROJECT cost, shall ensure the preparation, submission, publication and circulation of all public notices related to the CEQA environmental process and the NEPA environmental process, including, but not limited to, notice(s) of availability of the environmental document and or determinations and notices of public hearings are completed. Public notices shall comply with all State and Federal laws, regulations, policies, and procedures. STATE will work with the appropriate Federal Agency to publish notices in the Federal Register, if applicable.

7. All administrative reports, studies, materials, documentation, including, but not limited to, all administrative drafts and administrative finals, relied upon, produced, created or utilized for PROJECT will be held in confidence pursuant to Government Code section 6254.5(e). The parties agree that said material will not be distributed, released or shared with any other organization, person or group other than the parties’ employees and agents whose work requires that access without the prior written approval of the party with the authority to authorize said release and except as required or authorized by statute or pursuant to the terms of this Agreement.

8. No alteration or variation of the terms of this Agreement shall be valid unless made in writing and signed by the parties hereto, and no oral understanding or agreement not incorporated herein shall be binding on any of the parties hereto.

9. For purposes of this Agreement, the relationship of the parties is that of independent entities and not as agents of each other or as joint venturers or partners.

10. This Agreement shall terminate upon satisfactory completion of WORK or on June 30, 2012, whichever is earlier in time, except that the indemnification, environmental commitments, legal challenges, and CLAIMS articles shall remain in effect until terminated or modified, in writing, by mutual agreement. Should any PA&ED related or other claims arising out of PROJECT be asserted against one of the parties, the parties agree to extend the fixed termination date of this Agreement, until such time as the PA&ED related or other claims are settled, dismissed or paid.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SANDAG

Will Kempton Gary L. Gallegos
Director of Transportation Executive Director

By: ________________________  By: ________________________
Certified as to Funds:

District Budget Manager/BK
Approved as to Form and Procedure:  

___________________________  
Attorney, Department of Transportation  

Certified as to Financial Terms and Conditions:  

_________________________  
Accounting Administrator  
Reimbursements Section  

Approved as to form:  

By:  
__________________________  
General Counsel
Introduction

SANDAG is required by state law to prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the San Diego region. The purpose of the CMP is to monitor the performance of the region’s transportation system, develop strategies to address near-term and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. The last CMP update was adopted by SANDAG in 2006.

At its March 21, 2008, meeting, the Transportation Committee confirmed the approach for the 2008 CMP Update and directed staff to evaluate alternative means of meeting the CMP requirements for future updates. The 2008 CMP Update incorporates the results of new 2007 roadway and transit monitoring. In addition, an analysis of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) improvements on future roadway congestion is included.

Discussion

In order to meet state legislative requirements, the CMP provides: (1) ongoing monitoring of the region’s transportation system; (2) a program to evaluate and mitigate the traffic impacts of new development projects; (3) a number of congestion management strategies to mitigate congestion; and (4) a mechanism to prepare deficiency plans for roadway segments that do not meet the CMP Level of Service standard (LOS E).

The focus of the 2008 CMP Update is to provide:

- An updated CMP roadway network Level of Service (LOS) analysis based on 2007 traffic data;
- An updated CMP transit corridor analysis based on 2007 transit data; and
- An analysis of the effect of 2030 RTP improvements on the deficient segments identified in this CMP update.

Updated CMP Roadway LOS Analysis

Using 2007 traffic data, a CMP LOS analysis was prepared for the CMP roadway system (Chapter 2) consisting of all state freeways, highways, and select principal arterials. LOS is a measure used to...
evaluate how well a roadway section or intersection operates. LOS is commonly described in letter form ranging from LOS A (least congested) to LOS F (most congested). Attachment 1 illustrates the results of the LOS analysis.

The CMP standard is LOS E. Roadway segments not meeting this standard will require a deficiency plan analysis (discussed below). Based upon the 2007 data, there is a decrease of 15 deficient freeway and conventional highway segments equaling a decrease in deficient mileage of almost 51 miles compared to the 2006 CMP Update. For CMP arterials, there also has been a decrease of 12 deficient segments with deficient mileage declining by almost 16 miles.

**Updated CMP Transit Corridor Analysis**

The CMP includes an analysis of existing transit service in 11 CMP transit corridors based on 2007 data (Chapter 3). The corridors were evaluated in terms of miles of service provided, number of trips operated, ridership, and average bus speed. A summary of the transit corridor analysis is included as Attachment 2. Unlike the roadway analysis, there is no adopted CMP performance standard for transit services. Between 2005 and 2007, there has been an overall 12.8 percent increase in the number of trips operated, a 9.2 percent increase in ridership, and a 0.8 percent decrease in average vehicle speed. When compared to the prior CMP analysis, which was based on 2005 data, there has been a general increase in transit ridership in North County north-south and east-west corridors. For example, the I-5 North Corridor has seen a 14.8 percent increase in ridership.

**Deficient CMP Segment Analysis and Deficiency Plans**

An analysis of CMP-identified roadway deficiencies (segments with LOS F) was conducted to assess the impacts of recommended improvements contained within the 2030 RTP on roadway congestion. The results of this analysis are summarized below. Remaining deficient roadway segments that still require Deficiency Plans are included in Attachment 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing LOS F 2007</th>
<th>Projected LOS F 2030 No Build</th>
<th>Projected LOS F 2010</th>
<th>Projected LOS F 2020</th>
<th>Projected LOS F 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficient Segments¹</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficient Mileage¹</td>
<td>105.31</td>
<td>100.75</td>
<td>80.90</td>
<td>79.86</td>
<td>81.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹CMP roadway segments operating at LOS “F”

Source: 2030 RTP; Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario

As this analysis shows, even with the planned 2030 RTP improvements, there will still be congestion in the future in some corridors. Population and employment growth coupled with future changes in land use and additional planned development make tackling congestion a challenge that needs to continue to be addressed.

Under state law, the local jurisdiction or jurisdictions in which the deficiency occurs are responsible for the preparation of Deficiency Plans. The purpose of a Deficiency Plan is to evaluate the cause of
the existing roadway deficiency and to propose remedial actions necessary to address the deficiency. As previously discussed, the initial deficiency plan requirements are met through the RTP deficiency analysis. For those remaining deficient roadway segments, SANDAG and Caltrans are available to assist local agencies in preparing individual deficiency plans.

SANDAG, Caltrans, and local jurisdictions are working on a number of subregional and corridor studies that may lay the groundwork for specific Deficiency Plans. Corridor System Management Plans are underway for the I-5 North and I-805 Corridors. Upcoming planning efforts include the I-5 South and the I-8 Corridors. Additional travel demand modeling to evaluate the cause of the deficiency also may help address the requirements of Deficiency Plans. SANDAG staff in collaboration with local jurisdictions will develop additional implementation strategies for preparing Deficiency Plans that will be proposed as part of the Fiscal Year 2010 budget process.

**Options for Future CMP Updates**

Streamlined CMP Approach

The basic state legislative requirements of the CMP are to monitor the performance of our transportation system, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. Since 1991, SANDAG has addressed these requirements through a CMP document that is updated biennially. Since the legislative requirements also are being addressed through other SANDAG monitoring and planning activities, it is no longer necessary to prepare a stand-alone CMP document in the future.

One viable option for streamlining the CMP monitoring and reporting process would be to incorporate it into the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Annual Performance Monitoring Report. The RCP Annual Monitoring Report already includes CMP deficiency analysis information, and could be expanded to include the other information that is required to be reported for the CMP. There is also an established public review process for the RCP Annual Monitoring Report, which could serve as the public review process for the CMP as well.

Another option would be to continue to produce a separate CMP document every other year, but to reduce the contents of the document. Staff currently incorporates detailed information regarding the overall toolkit for CMP implementation in each report, along with details regarding the applicable legislation and other relevant background information. This material could be made available on the SANDAG website, and the CMP report itself could be shortened to include only the monitoring results and a status report on deficiency plans.

**CMP “Opt Out”**

The state CMP requirements allow congestion management agencies to “opt out” of the state CMP process. In order to opt out, a majority of the local jurisdictions representing a majority of the population in the county must adopt resolutions electing to be exempt from the state congestion management program. Under this option, SANDAG would still be required to comply with federal congestion management provisions, but would then need to monitor its compliance with Federal law through the RTP, which is produced every four years.
Conclusion

As the results of the Draft 2008 CMP analysis show, congested facilities that fail the CMP standards still remain and additional strategies to address those deficiencies and improve mobility are needed. For SANDAG to “opt out” of the State CMP program at this time could be interpreted by some as an indication that SANDAG is not seriously committed to addressing and resolving congestion problems. At the same time, streamlining the CMP reporting process by folding it into the RCP Performance Monitoring process would have the advantage of eliminating a somewhat redundant reporting process while still ensuring that congestion issues are properly monitored and addressed on a regular basis. Therefore, staff would recommend that this streamlined approach be pursued and that CMP monitoring be fully incorporated into the 2010 RCP performance monitoring report.

Evaluation on Potential Addition of Arterials to CMP Network

At its March 21, 2008, meeting, the Transportation Committee requested that SANDAG staff evaluate whether additional arterials should be added to the CMP network. The following criteria were developed and discussed with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) to conduct this evaluation. Currently, there are 11 CMP arterial corridors that are included in the 2008 CMP Update.

- Arterial must be included in the Regional Arterial System
- Arterial must be classified as a principal or prime arterial in the local jurisdiction’s circulation element/general plan
- Arterial must carry a high volume of traffic (at least 50,000 average daily traffic)
- Arterial is not near an existing CMP facility (within two miles or within one mile if the arterial has regional transit)
- Arterial provides connectivity and regional coverage to the CMP network

Based on the criteria listed above, staff proposes adding the following arterials to the CMP network:

- Telegraph Canyon Road/Otay Lakes Road: I-805 to SR 125 (City of Chula Vista)
- Mira Mesa Boulevard: I-805 to I-15 (City of San Diego)

City of Chula Vista staff concurs with SANDAG staff on the proposed addition of Telegraph Canyon Road. However, the City of San Diego staff disagrees with SANDAG staff’s recommendation and does not support adding Mira Mesa Boulevard to the CMP network. While we acknowledge that adding Mira Mesa Boulevard to the network of CMP arterials will result in additional planning requirements, SANDAG staff believes that it would be valuable to monitor the performance of Mira Mesa Boulevard due to its significance as a major east-west arterial as well as its future significance as a regional “Bus Rapid Transit” corridor. Therefore, we recommend that both Telegraph Canyon Road/Otay Lakes Road and Mira Mesa Boulevard be added to the CMP network and be shown in Table 2.3 in the final 2008 CMP update. New CMP arterials would be required to participate in biennial roadway monitoring and would be subject to the deficiency plan requirements if found deficient.
**Next Steps**

Pending the Committee’s action, a public hearing will be held at the November 7, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting to receive comments on the 2008 CMP Update. The Transportation Committee also will be asked to adopt the 2008 CMP Update at its November 7, 2008 meeting.

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments:  
1. 2008 CMP Update - 2007 Peak Hour Level of Service  
2. CMP Transit Corridors Analysis Summary  
3. CMP Roadway Segments Requiring Deficiency Plans

Key Staff Contact: Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967, hwe@sandag.org

Note: Printed copies of the Draft 2008 CMP Update were provided to Transportation Committee Members and Alternates. The Draft 2008 CMP Update may be obtained from the SANDAG Web site at [www.sandag.org/cmp](http://www.sandag.org/cmp) or by contacting the SANDAG Public Information Office at (619) 699-1950.
### CMP Transit Corridors Analysis Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Year of Data</th>
<th>One-Way Route Miles</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Average Weekday Bus Speed (mph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB/EB</td>
<td>SB/WB</td>
<td>NB/EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 15 South Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
<td>-145</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 15 North/State Route 163 Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>244.0</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>2,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>215.4</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>2,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-28.6</td>
<td>-264</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 North Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>225.5</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>3,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>199.3</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>4,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-26.2</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 South Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>12,850</td>
<td>5,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>12,224</td>
<td>6,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td>-626</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 8 Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>5,470</td>
<td>6,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>7,484</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>2,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 52 Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 75 Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-11.4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 76 Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 78 Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 94 Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>6,479</td>
<td>6,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>6,119</td>
<td>6,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-21.5</td>
<td>-360</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 905 Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>-75</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All CMP Transit Corridors</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,065.2</td>
<td>33,773</td>
<td>28,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>950.4</td>
<td>34,672</td>
<td>32,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-114.8</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>4,571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CMP Roadway Segments Requiring Deficiency Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMP Route</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Affected Local Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5</td>
<td>SR 54 to Pacific Highway Ramp</td>
<td>Cities of San Diego and National City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 8</td>
<td>Mission Bay Drive to Gilman Drive</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 15</td>
<td>I-5 to El Cajon Boulevard</td>
<td>Cities of San Diego and La Mesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 805</td>
<td>SR 125 to Johnson Avenue</td>
<td>Cities of La Mesa and El Cajon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 15</td>
<td>I-8 to Balboa Avenue</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 805</td>
<td>SR 163 to Miramar Road</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 805</td>
<td>Telegraph Canyon Road to SR 54</td>
<td>Cities of Chula Vista and National City and San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 52</td>
<td>I-5 to I-805</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 94</td>
<td>I-5 to College Avenue</td>
<td>Cities of San Diego and Lemon Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 163</td>
<td>Ash Street to Friars Road</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Highways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 67</td>
<td>Mapleview Street to SR 78</td>
<td>San Diego County and City of Poway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 75</td>
<td>Toll Plaza to I-5 North</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 76</td>
<td>Melrose Avenue to South Mission Avenue</td>
<td>City of Oceanside and San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 94</td>
<td>Jamacha Boulevard to Jamacha Road</td>
<td>San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arterials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramar Road</td>
<td>Black Mountain Road to I-15</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Harbor Drive</td>
<td>Laurel Street to Hawthorne Street</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATUS REPORT ON MID-CITY RAPID BUS PROJECT  

Introduction

The Mid-City Rapid Bus Project includes the design and implementation of a ten-mile Rapid Bus service between San Diego State University (SDSU) and downtown San Diego along El Cajon and Park Boulevards. The line will provide North Park, City Heights, and College area residents, students, and workers with a limited-stop, high-speed service in one of the key transit corridors in the region (Attachment 1).

The Mid-City Rapid Bus Project represents the initial step towards implementing a full Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service in this corridor, as envisioned by the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Rapid Bus project will implement a number of transit priority treatments (for example, signal priority treatments and signal queue jumps) designed to improve transit operations in a mixed-flow traffic setting; implementation of a full BRT service will require dedicated transit lanes throughout most of the project area.

The Mid-City Rapid Bus Project is included in the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan approved by the voters in 2004, and is on the Early Action Project list. This item provides a status report on project funding and status, preliminary engineering, environmental documentation, public outreach, and outlines the next steps for the project.

Discussion

Funding

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) administers the Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants program, which provides capital funds for major transit investment projects. The program includes a new project category called “Very Small Starts” to provide funding for simple, low-risk projects. Last August, the Board of Directors authorized staff to submit an application for funding to the FTA. The Board also agreed to add the Mid-City Rapid Bus project to the list of Early Action projects in the updated Plan of Finance (POF) to provide the local match for the grant.

The Very Small Starts application was submitted to the FTA in September 2007. The project described in the application was the middle segment of the corridor, including the northern end of Park Boulevard and the length of El Cajon Boulevard. The total estimated project cost, including vehicle acquisition, is $39.7 million (inflated to $43.3 million in year of construction). The requested federal share was 50 percent. In late December, SANDAG was notified by the FTA that the project was accepted into the program and approved to enter into project development, giving SANDAG the authority to complete preliminary and final design and environmental documentation.
The Mid-City Rapid Bus project is included in the President’s proposed budget for FY 2009. The federal budget currently is working its way through Congress. The SANDAG congressional delegation is supportive of the project and committed to protecting the project budget as it works its way through Congress. The project has been added to the Early Action program of projects, ensuring that the local matching funds will be available at the time of construction.

Staff will update the project cost estimate during final design. Staff will need to maintain cost control to ensure that the project budget does not exceed the limit of $3 million per mile imposed by the Very Small Starts program.

**Preliminary Engineering**

Preliminary engineering design has now been completed for the middle segment of the corridor (extending from Park Boulevard/University Avenue to College Avenue/El Cajon Boulevard), which is the subject of the federal grant. Preliminary engineering work completed includes:

- design plans for ten stations
- transit signal priority treatments
- a conceptual station shelter design
- a median running dedicated transit lane along Park Boulevard between El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue

Further refinements to the station plans are anticipated in the final design stage, as well as modifications to the shelter design.

**Environmental Documentation**

A draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared for the project and now is being circulated for public review; the public review period is September 2, 2008, through October 3, 2008. The draft MND is available for review at public libraries, on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/midcitybus, or in hard copy by request.

The draft MND analyzes potential project impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, hazardous materials, noise, aesthetics, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, transportation, and utilities. There are mitigation measures for noise, air quality, cultural resources, and hazardous materials. After mitigation, there are no remaining significant environmental impacts. The project’s impacts to on-street parking are considered not significant environmentally; however, staff would continue to refine the station designs to further reduce parking impacts throughout the final design process.

Staff will return to the Transportation Committee later this fall to request adoption of the MND.

**Public Outreach**

From the project inception, there have been a number of public outreach efforts to review the project with the communities served by the project and to solicit their input. With the completion of preliminary engineering and environmental studies, a number of recent public meetings have been held. A series of meetings focused on specific station areas and were held at local businesses
along the corridor. Adjoining business establishments and residences were notified by direct mail and in person. These informal sessions allowed neighbors to review station drawings and ask questions about a wide range of issues of specific interest to them, such as lane striping, curb markings, construction timing, and parking impacts. Of particular note was the concern expressed by business owners on Park Boulevard north of Howard Street about impacts to adjacent parking. Staff is working through some design refinements to address these concerns, and will continue to refine the designs throughout the process.

In addition to these station-specific meetings, a larger public forum will be held on September 11, 2008, to review plans for the project as a whole. The target audience for this event is community planning group members, community organizations, and the public. In addition to station site plans, this forum provides an opportunity for participants to learn about and comment on the project route, features, cost, and status, and to express their views on the conceptual shelter design and bus procurement. Staff will discuss the results of the meeting at the September 19, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting.

Next Steps

After the public review period on the draft MND closes in October, staff will incorporate any needed changes into the document and publish a final draft MND. This MND will be brought to the Transportation Committee for adoption later this fall. At that time, staff also will request the Transportation Committee’s authorization to prepare final design plans for the project. During final design, the following activities will occur:

- Refinement of station design drawings. Modifications will be made, as needed, to the station design drawings to reflect changed conditions and community input. For example, staff can anticipate some modifications to the station design at Park Boulevard and El Cajon to retain more on-street parking, and refinements to the College Avenue station to depict the new median installation near the intersection. In addition, detailed cross-sections and utility drawings will be prepared.

- Refinement of the shelter design and bus branding. The basic shelter concept has undergone community review at previous workshops and the recent September 11, 2008, community workshop. Staff anticipates revising the design based on community input and also will work with community groups to allow for some customization to reflect community character. Staff also will work together with the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) to develop a bus brand design.

- Collaboration with MTS on the operating plan, leading to an agreement on operating costs and TransNet support of the upgraded operations. Operating cost estimates will include frequency enhancements and maintenance of shelters, fare vending equipment, and on-vehicle signal priority equipment.

- Collaboration with the City of San Diego on issues including curb height, drainage design, traffic control, lane striping, and monitoring and maintenance of signal priority equipment. This will lead to an agreement on operating costs and responsibilities, including maintenance of travel lanes, drainage facilities, signal timing and phasing, and off-vehicle signal priority equipment.
• Collaboration with community organizations on maintenance of new landscaping. The stations will provide new street trees. Staff anticipates installing the landscaping and irrigation for the trees, then turning over maintenance responsibilities to existing maintenance districts.

• Conduct value engineering and revising cost estimates. The final design process will include a critical evaluation of cost-effectiveness and possible design modifications to add value to the project. Cost estimates will be revised throughout the process. Staff will maintain a tight control on project costs to ensure that SANDAG remains eligible for the Very Small Starts grant.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Mid-City Rapid Project Map

Key Staff Contact: Miriam Kirshner, (619) 699-6995, mki@sandag.org
Mid-City Rapid
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Introduction

The North County Transit District (NCTD) SPRINTER Rail Project converts an existing 22-mile freight rail corridor into a Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) transit system connecting Oceanside, Vista, unincorporated County areas, San Marcos, and Escondido. The SPRINTER is a TransNet-funded project to increase east-west mobility in the State Route (SR) 78 corridor. In response to requests from NCTD and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), SANDAG staff is currently providing support and oversight services for the project and has been asked by the SANDAG Board of Directors to report on its progress monthly to the Transportation Committee.

Discussion

Current Progress

The Mainline contractor continues with landscape maintenance and punch list work. The contractor believes all work should be complete within a month.

The deployable fall protection plates on the eastbound Escondido Avenue Station platform gangways are complete and have been inspected by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Written approval from the CPUC to open the platform was received on September 10, and service there started on September 12.

The Inland Rail Trail work is complete except for punch list work. Operations and maintenance agreements are currently being negotiated with the Cities of Escondido and San Marcos.

After taking a dip in mid-summer, ridership is again increasing. Daily boardings have risen from 6,962 in early August to 7,625 in late August. Ridership is expected to increase further with the start of school and the opening of the eastbound platform at Escondido Avenue.

Claims and Disputes

When all work on a contract is done, NCTD sends the contractor a “notice of completion.” This notice starts a timeline for the contractor to submit any dispute or potential claim as a formal project claim. The SPRINTER Vehicle Maintenance Facility is complete and there are no outstanding issues. NCTD also believes all issues have been resolved with the San Marcos Loop contract and the DMU vehicle procurement; however, there are outstanding disputes on the Mainline contract. The systems subcontractor believes it has been impacted by changes to the signals and communication work. There also is an outstanding dispute over the responsibility for the failed rail connections to the bridges over SR 78, which was corrected during construction. The notice of completion for the Mainline contract is expected to be sent to the contractor this fall.
The May 2007 settlement agreement included payments to the Mainline contractor up to $12.2 million for damages due to the design changes. The contractor has submitted documentation supporting payment of $8.1 million to date.

The settlement agreement provided for payments up to $3.3 million for “constructive acceleration” if the Mainline contractor met certain progress milestones and, conversely, liquidated damages of up to $20,000 per day should those milestones be missed. The contractor did not meet these milestones and has stated it will submit a schedule analysis showing delay from additional NCTD changes to the contract.

**Estimate at Completion**

The August estimate at completion (EAC) was reduced by $200,000 to $479.1 million. The $479.1 million includes a $6.5 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 all 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 million of capacity between budget and EAC.

The current EAC includes the cost of the additional stormwater control measures put in place earlier this year. It also assumes increases in cost of construction management, insurance, and permitting.

Risks to budget lie just with the Mainline contract. Final cost is now dependent on how the issues described above are resolved and whether new claims are submitted later this year. In addition to the claims, the cost to analyze, negotiate and defend any claim also must be considered as a risk to budget.

**SPRINTER Staff**

On September 1, the NCTD employees working on the SPRINTER transitioned to SANDAG in accordance with Senate Bill 1703. Their current work assignments have not changed and for SPRINTER matters they will continue to work under the direction of the NCTD Board and management.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contact: Jim Linthicum, (619) 699-1970, jlin@sandag.org
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Sept. 19, 2008
SANDAG
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
AGENDA ITEM #2 (Public Comment...)

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.
Project Status and Schedule

- Project is currently in the environmental stage and will be completed in two phases or "Tiers".
- Phase 1/Tier 1: Programming phase – Final Draft EIS/EIR was released for Federal Agency Review on August 22, 2008; 30 day review ends September 22, 2008.
- Approval for Tier 1 and Presidential Permit – October 2008.
- Begin Construction – 2012.

Cost and Funding

- Estimate cost for construction a four-lane freeway ranges from $300 to $360 million.
- Estimate cost for construction the POE facility ranges from $250 to $300 million.
- Currently $13 million is programmed for the Environmental Document phase.
- CTC approved $75 million Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF).
- SB 1486 (Ducheny) Toll/Funding implementation – January 2009.
**PHASE 1A**

**Project Summary**
- Project limits: Britannia Blvd to Siempre Viva Road.
- Estimated cost to construct: $76.5 million.
- End construction: November 2010.

**Recent Activities**
- Construction underway.

**Risks**
- R/W settlement costs may exceed estimated cost/allocated amount.

**Right of Way Acquisition/Condemnation Status (Phase 1A and Phase 1B)**
- 73 parcels required, 68 acquired, 3 lawsuits pending on remaining 5 parcels.
- Total R/W allocation: $219.6 million.
PHASE 1B

Project Summary
- Project limits: East of Interstate 805 to Britannia Blvd.
- Estimated Cost: $104.7 million (including support and escalation).

Funding Sources
- $91.6 million from the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF).
- $8.4 million from TransNet Funds for border projects.
- $4.7 million from SAFE TEA-LU earmark.

Recent Activities
- Baseline Agreement for TCIF funding approved by CTC.

Schedule
- Project Ready to List for advertising October 2008.
- Bid Opening January 2009.
- Award February 2009.
- End Construction May 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for Additional Information: Requirements of the RS RTP</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The last four items listed under the components of the RS RTP (Policy 18) are not currently included in the draft Coordinated Plan which include:</td>
<td>1 and 2. The final four components of the RS RTP mentioned in the Coordinated Plan were not prepared since they all relate to the development of new transit services. In order to include new service development in the plan, SANDAG will need to receive the Service Implementation Plans (or SIPs) from both operators. The SIPs were not prepared by either operator this year or last year due to the lack of available funding, staff resources, and anticipation that the development of new services would not be feasible under the current budgetary constraints. However it is anticipated that future Coordinated Plans will evaluate and prioritize new and revised services for implementation, along with SANDAG TransitNet projects such as Bus Rapid Transit, Rapid Bus, and Light Rail extensions once the SIPs are provided to SANDAG for consideration. SANDAG will then include and evaluate those projects in the Regional Service Implementation Plan which is SANDAG’s responsibility and which is part of the fourth bullet mentioned. The RSIP then will become the basis for the transit agencies to develop their annual operating budgets for SANDAG adoption. The inclusion of near-term TransitNet projects (as mentioned by Move San Diego) will be included in the description of transit services detailed in Appendix B. As requested all short-term (5-year projects will be included).</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with our Mission we are concerned that these items, which are clearly performance based criteria, seem to be missing from the current draft Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We hope to see a comprehensive summary of all current and future transit project planning efforts for the five year period. Specifically, we feel that a summary of existing current and planned transit projects, their status and planned budgets (Federal, State and local allocations) should be described and detailed in this Plan. Projects such as:</td>
<td>3. No additional subarea studies are planned due to existing budget constraints. However, subarea studies will be and are currently being developed for the near-term TransitNet projects mentioned above. SANDAG staff will include subarea studies in future Coordinated Plans as they are developed. Such plans will benefit from future inclusion of transit agency SIPs as well as from future data gathering of social service agencies providing transportation under the Coordinated Plan funding sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Super Loop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mid-City Rapid Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mid-Coast LRT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I-15 Centerline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We urge that you add a section in the Plan that identifies and prioritizes regional and subarea transit planning studies (e.g. University City and Mission Valley).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for Information</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Request for most recent Regional Service Implementation Plan document.</td>
<td>1. No Regional Service Implementation Plans have been prepared since consolidation (SB 1703) due to budget constraints. However, SANDAG expects one to be prepared with the next Coordinated Plan cycle since SIPs are expected to be submitted by the transit agencies.</td>
<td>Chapter 4 and Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Please clarify differences between Service Improvement Plans, Service Implementation Plans and Service Adjustment Plans (used in past RS RTPs).</td>
<td>2. The correct plan name is Service Implementation Plan. Any reference to Service Improvement Plan in either the Plan or Technical Appendix was in error has been updated. Service Adjustment Plans existed only under pre-consolidation (SB 1703). This function is now carried out through the Service Implementation Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for Addition: Service Improvement Plans</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We could not find the applicable policy assigning the Service Implementation Plan responsibility to the transit operators. According to Policy 18 it appears that it is</td>
<td>1. This is correct. Policy 18 directs SANDAG staff to prepare the Regional Service Implementation Plan. However, to do this SANDAG must receive the Service Implementation Plans from the transit operators as required by Section 1.2.3 of</td>
<td>Chapter 4 and Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANDAG’s responsibility “carried out in collaboration with the transit agencies.”</strong></td>
<td>Policy 18 stating that it is the responsibility of the transit operators to “develop proposals for new and revised services to be included in the Regional Service Implementation Plan.”</td>
<td><strong>Chapter 4, Appendix L,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is it correct that the SIPs have not been done since the Coordinated Plan combined the RSRTP with the Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan requirement to receive federal funding.</td>
<td>This is correct. The SIPs have not been done since the Coordinated Plan was combined with the RSRTP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have TDA requirements changed such that a list of Specific Service Adjustments (or Improvements or Implementations) is no longer required.</td>
<td>Specific Service Adjustments are not covered in the revised (2005) TDA Statutes and California Codes and Regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.</strong> The comparison of driving times to transit travel times may be available in the near future utilizing the A-Pems (Arterial) and T-Pems (Transit) programs once they are operational. However, given that sample data is not yet available, the development of an indicator would be premature at this point. SANDAG will look to incorporate this into future Coordinated Plans. <strong>2.</strong> An explanation of completed trips will be included in the Final Plan. <strong>3.</strong> The average transit operating speed baselines are included in Appendix L (Page L-7). <strong>4.</strong> A baseline of the human service transportation programs included in Chapter 4 (Pages 4-18 to 4-19) is not yet possible since the programs that have been funded to date are too new to have any real workable data associated with the indicators. In addition, no data is currently available to show the baseline number of trips offered in the region. However, future Coordinated Plans will expand this section since performance monitoring of these programs will be included in the future from newly funded programs. Updates of the transportation inventory will also include number of trips provided so that a regional number can be estimated. The performance indicators included in the plan are clearly articulated in the federal circulars of each program under SAFETEA-LU. SANDAG may not change these measures but may add additional measure to evaluate social service transportation if deemed appropriate. <strong>5.</strong> The results of CTSA programs funded under the federal, state and local programs will be evaluated under the objectives and performance indicators included in the plan.</td>
<td><strong>Chapter 4,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. There appears to be no matching indicator in the Reliability and Speed Objective section to measure the competitiveness of transit times to major destinations. We urge you to adopt an indicator related to this goal that compares transit times with driving times.</td>
<td><strong>1 and 2.</strong> No specific targets will be set for FY 2009 since this method of evaluation was replaced with the analysis of trend data. Future TDA reports will look to see if trend data suggests that performance is weakening or declining (not if they met a particular numerical target). <strong>3.</strong> Chart data was not included for 5 years since the evaluation of previous data looks only backward and not forward. The intent of a 5-year plan is to look 5 years into the future (e.g. 2008-2012 for this plan). The analysis of older data (between 4 and 5) starts to introduce service levels that are much different than from the system today and can therefore skew the results so that trend data is no longer accurate.</td>
<td><strong>Chapter 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In this section you do have a guideline with Percentage of Completed Trips but there is no explanation of this indicator. Please add a definition.</td>
<td><strong>1.</strong> When and how will the specific targets for each [TDA] indicator be set for FY 2009? <strong>2.</strong> Please include in this document what targets were set annually for each [TDA] indicator for the years charted (05-07) or indicate if targets are not set and the program only consists of monitoring. <strong>3.</strong> Given that SRTPs run for 5 years, we urge you to include and chart data for the past five full years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Average Transit Operating Speed In Each Zone guideline states that it will only be reported next year. Please include the baseline times and targets for the speeds in each zone.</td>
<td><strong>1 and 2.</strong> The TDA language includes a segment on evaluating whether an operator has made “reasonable efforts” to implement productivity improvements. This is done under</td>
<td><strong>Chapter 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Please provide a baseline and improve the measurement of the “Increase in the number of human service programs including coordinated transportation as an integrated component” objective. 5. Some discussion should be included related to what consolidation is foreseen and results are being produced by the CTSA.</td>
<td><strong>3.</strong> The Average Transit Operating Speed In Each Zone guideline states that it will only be reported next year. Please include the baseline times and targets for the speeds in each zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the TDA requirement for a “productivity” Improvement Program or a “performance” Improvement Program. It appears that these words are being used inconsistently to refer to the same thing. Can you please clarify?</td>
<td>the Productivity Improvement Program included in the TDA legislation. The “performance” language is derived from the TDA triennial performance audit which is also required by TDA legislation. Transit agencies must also respond to improvement recommendations included in performance audit. However, the difference is that the “Productivity Improvement Program” is based on the indicators articulated in Chapter 4 Page 4-21, while the triennial audit recommendations are more process oriented and not necessarily tied to actual transit service operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are no Performance Improvement Recommendations (PIRs) in this Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do the Performance Improvement Program (PIP) associated reports (“Quarterly Operations Report,” “Annual Route Monitoring Report,” and “Budget Monitoring Process”) as mentioned in the most recent PIP still occur?</td>
<td>3. The “Quarterly Operations Report” is still being developed and is the central topic of quarterly Short-Range Transit Working Group meetings which are attended by MTS, NCTD, the CTSA and organized by SANDAG. The Coordinated Plan is now the “Annual Monitoring Report.” Data from which is included in the annual TDA Productivity Improvement Program reviewed by the SANDAG Board of Directors at the end of the Fiscal Year for the next Fiscal Year. The “Budget Monitoring Process” from a transit service planning perspective has not occurred since the operators have not prepared Service Implementation Plans since the Coordinated Plan components were conceived.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are the system’s highest priority operational improvements (adjustments) for the coming fiscal year(s)? There appear to be no recommendations in this draft CP.</td>
<td>4. There are no recommendations for transit system priority since neither agency is planning additional service given the extensive budget cutback that have been required in order for the transit agencies to balance their budgets. It is staff’s intention to include such priorities in the future. However, given that money has been allocated for social service transportation and transit, priorities were developed to help distribute this funding. These priorities are based on the needs included in Chapter 7 and elaborated at the end of Chapter 8 in Tables 8-2 through 8-4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We are aware that changes related to reorganization of SANDAG and the transit agencies have changed certain processes, but we are concerned that without SIPs or PIRs or any recommendations in this CP that we could be in jeopardy of noncompliance with TDA performance requirements in addition to noncompliance with SANDAG Board Policy 18.</td>
<td>5. The Performance Improvement Recommendations were replaced with the comprehensive monitoring program included in this plan. Since the TDA funding is not tied to the development of PIRs, there are no noncompliance issues. SANDAG will ultimately comply with all of the components of Policy 18 once SANDAG receives the Service Implementation Plans (SIPs) from the operators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Plan does not appear as useful to the public as it has been in the past which included detailed and specific Summaries of Transit Needs and Service Recommendations.</td>
<td>6. The plan is quite different from previous SRTPs prepared by the operators since it takes a policy perspective rather than an operations perspective. To that end Policy 18 states that the plan will “establish goals and objectives and provide guidance for service planning during the upcoming year and will balance the immediate needs of optimizing the transit system in response to operational and financial constraints, with the mid- and long-range system development goals established in the long-range plans.” The plan, given the federally mandated components, also takes a passenger perspective and includes social service transportation elements that were never addressed in the past as if they did not exist at all. The needs have been enhanced and general priorities have been structured where funding is available. Staff will continue to enhance the report to ensure that service recommendations are included at which time there is available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUEST FOR ADDITION: PERFORMANCE AUDIT RESPONSES AND PEAK DATA 1. The transit agency responses to the triennial TDA performance audit are not included in Appendix J. We would like to see them as well as a reference to the most recent performance audit. 2. A significant amount of data appears to be missing from Page L2 due to the update of the SANDAG Passenger Counting Program. When will this data be available and what is the status of the program? 3. Typo on page 4-22 on Footnote 7 which appears to be missing at least one word. 4. Please add additional information to Appendix J that explains exactly how the composite index is calculated.</td>
<td>1. The agency responses were inadvertently omitted from Appendix J and will be replaced in the final version of the plan. However, these responses were made public and available when the Productivity Improvement Plan was passed by the SANDAG Board of Directors on June 27, 2008. These tables are available at <a href="http://www.sandag.org/uploads/meetingid/meetingid_1888_8379.pdf">http://www.sandag.org/uploads/meetingid/meetingid_1888_8379.pdf</a> (agenda item 12A). 2. The Passenger Counting Program is nearing completion and should be fully operational by January 2009. 3. The footnote will be corrected with “equated” substituted with “equaled.” 4. As requested, additional information regarding the composite index calculations will be added in the Final Plan.</td>
<td>Chapter 4, Appendix J and Appendix L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUEST FOR INFORMATION: REGIONAL PROGRAM FOR TRANSIT PRIORITY 1. Please provide information on how one can obtain a copy of the “Regional Program for Transit Priority” (Ref Page B-19) and how the public and Move SD can give input to this program. 2. Please add Move SD to the list to receive all notices regarding the Comprehensive Fare Study.</td>
<td>1. The Regional Program for Transit Priority has been discontinued. Staff will update Appendix B to include information about the program which took its place. The program (“Transit Priority Measures” - CIP#1128800) was developed to implement selected cost effective transit priority measures along existing transit service routes in the San Diego region. 2. Move San Diego will be added to the list to receive all notices regarding the Comprehensive Fare Study.</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUEST FOR CHANGE AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION 1. How can we get a copy of the Transit CIP and we urge SANDAG to include the Transit CIP in the RSRTP.</td>
<td>1. The capital budget for transit projects is included in Chapter 9 of the SANDAG “Program Budget FY 2009.” As requested, information regarding the operating and capital costs of these projects along the short-range (5 year) trajectory will be provided at the end of Appendix B.</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUEST FOR ADDITION: RSRTP PERFORMANCE STATISTICS 1. In matching objectives with performance statistics, there are no matching indicators or baselines for human service transportation, JARC projects, or Senior Mini-Grant projects. Perhaps this is because they are new indicators, but shouldn’t a baseline be included? 2. The Environmental Justice Indicator tables are included separately in Appendix H and we recommend that you list this exception on Page 4-7, when first referencing Appendix L as the source for the matching funds.</td>
<td>1. As mentioned in the response to the “Performance Indicators” comment #4, a baseline of the human service transportation programs included in Chapter 4 (Pages 4-18 to 4-19) is not yet possible since the programs that have been funded to date are too new to have any real workable data associated with the indicators. However, future Coordinated Plans will include this data. 2. The “Transit Objectives” paragraph on Page 4-7 will be amended to include Appendix H as the source for the Environmental Justice information.</td>
<td>Chapter 4, Appendix H and Appendix L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUEST FOR ADDITION: APPENDIX H TITLE VI COMPLIANCE 1. Please add the Census Tract maps to Appendix H since, without the maps, there is no way for the public to understand whether their area is being included in the analysis or not.</td>
<td>1. The Census Tract maps from the triennial Title VI report will be added to Appendix H as requested.</td>
<td>Appendix H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQUEST FOR INFORMATION: JARC AND NEW FREEDOM APPLICATIONS</strong> 1. Where can we determine what projects were submitted or are being submitted for JARC and New Freedom funding? This information should be included in the Coordinated Plan. 2. Page 9-3 states that JARC grants were received by SANDAG for “three bus services operated by MTS and a bus stop improvement program at NCTD.” What bus services were funded and what bus stops were improved?</td>
<td>1 and 2. The actual projects funded under the JARC and New Freedom (and Senior Mini-Grant) will be included in Chapter 9 as suggested. In addition, for the purposes of monitoring they will be included in future Coordinated Plans once performance statistical data is available.</td>
<td><strong>Chapter 9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQUEST FOR ADDITION: SMART GROWTH CONSISTENCY</strong> 1. It is unclear why the Smart Growth section delegates this responsibility to MTS, rather than planning for and recommending addressing service levels consistent with the RCP as with the first five areas. 2. The combination of needs in the City Heights area should make this a high priority for staff to recommend funding increases for transit to be consistent with Smart Growth. 3. The five areas without the recommended levels of transit services in the RCP should also be considered from a Title VI perspective as to whether some of the areas should be ranked higher than others for additional transit service and for additional funding in support of the needs of low-income, seniors and disabled.</td>
<td>1. SANDAG plans for and addresses service level consistency with the RCP but also acknowledges that the current budget shortfall will most likely constrain the ability of the agency to add new services in the near-term. The Smart Growth performance measures are also guidelines and not mandates. As such, responsibility has not been delegated to the transit agencies but rather the evaluation of the service is a collaborative process which involves the transit agencies where issues such as cost effectiveness and budget deficiencies are taken into account. 2. The SD-CH-2 Smart Growth area in City Heights was an area recognized as being transit deficient and was also included under the areas with transit and social service gaps included in Appendix O. This identification opens up the neighborhood to potential funding for transit or social service transportation projects based on the existing identified gaps in service. 3. The Smart Growth Concept Map development is separate from the development of this plan. From a Title VI perspective, any new or revised service must undergo a civil rights review process, based on the revised federal guidelines from 2007, which is conducted by the transit agencies independent of the Regional Short Range Transit Plan. These Title VI reports are then considered by SANDAG for consistency with Title VI triennial reporting prepared by SANDAG.</td>
<td><strong>Chapter 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQUEST FOR ADDITIONS AND INFORMATION: CHAPTER 9 FUNDING</strong> 1. In each section could you please include the specific funding formulas including the specific dollar amounts received and expected to be received from each fund during the Plan period (5 years). 2. Page 9-1 refers to Figure 9.1 but we could not find Figure 9.1. 3. Page 9-2 Inter-City notes that “MTS received money from this fund in 2007” and that MTS and NCTD are seeking additional funding in 2008. What amounts for each agency and for what? 4. What is the implication of the CMAQ disclosure of expiring funds (page 9-4)? How much CMAQ funding in programmed New Start funded projects is going to be lost and in what years and for what projects? 5. What is the breakdown of the Prop 1B funding estimate by year and by agency and is this still valid considering the budget cuts?</td>
<td>1. 3-10, 14, 16-18. SANDAG will include specific funding formulas and amounts for the programs listed in Chapter 9. Where large tables are required, the information will be placed in Appendix B. 2. The urbanized area map was inadvertently removed from the previous draft and will be replaced and labeled Figure 9-1 consistent with the text. 11. The sentence referencing ITOC action in Fiscal Year 2008 will be updated to state how SANDAG staff has already worked with ITOC in the development of project criteria. 12. The footnote in Table 9.2 will be clarified as requested and will say that the funds to be returned to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program for completed projects. 13. The bicycle funding information was included since it is part of the overall TDA claim. However, the detailed information on bicycle projects is not mandated for inclusion in the Regional Short Range Transit Plan.</td>
<td><strong>Chapter 9, Appendix B, and Appendix C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Please indicate the STA revenue formula for the additional 25% allocated to individual operators (Page 9-4).</td>
<td>15. The ferry operating cost amount in C-8 refers to FY 2007 while the amount listed in Table 9.2 is for the FY 2008 TDA claim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Please indicate the specific STA requirements and eligibilities required for each operator to receive STA funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Please state what projects and how much funds they have received under the RIP and IIP as well as estimates for how much funding would be received in the 5 years covered by the RSRTP (Page 9-5).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Please list what projects and monies allocated for each under the $197 million allocated under the TCRP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Prepare figures related to funding amounts expected for each category of fund or perhaps list sources of funding estimates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Double check appropriateness of paragraph discussing the TransNet Extension Ordinance on Page 9-7. If it is accurate, what was the outcome of the ITOC criteria from the Fall of 2007.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Please provide completed projects and location of returned money on Page 9-8/Table 9.2 Footnote 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Regarding the Bicycle and Pedestrian funding expense on Page 8-8, is there additional allocation information by project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Please provide additional breakdowns for the Capital expenses for both MTS ($8,157,307) and NCTD ($5,350,000). What projects were funded and for how much?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. $143,285 is listed under &quot;Ferry service&quot; spent in FY2008 but the total operating cost from Page C-8 is listed as $139,116.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. What was the Capital Transfer to SANDAG in the amount of $173,600 for?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Administrative/Planning transfers to SANDAG in the amount of $2.3 million (MTS) and $0.5 million (NCTD). What projects used these funds and how much for each? What was the breakdown for Planning and Administration for each?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. SANDAG Regional Planning in the amount of $3.5 million and Administration in the amount of $0.5 million. What are these amounts for and are they further allocated by project? What happens to the balance of $0.6 million? The column CTSA should be adequately labeled in this table.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Comments received September 12, 2008 from Marcela Escobar-Eck, Move San Diego
September 11, 2008

Daniel Levy, Senior Transit Planner
SANDAG
401 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: COORDINATED PLAN, 2008-2012

Please accept these comments in response to the Coordinated Plan, 2008-2012.

In Appendix O, page O-13, no gaps or deficiencies are shown for Residential Transit or Residential Social Service Transportation for rural areas for 2008-2012. Recently the fixed route bus service serving Ramona was reduced to a commuter route, and the FAST bus discontinued. The FAST bus was busy six days a week. Now a population of 60 to 70 disabled and elderly people are unable to get around Ramona or outside of the Community. This recent decision to cut bus service in Ramona and other rural areas, if applicable, should be documented in a regional planning document such as the Coordinated Plan and addressed.

The Community of Ramona is not shown on the Coordinated Plan maps for disabled people or senior citizens (Appendix O, O-15 and O-16). No rural areas are shown yet there are elderly and disabled people living in these communities with transportation needs that include going out of their communities to visit, for example, specialists who are not available within the community. Rural communities should be addressed completely in the Coordinated Plan, identifying all populations within all areas identifying their transportation needs and gaps in these needs, and looking for ways their needs can be met.

Through pressure and decisions by SANDAG and County, Ramona has low income housing such as apartments where disabled people and people with limited means can live in a rural community. Transportation services should be in place to support areas with low income housing in rural communities if such housing is mandated to be in these communities. Otherwise these people, less likely and less able to effectively represent themselves, are trapped in their communities.

As the lead regional planning agency for San Diego County, SANDAG should use whatever means it has available to assure the transportation needs of the disabled, the elderly and people of limited means are identified and met. The Coordinated Plan does not identify or address the special needs of these people in rural communities.

Kristi Mansolff
15873 Hwy 67
Ramona, CA 92065
September 18, 2008

To: SANDAG Transportation Committee
RE: Regional Short Range Transit Plan

Move San Diego is a regional non-profit group dedicated to increasing the sustainability and performance of regional smart growth transportation and land-use planning.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Regional Short Range Transit Plan.

Move San Diego submitted detailed comments in writing and met with staff earlier this week. We look forward to the next draft that will be going to the SANDAG Board.

We remain concerned that no Service Improvement Plans for transit have been done since agency consolidation and our comments raised several issues where the RSRTP draft is inconsistent with SANDAG Board Policy 18. Staff is making their best effort to comply. However, several aspects are out of their control and the Board should become aware of these areas.

SANDAG Board Policy 18 states that the RSRTP will include a few key items that are not in the RSRTP draft:

- Parameters for short-range (0-5 years), new and revised service development, as well as regionally significant and all other service adjustments
- Identification and prioritization of regional and subregional transit planning studies; and
- Evaluation and prioritization of new and revised services for implementation, including the adoption of an annual Regional Service Implementation Plan

Given the transit agency fiscal crisis, we suggest that the SANDAG Board have a discussion as to the need to comply with Policy 18 or whether in fact SANDAG should acknowledg the aspects of Policy 18 that are not being complied with and consider the implications and the means for compliance.

We are also concerned that the SANDAG Board should be adopting a set of 2009 Productivity Improvement Recommendations in order to ensure that should additional State TDA funds become available that the agencies would qualify for additional funds. In our meeting with staff, they planned to check into the status of this and let us know if indeed, the Board needs to adopt PIRs for 2009.

MSD also urges that the Transportation Committee recommend to the SANDAG Board to direct that subregional plans for the Golden Triangle and Mission Valley be placed as a priority into the RSRTP. In the case of the Golden Triangle, significant regional transportation planning funding is becoming available as a condition of the Westfield UTC project approval. Given the importance of transit planning to these regionally significant smart growth areas, and the availability of regional planning funds, we feel it's important to have these planning efforts in the RSRTP.

Adding needed subregional studies to the RSRTP would increase the connectivity of short term land use approvals of large projects with needed smart growth transit planning.

Move San Diego • PO Box 99179, San Diego, CA 92169 • 858-272-0347 • info@MoveSanDiego.org
Without additional short term regional planning, these traffic-clogged, transit deficient and economically strategic smart growth areas will see inadequate improvements being contemplated until the next Regional Transportation Planning process three years from now.

We look forward to continuing our productive work with SANDAG staff on the RSRTP and other regional planning issues.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Carolyn Chase
Move San Diego
Hello SANDAG members and Staff:
Hope you are having a healthy and wonderfully pleasant day!

**Who am I? - Ms. J. Berry**

Good question. Because of my illness, I decided it would be more effective to tell my story on paper. I apologize for all the reading I will have you do. Due to my illness this is the best way for me to communicate with you. Look, since NCTD are now landlords, you can always get rid of us by moving us into the Sprinter zones for access purposes. Of course you pay moving fees (wink, wink -- just joking). Some of Ramona’s citizens may truly not appreciate this type of humor.

I am not mulatto or a mutt like may appear at first glance. I am a 47 year old black woman by way of New York, through Atlanta. I am more like Alex Haley, I know my roots! (smile) My moms family is from Puerto Rico. My departed dads is from the Virgin Islands. Now if any of you have noticed the latest stats from Ramona, next question - **How did I get there?** Not by choice. I know God put me there to heal. Oh yes, by the way, I am Christian.

About 6 years ago, I was carrying my then 1yo down a flight of steps and was aware that I was about to fall. Like any mom would do, my instincts kicked in to keep my child from harm and in order to keep her from being injured I twisted myself around so that she would land on me. And she did. Yeah! I have amnesia of the incident but was told that when I landed, I hit the back of my head on the concrete. Ever since that day 3/31/2002, my health has been on the constant decline with something called “Chiari Malformation”.

It appears my brain was juggled and started descending out of my skull. It causes a blockage in my neck and spinal fluid cannot flow regularly to my brain. I have a long list of symptoms that this has triggered, but some of the main ones are Exertional Headaches: Coughing, Sexual and Physical. These are migraine type headaches. Also dizziness, fatigue, muscle aches, “Brain Fogs”, damaged sight, sensitivity (sound, light, wind, smells).etc, etc. If I stand longer than 10 minutes or sit longer than 30 minutes, I am aggravating these symptoms and I am risking great hours of pain later that day. The “brain fogs” is what limits my conversational skills. So if I respond slowly to your questions, I am probably having a brain fog. It is like temporarily “blacking out” I compare it to a computer rebooting. I kinda sit there dazed for a minute until my mind reboots. It is also the cause of my short-term memory.

After 30+ years on the workforce, I was in complete denial after the fall. I was employed with a major airline in Atlanta. So I lost my job, car, retirement and many other personal belongings. While in denial, I believed that I should return to San Diego where I was employed before I went to Atlanta. I believed I had a better shot here for reemployment (plus my grandchildren were being born in LA and I wanted to be close by.) So still in denial, I used my retirement to relocate to San Diego.
Now - **Why Ramona?** Surely you realize a black woman with sense and no Ramona connections does not actively choose Ramona. I arrived with no job and only a great job history. Ramona was willing to work with me until I got established. As you see, I am very blunt (It’s a New York attribute).

While in line at the neighborhood Albertsons in Aug 2005, (I relocated to Ramona from Atlanta in May that year), I saw a book entitled “Headaches for Dummies”. After 3 years of unknown health issues I found my very unique “Exertional headaches” and took my prognosis to my doctors at Kaiser. They soon took MRIs and confirmed the Chiari Malformation. I had a surgery on my brain and spine July 2006, but because Chiari is so new and inexperienced by the medical community, the operation basically achieved nothing. So here I am in Ramona, trying to maintain my independence while raising my now 8 yo. I receive a fixed income which does not cover my rent. I am also educating myself on my illness since I need to introduce people to it in most cases and avoid it’s past history of maltreatments and misdiagnosis.

The Chiari had already turned me, Ms. Social, Jetsetting, Butterfly, into a hermit, but these bus closures have me on suicide watch. My Chiari enhances my depression and the inability to get to the doctors, shopping, my daughters school, any events, etc is taking its toll. I am not able to take the 386 with the new “commuter” schedule. I take my daughter to the busstop in the morning for school. Even if another parent could take her for me, the 12+ hour wait to return to Ramona is out of the question for me and my Chiari. My choices are few... 1 - Receive a donated car. 2 - Move before evicted. or 3- Suicide. ... I just pray that I can leave of my own free will and not by eviction.

When I am financially able, I will leave Ramona, but who knows when the financial ability will arise. In order to be here today I had to rent a car. The cost with gas will exceed $50. I am truly stranded, not to mention the scars it will leave on my daughter who is very comfortable in Ramona. She attended pre-school here and is now in third grade.

Although I will probably leave Ramona, I have committed to help the disabled and seniors here. I am in total disbelief of the treatment of them in this case. NCTD is constantly waiting for us to swallow that these cuts were caused by their budget downfalls. The deeper we dig however, we discover that there has been an allowance of ill managed funding. And all through this cycle the injured are the seniors and disabled. If this was done to people who are known to have able bodied representation, it probably would not bother me. But this... it bothers me!

OK - That’s my story, expanded version. Here’s a few others ...
Some passengers have moved in order to keep employment. Great expense. Others have moved because of no access.

 Sherrie Rohter has Cerebral Palsy and is a Triplegic. With the use of one limb she created the petition to Save Ramona Buses which now contains over 500 signatures. Without transportation she is now a deeply depressed prisoner of her home. She has lost her job and any contact beyond her home. She is normally a wonderful rebel, very strong for someone with her tiny stature. She was reduced to deep sobbing because she could not attend this meeting and represent herself. She dictates ... Since we have no buses right now it’s hard to get people to take me anywhere and I don’t think it’s right for them to take the buses away from all the people. Now I and all the other people have to rely on other things to get us everywhere. I was so independent to take myself, now I can’t. I feel like I’m in a hole and can’t get out. ... It’s not right for me and other people to have no buses. Because I have to take my chair with me and I need a bus with a Lift. And I can’t go to work either. It isn’t right for the people and me to have no transportation at all. Thank you

 Some passengers have already lost their jobs Others were employed at the Wild Animal Park Students at San Pasqual Academy are still shell shocked and mostly stranded like us ...

 Another passenger of the former paratransit FAST bus and current route 386 rider wrote to a federal agency concerning the new services ... Someone told me that the public needs to demand through government representatives that the money be placed back into the general fund, even if some of the excess, and there is excess, land needs to be sold. Can you advise us? When will this situation be corrected? I am not sure how long my health will allow me to cope with the existing situation. I stand to lose my job and my retirement and possibly my home because of the physical and emotional stress that this existing situation is causing me. I need a speedy resolution to this situation, or I may be forced to engage an attorney in this matter - Cindy
1 - Why am I here?  - (Handout)

2 - Alternatives – Went from $2 a day to $50+ a trip. Insulting. What was real plan?

3 - Why are we married to NCTD? Why has MTS not been considered for us in Ramona? The true needs of Ramona passengers is an increased route system which includes SDCE. Also connections should be increased to Escondido, Poway, El Cajon & Santee. If funds are allocated to only new projects, what about cost of a trolley cnx to Escondido, Poway, El Cajon, Santee & Julian? As a geographical center, full access should not be a problem. These factors ever considered?

4 – What was Attorney General Jerry Brown’s Connection? He originally predicted failures in “Smart Growth” planning. Was it he who spooked SANDAG into omitting Ramona + (small & Rural)?

5 - Where does Ramona stand with “Smart Growth”? Even as a geographical center? Is it more than obvious SANDAG will not incorporate Ramona in “Smart Growth? What is a Smart Growth Alternatives?

6 - Is it true that Eminent Domain funds went to (Developers) purchase RE investments? What is official purpose of Eminent Domain funds?

7 – Were you advised that cost of lawsuit offset gain of cutting off Ramona? Were you advised it would never get into court?
8 – Did Ramona taxpayer dollars go toward investment funding?
San Diego Developers, Officials Review Region's Smart Growth Options at Roundtable
Discussion … Although the district used eminent domain to acquire land in the Sprinter corridor, such
acquisitions are becoming increasingly difficult, the discussants noted, calling them critical for a smart-

9 - Is it true that we as taxpayers are contributing to the funds for
transportation but are no longer to receive the services?
How can this be reasonably explained?

North County Transit District answers

| Sunday, February 24, 2008 3:31 PM PST |
Editor's Note: On Feb. 18, the North County Times editorial board sat down with officials from the North
County Transit District to discuss problems with the Sprinter and other regional transportation and
development issues. Below is an edited transcript of that meeting.

Present at the meeting were Karen King, executive director of NCTD; Pete Aadland, director of
communications and business development for NCTD; Don Bullock, Sprinter project manager; and Ed Gallo,
chairman of the NCTD board and Escondido councilman

KK: ... About 70 percent of our operating budget comes from federal, state and local subsidies. And we don't
really allocate that by mode unless the source requires us to do so. And some of our federal funds, for
example, are designated for rail only or bus only, but in general we put it all in a pot and then allocate
those to the different modes. So it will just get folded into our budget. We do have some federal Congestion,
Mitigation and Air Quality funds that are available for the first couple of years of operations. They're a
limited source that can be applied to new starts such as this project, until you can develop the ridership. ...
The fare will be the same as the bus, which is $2 for a single ride or $4 for a day pass. And right now our
fare box recovery ratio systemwide is running about 27 percent, which is pretty average for a transit
system.

10 – If Ramona receives no transportation services
will our sales tax be reduced?
Public Hearing on the 2008-2012 Coordinated Plan
Transportation Committee
September 19, 2008

Coordinated Plan Overview

- Provides short range (5 year) blueprint for development of transit & social service transportation
- Plan required for the distribution of New Freedom, JARC and 5310 funds in FY 2009
- Plan also required to grant TransNet Senior Mini-Grant funds
One Region – One Network – One Plan

The plan is comprehensive and covers:
- Public transit
- Social service transportation
- Vanpools
- Volunteer transportation services
- Employer shuttles
- Senior transportation
- Transportation for persons with disabilities
- Private transportation

Regional Short Range Transit Plan Component

SANDAG Board Policy 18 states that the 5-year RSRTP include:
- Goals and objectives for transit services
- Existing transit system inventory
- Transit performance monitoring program (TDA)
- Service gap and deficiency identification
- Existing service and program evaluation
- Parameters for short-range new and revised services
Federal Coordinated Plan Component

SAFETEA-LU states that the Coordinated Plan include:

- An assessment of available services
- An assessment of transportation needs
- Strategies to address the identified transportation needs
- Priorities for implementing the strategies based on resources, time and feasibility

What’s New?

- Connection to RTP strengthened
- Performance monitoring program enhanced
- Strategies prioritized
- Funding efforts detailed
Comments Received on the Draft Plan
Prior to Agenda Production

- General support of the plan
- Request for more detailed information on Civil Rights
  information included in the Technical Appendix
- Request that additional locations be added to list of areas
  with social service transportation deficiencies
- Request that SANDAG think creatively about ways to
  solve current and future transportation problems
- Request that transportation needs of Ramona residents
  be reconsidered

Comments Received on the Draft Plan
After Agenda Production

- Request that transportation needs of Ramona
  residents be reconsidered
- Comments from Move San Diego
Today’s Actions

- Hold public hearing
- Recommend that the Board of Directors approve the 2008-2012 Coordinated Plan

Public Hearing on the 2008-2012 Coordinated Plan
Transportation Committee
September 19, 2008
## Initial Rankings by Evaluation Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>AVG RANK</th>
<th>FINAL RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out &amp; About Vista</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Community Center</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ElderHelp</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveler’s Aid</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Family Services</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Congregations Together</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITN San Diego</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Elderlink</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Shepherd Senior Center</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD Mobility Management Program</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Social Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Route 25</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Route 41</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Route 83</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Route 86</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Route 704</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Route 854</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Route 871 &amp; 872</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Route 904</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Route 921A</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 967 &amp; 968</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS RB DART</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar Community Connections</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This represents the initial rank by the evaluation committee prior to FACT’s addendum. The additional information provided by FACT, per the request of the scoring committee improved the rank of this application.*
September 19, 2008

Jim Madaffer, Chairman
SANDAG Transportation Committee
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Chairman Madaffer:

I am writing to respectfully request that you and the SANDAG Transportation Committee support MTS’s application for the Mini-Grant Program.

As you may be aware, MTS recently voted to eliminate DART or “Direct Access to Regional Transit”, one of the only few public door-to-door shuttle programs available in the County. The DART was a great value, an important fact for seniors who frequently live on a fixed income and generally less able to absorb significant transportation costs. The program gave seniors access to a vast network of services that enhances their independence and ability to maintain a connection with the broader community.

I truly believe that MTS’s application does fit the goal of the Senior Mini Grant Program because it provides services that focus on innovative and cost-effective transportation approaches for seniors. As demonstrated in MTS’s application, the services are cost-effective ways to provide senior transportation and they specifically target large senior populations. This section of the TransNet Ordinance was designed and intended to improve service to seniors. If these services do not receive funding from the Mini-Grant Program, services to seniors throughout the county will be degraded. Declaring MTS’s application ineligible for funding would undermine the very purpose of this section of the TransNet Ordinance.

I implore you to fight for our senior residents who need these specialized services and ask that you support MTS’s application. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Brian Mainschein
San Diego Councilmember, Fifth District

CC: SANDAG Transportation Committee
Senior Mini-Grant & New Freedom Grant Recommendations

Transportation Committee

September 19, 2008

Background

- SANDAG designated agency to award New Freedom grants
  - Grants for capital, operations or planning with local matching funds requirement
- TransNet Extension ordinance requires a competitive process to award Senior Mini-Grant projects
  - Grants for capital or operating with matching funds requirement
Process

- Transportation Committee approved process and award criteria
  - New Freedom approved January 2008
  - Senior Mini-Grant approved February 2008
- Announcement of availability issued February
- Five outreach meetings to explain RFP
- Scoring by outside evaluation committees

Process

- Grants may be awarded for multiple years
  - Last years of funding
- Senior Mini-Grant: FY 2009, 2010 & 2011
  - Performance must improve in later years
Evaluation Committees

- Senior Mini-Grant reviewed by two seniors, representatives from Caltrans, AARP, and Adult Protective Services
- New Freedom applications reviewed by three representatives from social service agencies, MTS, and Caltrans

Responses

- Senior Mini-Grant
  - Received 18 applications for 28 projects
  - Recommendation – fund 14 projects
- New Freedom
  - Received 7 applications for 7 projects
  - Recommendation – fund 6 projects
Policy 33 Interpretation

- Policy 33 (RHNA) is inconsistent:
  - Attachment 2 lists the Senior Mini-Grant Program as being subject to the policy
  - Section 2.2.4 exempts funding sources that can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions
- Inconsistencies will be addressed during a review later this fall
- To avoid delays, it is requested that Section 2.2.4 be applied to the Senior Mini-Grant Program

Senior Mini-Grant Recommendations

- 14 recommended projects total $1,268,556
  - Volunteer Driver Programs
  - Taxi Vouchers
  - Senior Shuttles
  - Travel Training
  - Ride Reimbursement
- Negotiated budget reductions with 3 most expensive projects
- Worked with FACT to address evaluation committee concerns
New Freedom Recommendations

- **FY 08**
  - Funding for 5 projects:
    - Fully fund 3 projects
    - Partially fund 2 projects
- **FY 09**
  - Additional funding available to allow partial funding of 6th project
- Total - $1,201,001 over 2 years

Next Steps

- Projects included in RTIP
- Forward New Freedom recommendations to FTA in fall
- Execute contracts with grant recipients
Recommended Action

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend the following to the Board of Directors:

1) Apply Section 2.2.4 of Board Policy 33 to the Senior Mini-Grant program for the Fiscal Year 2009 cycle.
2) Approve funding for the list of Senior Mini-Grant and New Freedom projects as outlined in Attachment 1

Senior Mini-Grant & New Freedom Grant Recommendations

Transportation Committee

September 19, 2008
Background

- SANDAG is designated recipient for JARC funding
- All JARC projects must be derived from Coordinated Plan
- Transportation Committee asked staff to review the evaluation criteria used and return with additional alternatives
  - Interest in increasing weighting of 2 criteria:
    - Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators
    - Innovation
Evolution of Evaluation Criteria

• Original criteria adapted from Caltrans
• Reviewed by Coordinated Plan Ad Hoc Group
• Adjustments made after each competitive cycle respond to:
  • Lessons learned
  • Comments by Transportation Committee
  • New federal requirements

Development of 3 Alternatives

• Created stakeholder ad hoc group
  • Met to review research on criteria used by agencies across the nation
  • Provided input
• Utilized feedback from the August 1 Transportation Committee Meeting
  • Increase “Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators” and “Innovation” criteria
Alternatives

- Alternative 1: Redistributes weightings
- Alternative 2: Eliminates “Coordinated Plan Priority” as evaluation criteria
- Alternative 3: Breaks criteria into 5 point sub criteria

Examples of High Priorities

- Develop or expand service in areas with little or no other transportation options
- Development of centralized ride scheduling, dispatching, and mobility center
- Improve transportation services to rural areas
- Increase coordination efforts by combining resources such as: vehicles, riders, vehicle maintenance, driver training and insurance coverage
Recommended Alternative

- Sub-criteria results in a more thorough evaluation process
  - Requires focus on various aspects within each criterion
- Supported by all members of the stakeholder ad hoc group

Next Steps

- Today - Transportation Committee approval of recommended alternative
- 10/1: Advertisement of RFP
- 10/31: Closing date for proposals
- 12/19: TC approval of JARC grants
Recommended Action

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the evaluation criteria outlined in Alternative 3 in Attachment 1 for the JARC Grant Program fall 2008 competitive process.
Capital Improvement Program
Budget Transfer

- Approve MOU with MTS to transfer $150,000 for a construction project
- El Cajon Transit Center - building demolition and resurfacing
- Building Uneconomical – high maintenance & major repairs
- Approved by MTS Board August 21, 2008
Project Transfer Summary & Recommendations

- Approve as a SANDAG Project
- Approve MOU for Budget Transfer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>EXISTING FY09</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon Transit Center Building Demolition Project</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS – Blue and Orange Line Station Improvement Project</td>
<td>$250,012</td>
<td>$100,012</td>
<td>-$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agreement with Caltrans for Preliminary Engineering on the Interstate 5/State Route 56 Interchange Improvement Project

September 19, 2008

Agreement with Caltrans

- On-call capacity to $1 million requested
- SANDAG has $175 million capacity
- Project is a TransNet project, but not an Early Action Program project
- All costs reimbursed within 25 days by Caltrans
- ITOC recommends approval
- ITOC concerned about repayment
Recommendation

Recommend to the Board that the Executive Director be authorized to sign an agreement with Caltrans for preliminary engineering on the Interstate 5/State Route 56 Interchange improvement project.
2008 Congestion Management Program

Draft – September 19, 2008

Overview

- Purpose of CMP
- Roadway Level of Service
- Transit corridors
- Deficient segments
- Initial options for future CMP updates
- Potential new CMP arterials
- Next steps
Purpose of CMP

- Ongoing monitoring of the region’s transportation system
- Strategies to mitigate congestion
- A program to evaluate and mitigate the traffic impacts of new development projects
- Mechanism to prepare Deficiency Plans for segments that do not meet the CMP LOS standard
CMP Roadway LOS

- 2007 traffic data
- CMP standard is LOS E
- Decrease of 15 deficient freeway segments and 12 arterial segments
- Deficient mileage has declined by 67 miles
Transit Corridors

• 11 CMP transit corridors
• 2007 data
• Overall increase in number of trips and ridership
• Ridership increase in North County north-south and east-west corridors
Deficient Segments

- Deficiency analysis conducted to assess impacts of recommended 2030 RTP improvements
- 21 segments remain deficient
- Local jurisdictions responsible for funding and preparing Deficiency Plans

Deficient Segments

- I-5: SR 54 to Pacific Hwy (San Diego/National City)
- I-5: Mission Bay Dr to Gilman Dr (San Diego)
- I-8: I-5 to El Cajon Blvd (San Diego/La Mesa)
- I-8: SR 125 to Johnson Ave (La Mesa/El Cajon)
- I-15: I-8 to Balboa Ave (San Diego)
- I-15: SR 163 to Miramar Rd (San Diego)
- I-805: Telegraph Canyon Rd to SR 54 (Chula Vista, San Diego County, and National City)
- SR 52: I-5 to I-805 (San Diego)
- SR 94: I-5 to College Ave (San Diego and Lemon Grove)
Deficient Segments

- SR 163: Ash St to Friars Rd (San Diego)
- SR 67: Mapleview St to SR 78 (San Diego County and Poway)
- SR 75: Toll Plaza to I-5 North (Coronado)
- SR 76: Melrose Ave to South Mission Ave (Oceanside and San Diego County)
- SR 94: Jamacha Blvd to Jamacha Rd (San Diego County)
- Miramar Rd: Black Mountain Rd to I-15 (San Diego)
- North Harbor Drive: Laurel St to Hawthorne St (San Diego)

Deficiency Plans

- Evaluate the cause of the existing deficiency and develop strategies
- Subregional and corridor studies may lay the groundwork for specific Deficiency Plans
- Additional travel demand modeling
- Develop additional implementation strategies
Initial Options for Future CMP Updates

• Streamlined CMP Approach

• Other Issues
  – Enforcement mechanisms
  – CMP opt out

• Streamlined CMP Approach
  – Incorporate CMP requirements into existing SANDAG planning activities, such as the RCP Performance Monitoring Report or
  – Produce a shorter CMP progress report, limited to monitoring results and a status report on Deficiency Plans
Potential Additions to CMP Arterial Network

- Staff was requested to evaluate potential arterial additions to the CMP
- Criteria:
  - Must be included in the RAS
  - Must be classified as a prime arterial
  - Carry a high volume of traffic
  - Not near an existing CMP facility
  - Provides connectivity and regional coverage

Potential Additions to CMP Arterial Network

- Staff proposes adding two arterials to the CMP network
  - Telegraph Canyon Rd/Otay Lakes Rd: I-805 to SR 125 (Chula Vista)
  - Mira Mesa Blvd: I-805 to I-15 (San Diego)
Recommendation

- Release the draft 2008 CMP for a 30-day public comment period
- Schedule a public hearing for the November 7, 2008 Transportation Committee meeting
- Discuss options for future CMP updates and potential future additions to the CMP arterial network
**Mid-City Rapid Update**

**Status Report**

*Work Completed in first phase:*
- PE on University/Park to El Cajon/43rd (7 stations)
- Prototype shelter design and station layout
- Transit Signal Priority (TSP) technology study
- Cost estimates
- Ridership projections

**Status Report (cont’d.)**

*Work Completed in second phase:*
- Very Small Starts application - $20m award
- PE on El Cajon/Euclid, 54th, and College
- Refinement of Park Boulevard design
- TSP inventory and procurement plan
- Updated cost estimates
- Updated ridership projections
- Traffic Study
- Mitigated Negative Declaration
Federal Funding

- For the El Cajon Blvd/northern Park Blvd segment
- Total Capital Cost is $43 million
- Approved for a 50% federal match ($21 million)

Transit Station Elements

Elements:
- 14' x 24' Shelter
- Real-time Display for Next Bus Arrival Times
- Raised Platforms
- Improved ADA / Sidewalk Crossings
- Ticket Vending Machines
- Benches
- Bike Rack
- Deciduous street trees

Preliminary Engineering Design

Site Plan

Design Drawing

Transit Signal Priority

Communication between vehicle and traffic signal allows green light to be extended for several seconds for all through traffic
Transit Route

Cars and buses use same lane, but buses stop in-lane at stations

Dedicated Transitway

Cars kept out of transit lane by barriers, striping, curbs, and signage

Park Blvd Segment - North

Possible Mid-City Rapid Vehicle
Environmental Document

Mitigated Negative Declaration
• Analyzes impacts to:
  • Air quality
  • Cultural Resources
  • Hazardous materials
  • Noise
  • Aesthetics
  • Geology
  • Water Quality
  • Transportation
  • Utilities

Public Outreach

Final Design Issues
• Refine Station Site Plans to Reflect Changed Conditions and Public Input
• Shelter Design
• Update the Bus Branding Scheme
• Landscape Maintenance Agreements
• MOUs with City of San Diego and MTS for signal maintenance and route operations
• Detailed signal timing plans
• Continuous refinement of cost estimates

What are the Next Steps for this Project?
• Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration – Fall 2008
• Prepare Final Design Plans – 2009
• Begin Construction – 2010
• Open For Service (subject to Federal Transit Admin. approval) – 2011

Funding Source: TransNet and FTA (federal grant)
Current Progress

- Landscape maintenance and punch list: on-going
- EB Escondido Ave. platform: open
- Inland Rail Trail: maintenance agreements pending
- Final completion of field work: October
- Financial close-out of contracts
  - With claims resolved: spring 2009
  - With claims unresolved: TBD
Weekday Ridership Trends

**SPRINTER Ridership, April – June 2008, Weekdays**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early April</td>
<td>6566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late April</td>
<td>6738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early May</td>
<td>6420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late May</td>
<td>6282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early June</td>
<td>7093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late June</td>
<td>7659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early July</td>
<td>7964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late July</td>
<td>7774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Aug</td>
<td>6962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Aug</td>
<td>7625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claims & Disputes

- Signal and communication changes
- Re-work of the rail-bridge connections
- May 2007 settlement agreement:
  - $8.1M of $12.2M justified and paid
  - Constructive acceleration/liquidated damages – schedule analysis pending
Estimate at Completion (EAC)

• New EAC: $479.1M
• Former EAC: $479.3M
• Includes full $15.5M maximum value of settlement agreement
• Includes $472.6M base cost and $6.5M contingency
• Project budget: $484.1M
• Total funds available:
  $484.1M - $472.6M = $11.5M

Estimate at Completion (EAC)

• Risk to budget
  • Current claims
  • Potential of another delay claim from Mainline contractor
  • Cost to analyze, negotiate, and defend claims
SPRINTER Staff

• NCTD staff working on the SPRINTER transitioned to SANDAG on September 1st
• Duties unchanged
• Direction remains with NCTD Board and management

SPRINTER Status Report

September 19, 2008
SPRINTER Completion Schedule

MS 5.5: $825K, no LD’s 8/2/07
Track complete, Dispatch from CCF, three stations functional

MS 6: $940K, no LD’s 9/3/07
Six stations fully complete and operational

MS 7: $660K, $20K/Day LD’s 10/1/07
Substantial Completion

MS 8: $495K, $20K/Day LD’s 10/14/07
Safety Certification Submittals

MS 9: $330K, $3K/Day LD’s 12/1/07
Complete Landscaping at Eleven Stations

Final Completion: $20K/day LD’s 3/7/08
Complete all Landscaping and Maintenance Period

Revenue Operations: December 2007