TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

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

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- PUBLIC HEARING: 2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE
- REVISION TO FY 2009 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT AND TransNet REVENUES
- SAN DIEGO REGIONAL BICYCLE PLAN PROGRESS REPORT
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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.
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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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 17, 2008, MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

CONSENT ITEMS (3)

+3. TransNet ROUTINE ACCOMMODATION EXCLUSIONS – CITY OF CHULA VISTA (Chris Kluth)

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve a request from the City of Chula Vista for exclusion from Board Policy No. 031, TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules, Rule #21: Accommodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians, for five specific roadway projects.

CHAIR’S REPORT (4)

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

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

REPORTS (5 through 14)

+5. 2008 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 1 (Sookyung Kim)

At its meeting on July 25, 2008, the Board of Directors adopted the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the five-year program of major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period from FY 2009 to FY 2013. SANDAG processes amendments to the RTIP on a quarterly basis based on requests from member agencies. Pending the federal approval of the 2009 Federal State Transportation Improvement Program, the Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2009-07 (Attachment 1), approving Amendment No. 1 to the 2008 RTIP.
ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR MID-CITY RAPID BUS PROJECT (Miriam Kirshner)

A draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Mid City Rapid project was circulated for public review on September 3, 2008. Public comments were received and incorporated into a final MND. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt the MND for the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project.

PUBLIC HEARING: 2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE (Heather Werdick)

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 transportation system, develop programs 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. The Transportation Committee is asked to conduct a public hearing on the Draft 2008 CMP Update, and following consideration of public testimony, approve the 2008 CMP Update. The Transportation Committee also is asked to discuss the options outlined in this report for future CMP updates and possible modifications to the CMP arterial network, and to provide direction to staff on these matters for further consideration at a future Transportation Committee meeting.

SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE REGARDING REVENUE SHARING FOR REGIONAL DAY PASSES (Dan Levy)

The Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance regulates the revenue sharing of regional fare media. The proposed amendments to the Fare Ordinance reflect that SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD have agreed to new a Revenue Sharing Agreement for Regional Day Passes. The Transportation Committee is asked to hold the second reading and adopt the proposed amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance in substantially the same form as Attachment 1 that would implement a new revenue sharing formula for Regional Day Passes.

UTC TRANSIT CENTER FUNDING (Susan Brown)

SANDAG staff has worked with Westfield, City of San Diego, and Metropolitan Transit System staff to ensure that the new transit center, approved as part of the redevelopment plans for the Westfield Shoppingtown University Towne Centre, meets the needs of existing and future transit services in the Mid-Coast corridor. The City and the developer have committed funding for a portion of the $22 million transit center, and SANDAG staff has committed to explore opportunities fund a share as well. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors direct staff to take steps necessary to utilize approximately $5.7 million in federal funds currently programmed for the Nobel Drive Coaster station for the UTC transit center.
The Transportation Committee is asked to amend the Automated Fare Collection Project (CIP Project No. 1145700) budget for the installation of rail station Compass Card validators and reprogramming of ticket vending machines by $327,904 through: (1) the allocation of $200,000 in interest earned on the project’s bond deposit; and (2) authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with Metropolitan Transit System in substantially the same form as Attachment 1 with terms including the transfer $127,904 from MTS to SANDAG. Additional actions by the Executive Director and possible action by the Executive Committee totaling $170,000 will result in an aggregate budget increase of $497,904 to the project.

Over the last year, SANDAG, Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit System, and City of San Diego staff have worked with a community working group selected by Councilmember Toni Atkins to develop and evaluate station concepts at El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue for the planned Interstate 15 (I-15) Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service. The result of this joint work effort has been the identification of four alternatives that are both geometrically viable from a construction standpoint and are supported by the community working group. The next step will be to carry these station alternatives into the next phase of project development (preliminary engineering and environmental analysis) that is expected to result in a recommended preferred station design by 2010. Staff will continue to provide periodic updates to the Transportation Committee.

Sales tax revenues have been impacted by the recent economic conditions. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the revised FY 2009 Transportation Development Act allocation to $113.8 million, which equates to a 4.96 percent decline; and (2) approve the revised FY 2009 TransNet allocation to $37.5 million, which equates to a 4.63 percent decline.

The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Plan) is being developed to support implementation of the both the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This report presents an introduction to what the Plan will accomplish, an outline of the planning process and a summary of the work completed to date. This report also summarizes the public involvement component of the planning process which illustrates the diversity of bicycle riders in the region and has generated data to refine both the regional bicycle network and facility options. This report is presented for Transportation Committee discussion.
14. SPRINT PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT (Jim Linthicum)

This item provides a monthly status report on the SPRINT project, including discussion of implementation and effectiveness of project cost control measures. SANDAG staff will summarize recent progress on the project.

15. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for December 12, 2008, at 9 a.m. Please note that the December meeting will be held on the second Friday of the month and will meet once due to the Christmas holiday schedule.

16. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

November 7, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 1

DRAFT

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF OCTOBER 17, 2008

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Vice Chair Jack Dale (East County) 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 Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Matt Hall (North County Coastal), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the September 19, 2008, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Jim Schmidt, a member of the public stated that he attended a recent meeting of the Sports Council and the Hall of Champions where Proposition B was discussed and the discussion was in opposition to the Proposition. Mr. Schmidt stated that he spoke with a member of the organization backing the Proposition, San Diego Community Solutions, and asked the number of members of the organization, which is only composed of two members, and why the organization did not send someone to address the Board of Directors when the Board took action on Proposition B, and the gentlemen stated that no one invited them to the meeting.

Clive Richard, a member of the public spoke regarding the state of public transportation in the region. He expressed support for a property tax to fund transportation instead of sales tax. Mr. Richard commented on the two types of transit in the region, bus and rail. He stated that his concern is the connectivity of transit in the region not what transit agency operates it. He stated that we should talk about consolidation of modes of transit not transit agencies.

Lorraine Leighton, a member of the public stated that she visited the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) convention and commented that she noticed several delegates walked in front of the moving trolley. Also, in Old Town she has noticed several people trespassing and walking on the tracks and crossing in front of the trolley. When she asked the security officer why he was not writing tickets, the officer told her he did not want to waste a day in court.

Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) stated that MTS officers have written 273 violations for trespassing during the first six months of 2008.
CONSENT ITEMS

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

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

Mayor Art Madrid (East County) stated that High Speed Rail was discussed at the recent League of California Cities Annual Conference. At this meeting, it was not confirmed whether the high speed rail route would continue to San Diego from Los Angeles but the report today reflects the route continuing into San Diego and requested clarification regarding recent changes that occurred in the legislation.

Gary Gallegos, SANDAG Executive Director stated that the original ballot measure required the San Francisco to Los Angeles route to be completed prior to allocating any bond funds to another piece of the route. Assemblymember Galgiani introduced a bill that requires financial accountability. The bill allows for the High Speed Rail Authority to make findings that as long as there is no adverse impact to the construction of the San Francisco to Los Angeles route, bond funds could be used for other segments. The bill also provides for oversight and accountability by requiring the High Speed Rail Authority to produce a business plan. The new language allows our region to be more competitive for these bond funds. Our region does need to move forward more quickly now. We have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the High Speed Rail Authority and our next steps will be assigning tasks to move the project forward.

4. LOS ANGELES-SAN DIEGO-SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY BOARD MEETING REPORT (INFORMATION)

The Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Known as Amtrak's Pacific Surfliner corridor, it is the second busiest intercity passenger rail corridor nationwide and Amtrak's fastest growing. The report summarizes the actions from the LOSSAN Board meeting on January 10, 2007.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Lori Holt-Pfeiler (North County Inland) and a second by Councilmember Hall, the Transportation Committee accepted Consent Items 3 through 4.

CHAIR’S REPORTS

5. STATE ROUTE (SR) 905/11 STATUS UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Vice Chair Dale introduced the item and Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director provided the monthly update of discussion by the State Route 905 strike team and the status of the SR 11 project.
Mr. Orso-Delgado stated that the legislation for SR 11 was signed and SANDAG is now the tolling authority for the project. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) nominated SR 11 as one of its transportation border relief programs so we can tap into the expertise of the FHWA for technical advice and financial support. Also, on October 3, 2008, a record of decision was signed that clears the way for the Presidential Permit, which should be issued by the end of this month. He stated that he and Mr. Gallegos will be meeting with Mexican government officials to discuss a bi-national financing plan for the new border crossing. This would lead the way for a unitary tolling system for both the U.S. and Mexican sides of the new POE.

Mr. Orso-Delgado stated that construction is underway on the SR 905 Phase IA project. He stated that litigation is still ongoing for three rights-of-way lawsuits with one trial next week and two more scheduled in November 2008. We are hoping that the cost of the litigation does not exceed the allocation for rights-of-way settlements.

Mr. Orso-Delgado stated the SR 905 Phase 1B project has been submitted to Caltrans Headquarters for approval and will be ready to list for advertising this month with the bid opening scheduled in January 2009 and construction beginning in May 2009.

Jim Schmidt, a member of the public submitted an article that he had written regarding tolls and expressed his support for the work SANDAG and Caltrans have done with SR 11.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

REPORTS

8. FUNDING EXCHANGE FOR SPRINTER PROJECT (RECOMMEND)

José Nuncio, Senior Engineer Financial Programming presented the item and stated that in December 2006, the Board of Directors approved a budget increase for the SPRINTER project of approximately $98.6 million, part of an action to add the SPRINTER project to the TransNet EAP. He stated that Table 1 of the staff report shows the breakdown of that $98.6 million budget increase. Mr. Nuncio stated that the largest component of $50 million was anticipated to be funds from Proposition 1B.

Mr. Nuncio stated that at the time, voters had just approved Proposition 1B and the approach to appropriate the funds had not yet been established by the Legislature. This inherent risk in approving the funding plan was shared with the Board of Directors. To date, of the $50 million, only $8.6 million has been made available to North County Transit District (NCTD).

Mr. Nuncio stated that although the project is now operational, NCTD continues to spend money as they complete many of the final work activities. Due to the absence of additional Proposition 1B funds, NCTD has had to use other agency funds to pay for the SPRINTER. Also, due to the long delay and period of uncertainty, it was not known what the final outcome was going to be in the state budget. NCTD, through no fault of its own, finds itself having to deal with a cash flow problem because the state legislature has not appropriated the funds as quickly as NCTD needs them.

Mr. Nuncio stated that in order to address the uncertainty, staff proposes to revise the original $98.6 million funding package. The main change is to replace approximately $41.4 million in
Proposition 1B funds with TransNet funds through an exchange of funds. As the Proposition 1B funds are appropriated, these funds will replace TransNet funds already programmed on other TransNet transit projects, including SuperLoop, Mid-Coast, South Bay Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and the Blue Line Trolley Retrofit.

Mr. Nuncio stated that two other options were considered but deemed not feasible. One option was to use funds other than TransNet such as State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), federal formula, or State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP) funds. However, the fact that the project is now essentially concluded prevents non-TransNet funds from being used. The second option would be to borrow other funds in advance of the Proposition 1B State Transit Assistance funds. In this case NCTD would borrow through SANDAG’s Commercial Paper program. This option however, would only add to the cost of this regional project.

Mr. Nuncio stated that it was important to note that the proposed exchange of funds does not cause an adverse impact to the delivery or schedule of any TransNet projects. Additionally, Section 7, Part B of the TransNet Ordinance allows for the exchange of revenues for federal, state or other local funds to maximize the effectiveness in the use of revenues. Mr. Nuncio commented that included as part of the package are other minor revisions that take into account actual receipts and are reflected in Table 2 of the staff report.

Mr. Nuncio stated that this action is not a budget increase. The SPRINTER budget remains the same. This action merely allows for a completed project to be fully funded.

Mr. Nuncio stated that this item was reviewed by the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) at its October 15, 2008, meeting. The ITOC had a number of concerns and did not reach consensus on a recommendation.

Mr. Nuncio stated that the ITOC did propose an action on the item which failed by a tie vote. The action was to approve the staff recommendation with the following conditions: (1) staff will provide additional assurances regarding the timeliness for the receipt of Proposition 1B funds; (2) that the first priority for distribution of any Proposition 1B funds would be for repayment of the $41.4 million loan; (3) NCTD would not be authorized to borrow any other funds until the $41.4 million loan is repaid in full; and (4) staff will express to the Transportation Committee the ITOC concerns that with the downturn in the economy and lower sales taxes numbers that use of TransNet funds to backfill projects that are not receiving funding from other sources will cause problems in the future. After discussion, the consensus of the ITOC was to direct staff to report to the Transportation Committee that (1) the ITOC made no decision on this item, and (2) to express the ITOC concerns and comments to the Transportation Committee, and (3) to inform the Transportation Committee of the failed motion.

Mr. Nuncio stated that he would briefly address each of the following concerns: need for additional assurances for the timeliness of Proposition 1B receipts, the priority for repayment of those funds back to TransNet, that NCTD not be authorized to borrow funds until the Proposition 1B funds are received in full, and concerns about using TransNet funds in this manner given the current downturn in the economy and lower sales tax receipts.

Mr. Nuncio stated that the legislative language governing Proposition 1B specifies that appropriations for certain of its elements need to occur by a certain date. Although this specific
program does not have a legislative deadline to appropriate, California Transportation Commission staff believe that the Legislature’s intent is to appropriate the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMSEA) within a reasonable time. Further, there has been no indication that the Proposition 1B transit funds would be at any greater risk than other Proposition 1B funds, having received the same voter mandate.

Mr. Nuncio stated that staff considers that the proposed transfer is an exchange of funds as allowed in the TransNet ordinance to maximize the use of regional funds. He stated that $41.4 million in Proposition 1B funds identified in the original SPRINTER funding plan will be dedicated for use on eligible TransNet Major Corridor projects.

Mr. Nuncio stated that requiring funds to be repaid in full prior to borrowing any other funds is a condition that has not been placed on a regional transportation agency in the past, and would be a potential barrier to managing cash flow for regional projects. A major advantage of having locally generated transportation funds is to have the ability to manage programming and funding of projects within the overall program to react to developments beyond the direct control of the region. As has been staff practice, any future considerations for funding exchanges or loans would be subject to the approval process of the Board of Directors.

Mr. Nuncio stated that the proposed package assumes a one for one exchange of funds. Considering the SPRINTER plus the other TransNet Transit project budgets as a whole, the exchange of TransNet and state funds does not increase the TransNet programming. The proposed funding swap is a tool that helps SANDAG match cash flow needs to revenue. Historically, the availability of TransNet has allowed SANDAG to move local projects forward when state and federal funding was delayed. Staff advises that Board policy not restrict this ability. The staff proposal only changes the timing at which the TransNet funds are expended.

Mayor Jim Desmond (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority [SDCRAA]) requested clarification regarding what the costs or ramifications would be to NCTD if it did not receive the TransNet funds.

Mr. Nuncio stated that if NCTD did not receive the Transnet funds, it would have to borrow from the commercial paper program at a high interest rate adding significant costs to the project.

Mayor Desmond requested clarification regarding what costs are associated with the transfer of funds.

Mr. Nuncio stated that SANDAG would lose some interest received on those TransNet funds. He stated that the Board of Directors has approved this type of transfer between TransNet projects in the past.

Councilmember Hall requested NCTD to respond to the question regarding the impact to NCTD if the transfer of funds was not approved.

Richard Hannasch, NCTD Finance Director stated that the alternative would be to borrow from the commercial paper program but the cost would be significantly higher. This would be an unbudgeted expense that would have to be paid from operating funds and that would have a
significant adverse impact to services. He stated that it would cost NCTD approximately $2.5 million per year to repay the commercial paper debt.

Mayor Jerome Stocks (Ex-Officio Second Chair) commented that it was important to keep in mind that this transfer will not impede the progress of any other TransNet project. Also, the SPRINTER is a TransNet project and it makes sense to fund it using TransNet funds. Finally, this is the best solution with the least cost and impact to operations.

Discussion ensued regarding the loss of potential earned interest on TransNet funds, high interest rate if borrowing commercial paper funds that would increase the cost of the SPRINTER project, the effect the swap would have on the delivery of other TransNet projects, any assurances regarding repayment of the Proposition 1B funds and the fact that any distribution of Proposition 1B funds is at the discretion of the legislature, the fact that the TransNet Ordinance gives priority for funding to unfinished TransNet projects, how the current economic crisis is affecting the region and the delivery of projects, and the fact that the SPRINTER project is completed and must be funded.

Mayor Madrid expressed his concerns that the Transportation Committee was not considering the comments made by the ITOC and that a year from now the Transportation Committee will hear a report that conditions are even worse. Mayor Madrid commented that the ITOC is a very educated group of individuals selected for their expertise, and this Committee is not taking their comments and conditions as important. He stated his support for implementing the conditions that the ITOC recommended.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification on the amount of interest the funds in TransNet are earning and Lauren Warrem, Finance Manager stated that we locked in rates at different times but the average is 4 to 5 percent.

Councilmember Monroe stated that at 4 percent interest, if these funds are transferred it would cost approximately $2 million to the TransNet program and Mr. Gallegos replied that there will be a cost regardless. The decision is to transfer the funds at a 4 percent loss or borrow the funds at a cost of 6 percent.

Councilmember Monroe stated that this amount of funding is available to be transferred for this project and asked why the funds could not be used to fund Blue Line improvements to move that project forward.

Mr. Gallegos replied that the Blue Line improvements are an Early Action Program (EAP) project and will not be adversely affected by this transfer; in fact staff is working very hard to move that project forward.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification on Proposition 1B funds received other than those for the SPRINTER, and Mr. Nuncio stated that $8.6 million of Proposition 1B funds that have been appropriated were given to NCTD. Other Proposition 1B funds went to MTS for purchase of buses.

Councilmember Monroe expressed his concerns that the Transportation Committee was not seriously considering the ITOC recommendation and that the ITOC could not come to a consensus.
Mr. Gallegos stated that staff did not articulate well enough to the ITOC that the funding for the SPRINT is a priority because this is a TransNet EAP project and is completed. Regardless of how it is funded, there is going to be a cost; staff is recommending the option with the least impact.

Mayor Stocks stated that we can’t view this as income or money lost because the SPRINT is a TransNet project under the first Ordinance and is an EAP project under the Extension Ordinance. He stated that TransNet funds are being spent for a TransNet project which is what those funds are designated for. The problem is that it was originally planned to use Proposition 1B funds and now we must use TransNet funds. This is a modification to the Plan of Finance but the funds are being spent correctly.

Supervisor Roberts stated that this action will cost money but the blame is that the State has taken those funds and until the State backfills those funds it will continue to have a negative effect. As long at the State has a budget problem it will continue to raid transportation and transit funding.

Mayor David Druker (North County Coastal) stated that one other consideration is how the Proposition 1B funds should have been used and that some of those funds should be used for projects that are not on the ground yet.

Action: Upon a motion by Chairman Ed Gallo (NCTD) and a second by Mayor Desmond, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve a revised funding plan, as shown in Table 2 of this report, and allow NCTD to begin to draw the TransNet funds in anticipation of an amendment to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program reflecting the revised funding plan (scheduled for the November 7, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting).

6. FIRST READING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE REGARDING REVENUE SHARING FORMULA FOR REGIONAL DAY PASSES (HOLD FIRST READING)

Vice Chair Dale introduced the item and stated that this is the first reading of the Proposed Amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance regarding the Revenue Sharing Formula for Regional Day Passes.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee waived the first reading of amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance that would implement a new revenue sharing formula for Regional Day Passes.

Dan Levy, Senior Regional Planner presented the item. In June 2008, the Board of Directors gave a second and final reading to amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance that included eliminating the NCTD Adult Day Pass and replacing it with the Regional Day Pass. Implementation of this change is scheduled for January 1, 2009, subject to a new revenue sharing agreement being in place. Staffs from NCTD, MTS, and SANDAG have now reached agreement on a proposed revenue sharing formula for Regional Day Passes.

Mr. Levy stated that the proposed amendments add new language to the portion of the agreements entitled “REGULAR AND PREMIUM REGIONAL DAY PASS REVENUE ALLOCATION FORMULA.” The proposed amendments would go into effect on January 1, 2009, and would apply only to paper pass sales. The amendments allow each transit operator to retain all revenue from
Regional Day Passes sold in their district and used exclusively on their vehicles. At the same time, revenue will be shared equally for passes purchased on one system and used on the other system, but only if the number of passes is a minimum of 25 and favors one district by 10 percent. Based on surveys conducted in June and September of 2008, the number of passes sold in each district and used in the other district is virtually in balance at this time, and no revenue sharing is required. SANDAG will repeat the survey annually to determine if the new revenue sharing provisions are triggered. The proposed amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance include an expiration date of June 30, 2011, or sooner, if the Ordinance is revised to adopt any new revenue sharing recommendations stemming from the Fare Study.

Mr. Levy commented that it should be noted that Regional Day Passes are issued primarily on paper from bus fare boxes and ticket vending machines. Regional Day Passes include a magnetic strip; however, the technology does not permit tracking of where the Day Passes are being used, only where they are sold. As a result, SANDAG will conduct an annual survey to determine if the number of passes being used to cross district boundaries is in balance, or if revenue sharing is required. The cost to conduct the survey is about $2,000, which will be shared equitably between SANDAG and the transit operators.

9. FY 2010 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS AND CRITERIA (APPROVE)

Victoria Stackwick, Associate Legislative Analyst presented the item. Each year, SANDAG approves a list of transportation projects to submit to its Congressional delegation for funding consideration during the annual federal appropriations process. The FY 2010 transportation appropriations process is expected to begin in early 2009.

Last year, the Transportation Committee approved both eligibility and evaluation criteria for selecting transportation projects for the FY 2009 federal appropriations cycle. In approving the criteria, the Transportation Committee recognized that Congress was facing many competing funding needs and that transportation appropriation levels were expected to be lower than prior years. The Board of Directors approved a list of the FY 2009 transportation projects on January 25, 2008, and projects subsequently were submitted to the Congressional delegation.

Ms. Stackwick stated that Congress recently passed and the President signed a continuing budget resolution (CR) for FY 2009. The CR did not include any discretionary transportation funding for FY 2009 projects. The congressional process for discretionary transportation funding for FY 2010 remains unclear. If any discretionary transportation funding is made available in FY 2010, it is expected to be extremely limited.

For the FY 2010 federal appropriations process, Ms. Stackwick stated that staff recommends using four eligibility criteria. The first three criteria would be the same as those used during the FY 2009 process: local projects would be required (1) to be included in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan, (2) to have nonfederal matching funds, and (3) to be able to obligate funding in a timely manner.

The fourth eligibility criterion would require projects to have proper federal environmental clearance. (Federal environmental clearance previously was an evaluation criterion.) Given the expected amount of discretionary funding available, staff recommends that the limited resources be
dedicated to projects that have been environmentally cleared through the federal process; environmental clearance typically is a good indicator of how “ready to go” a project is.

Once projects are determined to be eligible, they are reviewed against a set of evaluation criteria. The eligible projects that meet a greater number of evaluation criteria are then included in the comprehensive list of projects. For the FY 2010 federal funding cycle, staff recommends using the same evaluation criteria as used during FY 2009, except that federal environmental clearance would become an additional eligibility criterion. The proposed eligibility and evaluation criteria for FY 2010 are that the project is in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan; that the project has the minimum nonfederal match (e.g., 20 percent local/state match); that funding must be obligated within the fiscal year requested; and the project is environmentally cleared through the federal process. Once a project is determined eligible, it would be reviewed by staff using the following six evaluation criteria: project is in construction and requires additional funding; project is ready to advertise; project improves security and safety in the region; project protects the region’s investment in infrastructure, including rolling stock; project achieves environmental justice objectives; and project includes a mitigation measure required by a federal environmental document.

Ms. Stackwick stated that traditionally, SANDAG solicits local proposals from the region for consideration during the annual appropriations cycle. In addition to the local projects, the annual appropriations process includes TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) projects as well as regional transit priorities recommended by NCTD and MTS. In the last few years, Congress has not passed a budget on time, and discretionary transportation funds to the region have continued to decline. During FY 2009, project requests from SANDAG totaled approximately $172 million.

During the last week of September, Congress passed and the President signed a CR, House of Representatives Bill 2638, the year-end appropriations bill that provides full FY 2009 funding for Defense, Homeland Security and Military Construction-Veterans Administration programs, while keeping the rest of the government running at FY 2008 levels through March 6, 2009. Passage of a CR almost ensures that no project earmarks will be included in the FY 2009 Department of Transportation funding programs.

Ms. Stackwick stated that following approval of the FY 2010 selection process and criteria by the Transportation Committee, staff will work with local jurisdictions, transit agencies, and Caltrans to prepare the recommended list of FY 2010 appropriations requests. To include additional projects for consideration during the FY 2010 process, local agencies will have until Monday, December 15, 2008, to submit transportation project funding proposals for consideration. Recommended FY 2010 transportation project proposals will be presented to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors for action in January 2009.

Mayor Desmond requested clarification regarding the fact that one of the proposed evaluation criteria is that the project includes a mitigation measure required by federal environmental document but the FY 2009 matrix indicates that none of the projects include a mitigation measure.

Ms. Stackwick stated that that particular evaluation criterion was added to the criteria list for FY 2010, and Mayor Desmond asked whether that meant the FY 2009 projects would not be eligible under the FY 2010 program. Ms. Stackwick stated that projects must meet the eligibility criteria but
then are ranked based on the number of evaluation criteria they meet. The projects do not have to meet all six evaluation criteria just a greater number.

Councilmember Hall stated that funding for the Mid-Coast transit project needs to be discussed by the Transportation Committee. He expressed his concerns that under the current economic conditions, funding for the Mid-Coast project may become a major obstacle and Chair Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) stated that he would place an item regarding full funding for the Mid-Coast project on a future agenda for discussion.

Vice Chair Dale requested clarification on whether funding under this program was for new projects or could it be used to fund operations and maintenance.

Ms. Stackwick stated that staff submits the project list that is approved by the Board of Directors to the legislature for review. Congress will match the projects with the funding element that most fits the need and submit that list to each Committee for their funding consideration.

Mr. Gallegos stated that historically this is not just for new projects. The Board of Directors will determine the priority list for the region to share with the legislature what the priorities are for the region.

Vice Chair Dale stated that we must ensure the eligibility criteria are as flexible as possible to allow us to allocate funds when and where those funds are needed at the time the funds are needed. He commented that we need to ensure that our own rules do not constrain our ability to fund projects in the future.

Mr. Gallegos stated that federal funds always require a funding match, and this prioritized list of transportation projects will ensure that we focus the federal funds on those projects that have a funding match.

Ms. Stackwick stated that this process mirrors the congressional process. After we submit our list of projects, the congressional delegation submits those recommended for funding to the committees and if those projects do not meet the eligibility requirements such as a funding match, that project loses its level of priority on the list.

Chair Madaffer stated that the key to this process and what makes our region so successful for the federal dollars is that we have a unified approach. This gives our partners and local jurisdictions a deadline to submit their projects for inclusion on this list.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification regarding the local projects matrix and how the projects were ranked on the list.

Ms. Stackwick stated that the matrix shows projects submitted for consideration in FY 2009. Projects one through eight met all the eligibility criteria and at least four of the evaluation criteria. The rest of the projects either did not meet the eligibility criteria or not enough of the evaluation criteria. The projects are not listed in priority but coordinate with the local maps of the congressional delegations from north to south.
Councilmember Monroe asked why the project on SR 163 and Friars Road was not on the list and Ms. Stackwick stated that the project was not submitted for consideration in FY 2009.

Chair Madaffer stated that the project was still under consideration with the City of San Diego and it was a matter of timing but the project would be submitted for the FY 2010 list of projects.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Desmond and a second by Chair Madaffer, the Transportation Committee approved a recommended process and criteria for selecting transportation projects for the FY 2010 federal appropriations cycle.

7. **STATE ROUTE 76 CORRIDOR UPDATE AND BUDGET ADJUSTMENT (RECOMMEND)**

Allan Kosup, Caltrans Corridor Director presented the item and provided an update on the status of transportation improvements to the SR 76 corridor and a proposed budget adjustment.

Mr. Kosup stated that the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) SR 76 corridor projects will widen and realign eleven miles of conventional highway through the environmentally sensitive San Luis Rey River Valley. This corridor is recognized in the TransNet extension ordinance as having implementation priority as it was one of the uncompleted projects included in the Expenditure Plan for the original TransNet program. The 2005 baseline estimate for the corridor is $483 million. The corridor is comprised of three projects with approved 2007 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budgets. The three projects are the SR 76 Middle from Melrose Drive to S. Mission Road with a budget of $158 million; the SR 76 East from South Mission Road to Interstate 15 (I-15) with a budget of $242 million; and the SR 76 Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) with a budget of $83 million.

Caltrans anticipates federal approval of the Final Environmental Document and Project Report for SR 76 Middle in November 2008. The Final Project Report contains an updated estimate for SR 76 Middle of $244 million, which exceeds the current approved CIP budget by $86 million. The $158 million baseline budget for SR 76 Middle was established in 2004 based on an escalated 1999 planning level estimate. The current $244 million estimate reflects increased commodity prices, the addition of more stringent water quality standards, revisions to grading methodology and extensive roadway protection adjacent to the river.

Additional scope was added in the form of environmental enhancements that include animal crossings, wildlife fencing, and native revegetation of barren slopes. To control the project cost, the team has, through extensive value analysis efforts, reduced the project footprint, limiting wetland impacts while at the same time reducing right of way impacts. Given the middle project’s schedule for environmental approval, full construction funding must be programmed at this time.

The original plan was to build the SR 76 Middle project in three segments. Caltrans will now combine the three segments and will go out to bid it as one large project which Caltrans anticipates will provide significant cost savings. The baseline schedule for the middle project anticipated a construction start of July 2009. That start will be delayed until early 2010 although the use of the “Design Sequencing” delivery methodology will allow Caltrans to open SR 76 Middle in advance of the current December 2012 baseline date.
SR 76 East environmental studies are underway and Caltrans has scheduled the release of the Draft Environmental Document in early 2009. Formal consultation with federal and state resource agencies began with a June 2008 meeting. Project alternatives are in development and will be refined based on data gathered and public input at a scheduled October 22, 2008, public meeting. The current $242 million estimate for SR 76 East is a planning level estimate. Based on this estimate, the final corridor cost would exceed the current budget by $86 million. However, Caltrans is not proposing a cost increase at this time due to ongoing alternative development, incomplete scope definition, and potential new revenue sources including developer contributions, County Transportation Impact Fees, and casino development agreements.

While the baseline schedule for delivery of the SR 76 East environmental document has moved to early 2010, Caltrans anticipates completing all corridor construction in advance of the 2014 completion date included in the current CIP.

The SR 76 EMP project has purchased two mitigation properties to date and is actively pursuing additional parcels at this time. This item transfers $12 million from SR 76 EMP to SR 76 Middle to fund environmental enhancements included in the project’s scope.

In early 2008 the region requested state funding for SR 76 Middle as a part of the 2008 STIP process. The region did not receive those funds due to a statewide shortage of funding for the STIP. This item proposes to fully fund the Middle project by advancing TransNet funds previously programmed for right-of-way on SR 76 East. This programming action will not jeopardize timely delivery of any previously approved early action projects. This approach allows the region to use available federal dollars prior to using TransNet funds and in the spring of 2009, the annual comprehensive review of the TransNet Plan of Finance will be performed to assess other potential modifications to project budgets, including the utilization of past and anticipated construction bid savings.

Chair Madaffer expressed his support of the project and the progress made to date.

Councilmember Monroe expressed his concerns regarding moving funding into a project without knowing the impact to the overall TransNet program. He expressed his concerns that this project was going to be built regardless of the cost or how the increased cost would affect our ability to build future TransNet projects.

Chair Madaffer stated that most often a project’s budget increases from the original proposal to the time the project is built and complete. Due to the current economic situation, the TransNet list of projects will have to be reviewed and re-prioritized for funding based on lower than expected sales tax revenues. In this case, this is a TransNet project and it is this Committee’s responsibility to fulfill the promise to voters to build this project.

Mr. Gallegos stated that we delivered 21 major projects over the past 20 years of the original TransNet Ordinance but were not able to complete four of the original projects. These projects were budgeted with 1987 dollars and those estimates are quite obviously low. Hopefully over the 40 years of the entire TransNet program, we hope to balance the highs with the lows and find funding sources to deliver all the projects.

With the next transportation bill we hope to be in a position to advocate for funding. The infrastructure bonds from four years ago are allowing projects to go forward today. We need to
understand that this is a long term program. In the early 90’s we had a similar situation where sales tax dropped and costs increased. We need to understand that the economic situation will improve. Staff will brief the Board of Directors monthly on the financial impacts to SANDAG and the transit agencies from the current economic situation so staff can be proactive.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) expressed her concern that this Committee is not acting as if there is a financial crisis. She stated that we are committed to these projects and they are all valuable to the region. Councilmember Atkins stated that we act as though we will get money in the future when we should be considering the potential impacts of not receiving the money. She commented that the transit agencies are having difficulty providing routes and services; we need to recognize the crisis.

Chair Madaffer stated that it is important to recognize several projects were not completed under the initial TransNet Ordinance and were not funded until the TransNet Extension.

Councilmember Atkins stated that she had to go on the record regarding potential impacts of today's action on the I-15 Mid-City Centerline project. She commented that this project is building density with smart growth principles in the inner city and transit is an integral part. If our actions today cause this project to not be completed we will lose community support for decades.

Mr. Gallegos stated that there is a requirement for a comprehensive review for project status and budgeting every 10 years under the TransNet Extension Ordinance.

Mr. Kosup stated that when Caltrans returns with the SR 76 East project, if we can’t find additional revenues or match the scope, we will suggest project alternatives that stay within the scope for the project of $168 million; it may not have the same functionality but we plan to stay within budget.

Mayor Madrid stated over the past 20 years every project this Committee has approved has exceeded its budget. He stated that we need to change how we look at projects. We continue to think that the economy will turn around and improve. If we continue to act in the same manner as in the past we will make the same mistakes in the future. Mayor Madrid requested that the Transportation Committee consider holding special meetings to address these types of special issues. We need to develop a process for every project with a checklist to stay within a realistic budget.

Mayor Druker commented that this project is an 11-mile project that cost as much as the SPRINTER but is half the length. Additionally, this project does not serve smart growth areas.

Councilmember Monroe requested that staff provide a graphic or matrix that shows how budget transfers and actions taken on projects on the TransNet list of projects today affect all the projects on the list, specifically which projects get dropped off the list because there is no identified funding source because of the actions we take today.

Mr. Orso-Delgado stated that within the TransNet Extension Ordinance this project is a high priority and must be built.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the redistribution of funds between State Route 76 corridor projects to fully fund the construction phase of State Route 76 Middle.
Rachel Kennedy, Senior Regional Planner presented the item. The FY 2009 SANDAG Budget and Overall Work Program (OWP) includes the Interstate 5 (I-5) South Corridor Study as a pending work element. The draft scope of work was prepared in FY 2007 and initiation of the study was pending while funding was secured.

In 2005, the City of Chula Vista received discretionary funding included in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) for “Project Design and Environmental Assessment of Widening and Improving the Interchange at H Street and I-5, Chula Vista.” The funding allocation was modified at the City of Chula Vista’s request to broaden the project’s scope to “Conduct a study to examine multimodal improvements to the I-5 corridor between the Main Street Interchange and State Route 54” and was included in the bill known as H.R. 1195, which was signed into law in June 2008.

Ms. Kennedy stated that an amendment to the FY 2009 Budget and OWP will allow SANDAG, in partnership with the City of Chula Vista and Caltrans, to move forward with this important study that will examine projects and strategies for reducing delay attributed to congestion on several modes of transportation and will improve mobility for people and freight. Ms. Kennedy reviewed the proposed changes to the FY 2009 OWP element, as well as changes to other OWP elements from which staff resources will be drawn.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the study will evaluate multimodal improvements to accommodate current and future traffic demand in the I-5 South corridor from Main Street through SR 54 in the City of Chula Vista. It will focus on freeway and interchange improvements, including current interchange spacing and operation; light rail transit and freight rail services running parallel to I-5; and transit/pedestrian/bicycle circulation adjacent to I-5. This study will propose capital improvements, including preliminary engineering and environmental analysis with estimated costs and a conceptual phasing plan for financing and construction. The study is included in the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP).

Caltrans, Chula Vista, and SANDAG will work collectively on the study to assure coordination of the various transportation modes in the project study area. The proposed approach and funding allocation will allow for the development of a systems level planning analysis for the I-5 South corridor, which will be followed by future work on specific regional transportation projects located on the I-5 corridor within the City of Chula Vista.

SANDAG will be the lead agency and administer the study, in cooperation with Chula Vista and Caltrans. Through future action an ad hoc technical working group will be established. Staff from the City of National City, City of San Diego, Metropolitan Transit System, and others will be invited to participate.

SANDAG will contract with engineering consultant services for the study and the three participating agencies will contribute staff resources to the study effort. A draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) detailing the study and the fund reimbursement agreement between Chula Vista and
SANDAG is included as Attachment 2. Commencement of the study is conditional upon Chula Vista’s adoption of the MOU and execution of a separate agreement between Chula Vista and Caltrans.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the study is anticipated to begin in late 2008. The Transportation Committee will be asked to provide policy guidance at key project milestones.

Councilmember Hall requested staff provide a briefing on the status of the entire I-5 Corridor at a future Transportation Committee meeting.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors (1) authorize the Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and the City of Chula Vista in substantially the same form as Attachment 2, and (2) approve an amendment to the FY 2009 Budget and Overall Work Program for the Interstate 5 South Multimodal Corridor Study to transition the project from pending to an active work element.

11. **MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT UPDATE (INFORMATION)**

Leslie Blanda, Manager of Capital Development presented the item. In January 2005, the Board of Directors included the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project in the TransNet Early Action Program. The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will extend San Diego Trolley service from the Old Town Transit Center to University City, serving major activity centers such as the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and University Town Center (UTC).

Ms. Blanda stated that the Board of Directors gave staff direction to move forward with the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project as a high priority. SANDAG staff has secured the services of an experienced transportation consultant with expertise in developing Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts Projects. This expertise includes developing FTA New Starts Funding Applications as well as assisting clients with securing FTA Full Funding Grant Agreements. The consultant is well versed in all aspects of project development through the FTA process and has a proven track record of success within the industry. SANDAG staff additionally secured the services of a consultant experienced in public involvement to assist in preparation and implementation of a public involvement program to support all development phases of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. The services of a firm experienced in environmental law with experience in FTA New Starts Projects as well as other public transit projects will support the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project through environmental review and entitlements.

Ms. Blanda stated that the Mid-Coast Corridor Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) is a light rail transit (LRT) alignment that begins at the Old Town Transit Center and travels north in existing railroad right-of-way to Gilman Drive. Three stations are currently proposed in this segment and are located at Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, and Balboa Avenue. At Gilman Drive, the alignment continues north within the I-5 right-of-way to the proposed University Lane Station. The alignment crosses to the west side of I-5 and enters the west side of the UCSD campus just north of La Jolla Village Drive.

The alignment travels into Pepper Canyon where the proposed UCSD West Station is located approximately one block from the UCSD Price Center. The alignment continues to the east side of I-5 along Voigt Drive and serves the east side of the UCSD Campus at the proposed UCSD East
Station. The alignment continues along either Genesee Avenue or Regents Road and Executive Drive to the proposed Executive Drive Station. The alignment continues south on Genesee Avenue to the proposed terminal station located at University Town Center (UTC). A map of the alignment was included in the staff report.

Ms. Blanda introduced the Mid-Coast Consultant Team which includes PB Americas for design and environmental planning and the FTA New Starts program, MJE Marketing Services for public involvement, and Worden Williams, APC for environmental law issues.

Ms. Blanda stated that the current project development phase includes the preparation of an environmental document for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Preliminary Engineering is additionally included in the current project development phase. Preparation of the environmental document will include: development and evaluation of alternatives; conducting public scoping for the environmental document; selection of alternatives for detailed analysis in the draft environmental document; preparation of the draft environmental document; preparation of the final environmental document; and approval of the final environmental document. The Board of Directors will approve the final environmental document prepared under CEQA. The FTA will approve the final document prepared under NEPA.

Ms. Blanda stated that the first step in the environmental review process will be the development and evaluation of alternatives for potential inclusion in the public scoping process and in the draft environmental document. The alternatives include a revised LPA, additional LRT alignment variations, a commuter rail shuttle alternative, a bus rapid transit (BRT) alternative, a no build alternative and a transportation systems management (TSM) alternative. These alternatives are currently under development. The LPA previously adopted by the Board of Directors will be re-evaluated. The LPA will be revised to reflect changes in the planned I-5 improvements and other changes as well as to maximize its cost-effectiveness where achievable.

Ms. Blanda stated that prior to public scoping staff will present the alternatives, the findings of the alternatives evaluation and a recommended list of alternatives to be carried forward into public scoping to the Board of Directors for review and approval. The Board of Directors will have the option of identifying a preferred alternative to be carried through the public scoping process. This step is anticipated to occur in March 2009. During public scoping environmental issues and alternatives proposed for detailed environmental analysis will be presented to the public and interested stakeholders for review and comment. Public scoping is anticipated to be conducted in March and April 2009. Subsequent to public scoping staff will evaluate environmental issues and refine alternatives based on input received during the public scoping process. Staff’s evaluation will consider practical and legal requirements for alternatives in the environmental document. The Board of Directors will then be asked to approve the alternatives to be carried forward for detailed analysis in the draft environmental document. Board of Directors approval will be requested in June 2009. The draft environmental document is scheduled to be completed in August 2010. The final environmental document is scheduled to be completed in August 2011.

Ms. Blanda stated that Preliminary Engineering can proceed once the Board of Directors has selected a LPA and FTA has approved the SANDAG application to proceed with Preliminary Engineering on the LPA. It may be possible for the Board of Directors to select a LPA prior to proceeding with development of the draft environmental document. Should this occur, the
Preliminary Engineering application can be submitted to the FTA in the summer of 2009. The New Starts Application, which is a portion of the Preliminary Engineering application, would be rated by the FTA in the fall of 2009 and the project’s New Starts Rating would be published in the FY 2011 New Starts Report in February 2010.

Ms. Blanda stated that the Board of Directors included the Mid-Coast LRT Project in the TransNet Early Action Program. The Mid-Coast LRT Project was included in the original TransNet Ordinance and remains uncompleted. Under the TransNet Extension, the Mid-Coast LRT Project shall be given priority for implementation. TransNet includes $670 million in capital funds for the Mid-Coast LRT Project and $110 million in operating funds through the year 2048. Both the capital and operating included in TransNet are in 2002 dollars. SANDAG would be seeking FTA New Starts funding for the project. The proportion of local match provided by the TransNet capital funds, as well as the benefit to the financial plan resulting from inclusion of the TransNet operating funds, will be advantageous in securing a higher New Starts project rating from FTA for the Mid-Coast Project. The current cost for the Mid-Coast LPA is estimated to be $1.2 billion in year of expenditure dollars. The estimated cost of the LPA alignment will be updated during the current phase of work to reflect any revisions made as the result of re-evaluating the LPA.

MJE Marketing Services will assist SANDAG in developing and implementing the Public Involvement Program for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. Public involvement and outreach activities will commence with public scoping in the spring of 2009. Public involvement and outreach activities will continue through all phases of project development including the supplemental environmental phase, preliminary engineering, final design, and construction.

SANDAG will continue to coordinate with project stakeholders throughout development of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. Coordination with key stakeholders such as MTS, UCSD, Caltrans, and the City of San Diego is already underway. Periodic regularly scheduled meetings are anticipated with the key stakeholders. The Public Involvement Program, currently under development, will include a variety of methods for coordination with project stakeholders including the public. In addition, a Coordination Plan for environmental review is under development.

Ms. Blanda stated that the schedule assumptions for final design and construction outlined in this report are based on a range of project delivery methods that would deliver the Mid-Coast Project for revenue service between December 2015 and June 2018. Before any further information on project delivery is brought to the Transportation Committee, further evaluation is required of the different project delivery methods, including how the procurement strategies may fit into the overall New Starts schedule. A preliminary project schedule for the previously adopted LPA is shown as Attachment 2. The preliminary schedule indicates a range of start and finish dates for the final design and construction phases. This schedule is based on the assumption that a LPA will be selected by the Board of Directors upon completion of the public scoping process.

Ms. Blanda stated that key dates over the next year that are included in the preliminary project schedule for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project are: Board approval of alternatives for public scoping in March 2009, Public scoping in March/April 2009, and Board approval of alternatives for the draft environmental document in June 2009. Future development phases include final design, construction, systems testing, and start-up of revenue service.
Ms. Blanda stated that the ITOC and the Board of Directors will be briefed at their November meetings.

Mr. Gallegos stated that staff will provide regular updates on this project every other month until we reach the point of critical planning and at that time staff will provide monthly updates. This is the same procedure staff followed for the SR 905, SR 11, and SPRINTER projects.

Supervisor Roberts stated that this project is identified as high priority under the TransNet Ordinance and Extension Ordinance. He questioned whether it was possible to break the project down into two phases. The first phase could begin even sooner with the possibility to achieve budget savings. He stated that Phase 1 could be the portion of the project up to Rose Canyon at Gilman Drive which is about 80 percent of the line. The alternatives are identical to that point and SANDAG has control of rights-of-way up to that point. Phase II could continue the project from that point and alternatives could be discussed without delaying the entire project. Supervisor Roberts stated that he, Harry Mathis and Gary Gallegos met with Chancellor Fox at UCSD and she is a strong proponent for this project and is supportive of getting approvals from the Board of Regents for the portion that crosses the campus. He stated his support for the alternative that would cross the UCSD campus and provide for eventual connections in the future. He stated his support for a regular briefing to this committee.

Chair Madaffer stated that the potential where the existing rail line runs to Genesee Avenue, where there would eventually be a tunnel, is substantial especially due to the constraints north of Gilman Drive. Once the line crosses the campus the potential for future possible connections is endless, such as connecting with the COASTER.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification regarding the conceptual look of the BRT alternative.

Ms. Blanda stated that the BRT alternative is under development and there are not many details available but staff plans to take advantage of some of the benefits of BRT and develop the best possible BRT alternative along I-5.

Councilmember Monroe stated that one of the problems with light rail is getting to the light rail station and then parking becomes an issue. In some countries they build light trail and busways in the same right of way so residents can take advantage of connections from home to light rail and suggested that staff research that possibility.

Mr. Gallegos stated that one issue would be that this is a very busy rail corridor with freight, Amtrak, COASTER, and adding buses may not be feasible but staff will have consultants research the possibility.

Councilmember Hall stated his support of transit and suggested that staff review the SPRINTER project and analyze the positives and negatives. He stated that prior to beginning this project staff needs to do a full analysis and determine how best to bring this project forward. He expressed his concerns regarding budgeting and planning impacts of this project when both the SPRINTER and the COASTER have had such significant cost increases and problems.
Mayor Druker stated that staff needs to consider a Phase 3 up to Sorrento Valley and a Phase IV down Mira Mesa Boulevard for this project. In order to get the public’s support for this project, we need to get residents and employers in that area to support the project with the goal to bring more transit into this area.

Mayor Stocks asked whether elevated lines instead of tunneling would be considered when staff was studying the alternatives for the project. He stated that elevated lines have less environmental impact and a lower cost.

Ms. Blanda stated that depending on the location tunneling can have less environmental impact. Staff will look at the cost of both options, either tunneling or elevating the lines, at the applicable segments.

Supervisor Roberts stated that one segment does show a tunnel in the current project due to the steeper grades in that location.

Mayor Madrid commented that the San Diego State tunnel was the preferred option but staff did look at other options for the line. He commented that this project needs to look at all alternatives. He agreed that we need to analyze the SPRINT project to better understand this project. Mayor Madrid stated that the City of San Diego needs to reconsider zoning for higher density along that corridor.

Chair Madaffer stated that SB 375 calls for density along this type of corridor.

Chairman Harry Mathis (MTS) stated that running buses along the same light rail route was done along prior to the opening of the Mission Valley East with very low ridership. Since the line has opened bus ridership has increased significantly. He commented that this project is an addition to a network that has existed for 25 years and is a proven quantity. This project is another increment to a very successful system.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

12. COMPASS CARD AND 30-DAY ROLLING PASS TRANSITIONAL DEPLOYMENT (INFORMATION)

James Dreisbach-Towle, Systems Integration presented the item. At the June 13, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting, the Committee directed staff to implement 30-day rolling passes to replace the existing calendar pass products. This replacement implementation will be accomplished by migrating from the existing paper pass products to the new Compass Card.

Since then, staff from SANDAG, NCTD, and MTS has raised concerns regarding how the transition would be made from the monthly passes to the 30-day rolling passes. The Compass Card program has been in the pilot phase and will be introduced to the public beginning in January 2009. The transitional plan, which has been previously shared with the Transportation Committee, has the region phasing out the paper pass products over a six-month period. Paper passes will be completely eliminated by July 1, 2009.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that the language that was amended into the Ordinance in June 2008 regarding rolling passes is in Sections 3.5 and 3.6 of the Ordinance. The language in Section 3.6
states, “Effective January 1, 2009, each Regional Pass listed in Section 3 shall be replaced with a 30-day Rolling Pass.” This language could be interpreted to mean that the monthly passes will be replaced and unavailable as of January 1, 2009. Staff at SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD is concerned that such an immediate elimination of the monthly pass would be unduly difficult for customers to adjust to and staff to implement. Therefore, staff intends to utilize a phased-in approach for the replacement of the rolling passes and other Compass Card products in order to ease the transition which he reviewed for the Committee.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that beginning in January 2009, all regional 30-day pass products will be available on the Compass Card and will be sold at all Ticket Vending Machines, transit agencies’ transit stores, on the Compass Card web site, via the 511 Compass Card call center, and at third party distributors. Paper pass products will be gradually eliminated over the six-month period. This gradual migration will give SANDAG and the two transit agencies time to conduct a marketing, education, and outreach program that will explain the benefits of the program and the details for using the new Compass Card. MTS, NCTD, and SANDAG will be conducting focus groups with the Compass Card pilot participants to better understand the customer experience and to refine the outreach program. These focus groups are scheduled for later this month.

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

13. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, November 7, 2008, at 9 a.m.

14. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Madaffer adjourned the meeting at 11:25 a.m.
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<td>Art Madrid</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Jerry Rindone</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Toni Atkins</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Ben Hueso</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Greg Cox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome Stocks</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As ex-officio 2nd Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Orlando</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>Charlene Zettel</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Desmond</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramona Finnila</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTCA</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Albert Phoenix</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shane Chapparosa</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The TransNet Policy permits an exclusion from these requirements if an agency can show that the required accommodations will add disproportionate cost relative to the value of their use. The TransNet Policy specifies the process for seeking an exclusion, which requires the agency requesting the exclusion to include a notice of the decision in the public hearing required for the preparation of the Regional Transportation Improvement Process (RTIP). The decision then is subject to review and comment by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG), and the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), and ultimately approval by the Transportation Committee.

The City of Chula Vista is seeking exclusion from the TransNet Policy for five pavement overlay projects which are of one inch thickness or greater that were submitted as part of the RTIP for TransNet funding in FY 2008/2009 through FY 2012/2013. This report summarizes the requested exceptions by project location. As part of the RTIP noticing process, the City of Chula Vista adopted a resolution (Attachment 2) memorializing this request. On September 17, 2008, BPWG reviewed the proposed exceptions and recommended approval, and also provided comments which are incorporated into this report. On October 15, 2008, ITOC reviewed the proposed exceptions along with the comments provided by the BPWG and concurred with it to grant the exclusion for the subject projects.

Discussion

The following section of the report summarizes the specific projects, the City of Chula Vista’s justification for exclusion from the TransNet Policy, and comments provided by BPWG.

North Broadway Reconstruction – Bike lanes will not be provided on North Broadway because bike lanes exist on a parallel route along 5th Avenue. The TransNet Policy allows for an exception if there is a parallel route available that is less than a quarter mile total out of direction. In its presentation
to the BPWG, the City of Chula Vista also noted that this section of Broadway is not in the current City Bicycle Master Plan, the accident rate is higher than the state average, and there are driveways every 50 feet which make this an undesirable location for bike lanes. The BPWG commented that the total out of direction travel is actually one-half mile and that in the future as the section of Broadway that is south of the current project is improved, it should be made to accommodate a bike lane and a direct connection to E Street.

Main Street from the west Interstate 805 interchange to Oleander Avenue – Bike lanes and sidewalk on the north side of Main Street will not be provided due to insufficient roadway and right-of-way width. The TransNet Policy provides for an exception in this case due to the disproportionate cost of widening the underpass. The City of Chula Vista has noted that Caltrans lane width requirements for large truck lane storage and turning movements preclude the ability to meet the requirements of the TransNet Policy. While there are plans to improve the interchange in the City Development Impact Fee program, at this time improvements are estimated to be at least five years away. The BPWG commented that in the interim, appropriate signage for bicycles should be installed and that that there should be more assurances that the ultimate improvements will provide for bike lanes and sidewalks.

East H Street between Terra Nova Drive and Del Rey Boulevard – Sidewalks on the north side of Terra Nova Drive will not be provided. In accordance with the TransNet Policy, sidewalks are not required if the project is a new pavement overlay in a setting where there is no existing curb and gutter. The project has no existing curb and gutter. Additionally, the TransNet Policy allows an exclusion if the project is adjacent to a habitat conservation area with topographic constraints. There are existing bike lanes. The BPWG had no comments.

Wueste Road between Otay Lakes Road and Lake Crest Drive – Sidewalk will be excluded from the project. In accordance with the TransNet Policy, sidewalks are not required if the project is a new pavement overlay in a setting where there is no existing curb and gutter. The project area has no existing curb and gutter and there are no adjacent pedestrian-oriented land uses. Additionally, there is a parallel multi-use path available that is less than a quarter mile total out of direction. BPWG had no comments.

Broadway between Faivre Street and Beyer Boulevard – Sidewalks will be excluded from the project. In accordance with the TransNet Policy, sidewalks are not required if the project is a new pavement overlay in a setting where there is no existing curb and gutter. The project area has no existing curb and gutter and there are currently no adjacent pedestrian-oriented land uses. BPWG commented that although the current City of Chula Vista Bicycle Master Plan calls for Class III shared facility there is sufficient width to accommodate bike lanes.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

2. City of Chula Vista Resolution No. 2008-110

Key Staff Contact: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, ckl@sandag.org
Rule #12: Use of TransNet Revenues for Accessibility Improvements

Adoption Date: March 23, 1990 (Resolution RC90-35)

Text: In the development of TransNet-funded local street and road projects, local jurisdictions may include, within the street right-of-way, improvements to enhance accessibility to the transportation system, including, but not limited to, accessibility improvements to bus stop areas.
RESOLUTION NO. 2008-110


WHEREAS, on November 3, 1987, the voters of San Diego County approved the San Diego Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan (Ordinance); and

WHEREAS, on November 4, 2004, the voters of San Diego County approved the San Diego County Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan (04-01) extension (Extension Ordinance); and

WHEREAS, the Ordinance and the Extension Ordinance provide that the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), acting as the Regional Transportation Commission, shall approve a multi-year program of projects submitted by local jurisdictions identifying those transportation projects eligible to use transportation sales tax (TRANSNET) funds; and

WHEREAS, every two years, SANDAG updates the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) and releases new funding projections for the cities within San Diego County; and

WHEREAS, on March 18, 2008, pursuant to Ordinances No. 3106 through No. 3110, the City Council adopted the Western Chula Vista Transportation Development Fee (WTDIF) at a rate of $3,243 per Equivalent Development Unit; and

WHEREAS, on January 25, 2005, pursuant to Resolution No. 2005-014, the City Council adopted the City's Bikeway Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, in January 2008, SANDAG staff acknowledged this Plan as complete, consistent with the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, and coordinated with other jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, Section 4.E.3 of the Extension Ordinance states that all new projects, or major reconstruction projects, funded by revenues provided under this Ordinance shall accommodate travel by pedestrians and bicyclists, except where pedestrians and bicyclists are prohibited by law from using a given facility or where the costs of including bikeways and walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use; and
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WHEREAS, on February 8, 2008, the SANDAG Executive Committee considered a proposed amendment to SANDAG Board Policy 31 to establish guidelines for the implementation of Section 4.E.3 of the Extension Ordinance (Rule 20 Amendment); and

WHEREAS, staff believes that the Rule 20 Amendment was adopted by the SANDAG Board based on conversations with SANDAG staff; and

WHEREAS, the Rule 20 Amendment states that a local jurisdiction may use a bicycle or pedestrian master plan adopted by the city council and approved by SANDAG to determine the appropriate means of accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians in a given project and at a minimum provide the facilities called for in the plan; and

WHEREAS, the Rule 20 Amendment also lists the circumstances when provisions for bicyclists and pedestrians may be excluded; and

WHEREAS, the Rule 20 Amendment states that a new project or major reconstruction project may not include the expected bikeway treatment when a suitable parallel route with the appropriate accommodations exists that would require no more than 1/4-mile total out of direction travel; and

WHEREAS, the Rule 20 Amendment states that sidewalks or other walkways may be excluded from a project when it can be demonstrated that there are no uses (including bus stops) that would create demand for pedestrian access and that in making this determination, the agency must consider the potential for future demand within the useful life of the project; and

WHEREAS, the Rule 20 Amendment states that an agency is not required to acquire additional right-of-way to improve bicycle and pedestrian access; and

WHEREAS, the Rule 20 Amendment states that the provision of sidewalks for major rehabilitation projects involving only new pavement overlays of one-inch thickness or greater would only be required if curb, gutter, and related drainage facilities were already in place; and

WHEREAS, the Rule 20 Amendment states that the agency may consider context, cost, probable use, and severe topographic or biological constraints in its decision not to provide provisions for bicyclists and pedestrians; and

WHEREAS, the Rule 20 Amendment states that the procedure for excluding accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists includes the agency notifying SANDAG that bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities will not be included in the project along with written justification for that decision; and

WHEREAS, the Rule 20 Amendment states that the decision to exclude accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians must be made in the public hearing required by Section 5.A of the Extension Ordinance; and
WHEREAS, the proposed list of projects to be funded by TRANSNET during fiscal years 2008/2009 through 2012/2013 is consistent with the City’s existing Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the proposed changes to the CIP for fiscal year 2008/2009; and

WHEREAS, the streets included in the Major Pavement Rehabilitation Program are chosen from the list which was compiled on the basis of the City’s Pavement Management System; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a Public Hearing on April 22, 2008, as required by Section 5.A of the Extension Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Chula Vista as follows:

1. That it approves the submittal of certain projects for the TRANSNET Local Street Improvement Program to the San Diego Association of Governments for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program for fiscal years 2008/2009 through 2012/2013.

2. That it certifies that pursuant to Section 2.C of the Extension Ordinance, no more than 30 percent of its annual TRANSNET revenues shall be spent on maintenance-related projects.

3. That it certifies that, pursuant to Section 8 of the Extension Ordinance, the required minimum annual level of local discretionary funds to be expended for street and road purposes will be met throughout the five-year period consistent with the most recent Maintenance of Effort Requirements adopted by SANDAG.

4. That it certifies that, pursuant to Section 9.A of the Extension Ordinance, the City will extract at least $2,000 from the private sector for each newly constructed residential housing unit to comply with the provisions of the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program.

5. That it certifies that, pursuant to Section 13 of the Extension Ordinance, a separate Transportation Improvement Account has been established, with earned interest expended only for those purposes for which the funds were allocated.

6. That it certifies that, pursuant to Section 18 of the Extension Ordinance, each project of $250,000 or more will be clearly designated during construction with TRANSNET project funding identification signs.

7. That the City will indemnify, hold harmless and defend SANDAG, the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, and all officers and employees thereof against all causes of action or claims related to local TRANSNET funded projects.
8. That it certifies that, pursuant to Section 4.E.3 of the Extension Ordinance, all new projects, or major reconstruction projects, funded by TRANSNET revenues shall accommodate travel by pedestrians and bicyclists with the following exceptions, along with the accompanying justification:

A. The North Broadway Reconstruction project (STM354) qualifies as a major reconstruction project under the Rule 20 Amendment. Staff intends to exclude the bikeway treatment in the North Broadway Reconstruction project because a parallel route with appropriate accommodations exists on Fifth Avenue that would require no more than ¼-mile total out of direction travel. The parallel route on Fifth Avenue is included in the Bikeway Master Plan.

B. Because the new overlay project on Main Street from the west I-805 interchange to Oleander Avenue will be over one inch thick, the project qualifies as a major rehabilitation project under the Rule 20 Amendment. Staff intends to exclude the bikeway treatment on Main Street from the west I-805 interchange to Oleander Avenue because Main Street, which is currently designated as a Class 3 bike route in the Bikeway Master Plan, crosses the freeway and there is insufficient lane width for a Class 2 bike lane. Staff intends to consider additional bicycle facilities in conjunction with future interchange improvements.

C. Because the new overlay project on the north side of East H Street between Terra Nova Drive and Del Rey Boulevard will be over one inch thick, the project qualifies as a major rehabilitation project under the Rule 20 Amendment. Staff intends to exclude sidewalks on the north side of East H Street between Terra Nova Drive and Del Rey Boulevard for the following reasons: (1) due to its location adjacent to the City’s Multiple Species Conservation Program area, there are severe topographic and biological constraints; (2) there is insufficient right-of-way; and (3) there is no development adjacent to the project so there is no demand for pedestrian access or the potential for future demand for pedestrian access.

D. Because the new overlay project on Wueste Road between Otay Lakes Road and Lake Crest Drive will be over one inch thick, the project qualifies as a major rehabilitation project under the Rule 20 Amendment. Staff intends to exclude sidewalks on Wueste Road between Otay Lakes Road and Lake Crest Drive for the following reasons: (1) it is a two-lane road without existing curb, gutter and drainage facilities; and (2) there is no development adjacent to the project so there is no demand for pedestrian access or the potential for future demand for pedestrian access.
E. Because the new overlay project on Broadway from Faivre Street to Beyer Boulevard will be over one inch thick, the project qualifies as a major rehabilitation project under the Rule 20 Amendment. Staff intends to exclude sidewalks on Broadway from Faivre Street to Beyer Boulevard for the following reasons: (1) it is a two-lane road without existing curb, gutter and drainage facilities; (2) there are only industrial facilities adjacent to the project and these uses do not create a demand for pedestrian access or the potential for future demand for pedestrian access; and (3) it is currently being maintained as a Class 3 bike route in accordance with the City's Bikeway Master Plan.

9. That it certifies that all applicable provisions of the Ordinance, the Extension Ordinance, and SANDAG Board Policy 31 have been met.

Presented by

[Signature]
Jack Griffin
Engineering and General Services Director

Approved as to form by

[Signature]
Ann Moore
City Attorney
PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Chula Vista, California, this 22nd day of April 2008 by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: Ramirez, Rindone, and Cox
NAYS: Councilmembers: None
ABSENT: Councilmembers: Castaneda
ABSTAIN: Councilmembers: McCann

Cheryl Cox, Mayor

ATTEST:

Donna R. Norris, CMC, Interim City Clerk

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO )
CITY OF CHULA VISTA )

I, Donna R. Norris, Interim City Clerk of Chula Vista, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2008-110 was duly passed, approved, and adopted by the City Council at a regular meeting of the Chula Vista City Council held on the 22nd day of April 2008.

Executed this 22nd day of April 2008.

Donna R. Norris, CMC, Interim City Clerk
Introduction

On July 25, 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the five-year program of proposed major highway, arterial, transit, and bikeway projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2009 to FY 2013.

Recommendation

Pending the federal approval of the 2009 Federal State Transportation Improvement Program, the Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2009-07 (Attachment 1), approving Amendment No. 1 to the 2008 RTIP.

Discussion

SANDAG processes amendments to the RTIP generally on a quarterly basis and occasionally on a more frequent basis as circumstances arise. The quarterly amendment process usually falls in October of each year. However, since SANDAG anticipates federal approval of the 2009 Federal State Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP) which includes the SANDAG 2008 RTIP, to be delayed until the first week of November, the first quarterly amendment has been delayed to the November Transportation Committee meeting. Amendment No. 1 includes changes as requested by member agencies. Table 1 (Attachment 3) provides the project descriptions, proposed changes and funding for projects proposed.

Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee

The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) is the independent citizen oversight committee that reviews TransNet-funded projects. The ITOC reviewed Amendment No. 1 at its October 15, 2008, meeting focusing its review on the TransNet extension funded programs. ITOC members provided comments on three projects: State Route (SR) 76 (CAL29), SPRINTER (NCTD16), and City of Encinitas Traffic Safety Calming (ENC19). The ITOC comments related to SR 76 and the SPRINTER were conveyed to the Transportation Committee at its October 17 meeting and to the Board of Directors at its October 24 meeting. ITOC comments related to these three projects are included in Attachment 2. Project ENC19 was programmed as a congestion relief project. ITOC members correctly pointed out that traffic safety type projects are considered maintenance based on Rule 18 of Policy No. 031. This change has been made and is reflected in Table 1.

Public Notice/Resolutions

SANDAG transmitted the draft project amendment to interested parties for a 15-day public review. The comment period ended October 22, 2008. No comments were received.

Below are the proposed amendments with additional information included in Table 1 (Attachment 3).
• **SR 76 Middle (CAL29):** As approved by the Board of Directors at its October 24, 2008 meeting, this amendment fully funds this project. In doing so, funds were moved from various other projects namely, SR 52 Freeway (CAL26), SR 52 Auxiliary Lanes, Truck Lane and Inside Widening (CAL26B), SR76 East (CAL29B), and Biological Mitigation Program (V07). The total project for CAL29 increases to $244,201,000.

• **SR125 Toll, Gap, Connector (CAL31):** This amendment adds $15 million in federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds in the prior year reflecting the Board action from June 2007. Post programming authorizations such as this do not require amendment to the RTIP, but Caltrans has requested the update to ensure that the full cost of the project is reflected. Total project increases to $492,244,000.

• **SR 905 New Freeway (CAL38):** This amendment respreads the program for federal High Priority Program (HPP) and TransNet-Border funds to reflect actual federal obligation for HPP and cash flow expenditures for TransNet. Total project remains $450,500,000.

• **SHOPP Collision Reduction (CAL46B):** Caltrans has increased the funding for this program. Total project increases to $91,099,000.

• **Interstate 5 (I-5)/SR 78 (CAL71):** This amendment proposes to add a $500,000 federal Surface Transportation Program earmark funds. Total increases to $1 million

• **Safe Routes to School (CAL104):** Caltrans has allocated funds for additional projects in the San Diego region. Total programmed increases to $6,922,000.

• **Highway Safety Improvement Program (CAL105):** Caltrans has allocated funds for additional projects in the San Diego region. Total programmed increases to $6,959,000.

• **32nd Street Grade Separation (CAL107):** This amendment proposes to revise funding between fiscal years. Total programmed remains $118,460,000.

• **Tecate International Border Crossing Pedestrian Facilities (CAL116):** This new project would improve the existing pedestrian facility at the Tecate border. Total project funded with State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds is $2,383,000.

• **Otay POE Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities (CAL117):** This new project would improve the pedestrian and bicycle aesthetics, accessibility, and safety at the Otay Port of Entry. Total project funded with STIP TE funds is $2,060,000.

City of Encinitas

SANDAG transmitted a memo to all member agencies regarding TransNet Local Street and Road fund balances remaining after FY 2008, the last year of the original TransNet measure, and requested that agencies amend the RTIP to program the old carryover funds prior to using the new funds. The City of Encinitas amendments reflect the exchange from TransNet Local Street Improvement (LSI) to the carryover funds. The specific projects included in this amendment are Street Overlay Program (ENC14A), Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Program (ENC17), Traffic Safety/Calming (ENC19), North Coast Highway 101 Beautification (ENC20), Traffic Signal Modifications (ENC28), Improvements to the Leucadia Boulevard/Coast
Highway 101/Vulcan Avenue Intersection (ENC41). Encinitas Recreational Trail (ENC42) is a new project funded with federal Recreational Trails Program. These projects are also included in Table 1.

North County Transit District

- **Oceanside Escondido Rail Project (NCTD16):** As approved by the Board at its October 24, 2008, this amendment exchanges state Proposition 1B funds with TransNet-MC funds. Total project remains $460,266,000.

SANDAG

At its September 26, 2008, meeting, the Board approved the allocation of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Freedom funds and the TransNet Senior Services program funds. This amendment increases the total programmed for **5317 New Freedom Program (SAN58)** to $3,987,000 and **Senior Mini-Grant Program (SAN84)** to $3,914,000.

Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)

The MTS received two discretionary grants, Transit Security Grant Program and Job Access Reserve Commute program, from Caltrans. This amendment increases the total programmed for **Bus/Rail Support Equipment (MTS30)** to $59,006,000 and **Job Access Reverse Commute (MTS42)** to $6,941,000.

City of San Diego

- **Old Otay Mesa Road (SD155):** This amendment proposes to revise the project description by providing more detail. Total programmed remains $7,600,000.

- **Sea World Drive Widening and I-5 Interchange Improvements (SD189):** This new project would replace and widen the existing bridge from 4 lanes to 8 lanes with new on/off ramps. This amendment is to program the PE phase only. Total programmed is $12,875,000.

- **Palm Avenue/I-805 Interchange (SD190):** This new project would widen the existing bridge with repairs to bridge approaches and abutments. This amendment is to program the PE phase only. Total programmed is $13,863,000.

City of San Marcos

- **Discovery Street Improvements (SM31):** This new project would widen the roadway to four lanes. The total project is $4,100,000.

- **Via Vera Cruz Bridge and Street improvements (SM32):** This new project would widen the roadway to four lanes and to construct a bridge at San Marcos Creek. The total project is $14,000,000.

City of Santee

The City has received state Proposition 1B Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP) funds resulting in reprioritization of several traffic signal projects. The projects included for this amendment are **Mast Boulevard Street Lighting (SNT08)**, **Prospect Avenue and Fanita Drive Signal Improvements (SNT09)**, Magnolia Avenue Traffic signal Synchronization (SNT10),
and Mission Gorge Road Traffic Signal Synchronization (SNT11). Additional details are included in Table 1.

**Fiscal Constraint Analysis**

Federal regulations require the 2008 RTIP to be a revenue-constrained document with programmed projects based upon available or committed funding and/or reasonable estimates of future funding. Funding assumptions are generally based upon: (1) authorized or appropriated levels of federal and state funding from current legislation; (2) conservative projections of future federal and state funding based upon a continuation of current funding levels; (3) the most current revenue forecasts for the TransNet program; and (4) the planning and programming documents of the local transportation providers.

Tables 2a through 2c (Attachment 4) provide updated program summaries including a comparison from the prior approved version. (Chapter 4 of the Final 2008 RTIP discusses, in detail, the financial capacity analysis of major program areas including discussion of available revenues). Based upon the analysis, the projects contained within the 2008 RTIP, including Amendment No. 1, are reasonable when considering available funding sources.

**Air Quality Analysis**

On July 25, 2008, SANDAG found the 2008 RTIP in conformance with the Regional Air Quality Strategy/State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the San Diego region. All of the required regionally significant capacity increasing projects were included in the quantitative emissions analysis conducted for the 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan: Pathways for the Future (2030 RTP) and the 2008 RTP. The 2008 RTP and its conformity finding have been submitted to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and a determination of conformity is expected early part of November 2008. The FHWA and the FTA jointly approved the conformity determination for the 2030 RTP and the conformity redetermination for the 2006 RTP on December 10, 2007.

Projects in RTIP Amendment No. 1 meet the conformity provisions of the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR §93.122(g)). All capacity increasing projects in Amendment No. 1 were included in the quantitative emissions analysis conducted for the 2030 RTP and 2008 RTP. All other projects not included in the air quality conformity analysis are either noncapacity increasing or are exempt from the requirement to determine conformity according to the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR §93.126). SANDAG followed interagency consultation procedures to determine which projects are exempt. Amendment No. 1 does not interfere with the timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures. The 2008 RTIP, including Amendment No. 1, remains in conformance with the SIP.

RENÉE WASMUND  
Director of Finance

Attachments:  1. Resolution No. 2009-07: Approving Amendment No. 1 to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program  
   2. Excerpts of comments from ITOC  
   3. Table 1: 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, Amendment No. 1  
   4. Tables 2a, 2b, 2c: Fiscal Constraint Analysis

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, ski@sandag.org
WHEREAS, on July 25, 2008 SANDAG adopted the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and found the 2008 RTIP in conformance with the 1998 Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and the applicable State Implementation Plans (SIPs); and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors has submitted the adopted 2008 RTIP and its conformity document to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for approval; and

WHEREAS, on December 10, 2007, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) determined the 2006 RTIP and 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan: Pathways for the Future (2030 RTP) conform to the applicable SIPs in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93; and

WHEREAS, member agencies have requested various changes to existing projects for inclusion into the 2008 RTIP as shown in Table 1 (Attachment 3); and

WHEREAS, the amendment is consistent with the metropolitan transportation planning regulations per 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 450; and

WHEREAS, the amendment is consistent with the 2030 RTP which conforms to the 1994 and 2002 SIPs; and

WHEREAS, the regionally significant capacity increasing projects have been incorporated into the quantitative air quality emissions analysis and conformity findings conducted for the 2030 RTP and the 2008 RTIP; and

WHEREAS, Amendment No. 1 to the 2008 RTIP continues to provide for timely implementation of transportation control measures contained in the adopted RAQS/SIP for air quality and a quantitative emissions analysis demonstrates that the implementation of the RTIP projects and programs meet all the federally required emissions budget targets; and

WHEREAS, projects in Amendment No. 1 satisfy the transportation conformity provisions of 40 CFR 93.122(g) and all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450; and

WHEREAS, all other projects in Amendment No. 1 are either noncapacity increasing or exempt from the requirements to determine conformity; and
WHEREAS, the 2008 RTIP Amendment No. 1 is a fiscally constrained document as shown in Tables 2a through 2c (Attachment 4); and

WHEREAS, the amendment is consistent with the Public Participation Policy adopted by the SANDAG Board; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors has delegated the approval of RTIP amendments to the Transportation Committee;

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Transportation Committee does hereby approve Amendment No. 1 to the 2008 RTIP, pending receipt of the U.S. DOT’s finding of conformity on the 2008 RTIP; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that SANDAG finds the 2008 RTIP, including Amendment No. 1, is consistent with the 2030 RTP, is in conformance with the applicable SIPs and 1998 RAQS for the San Diego region, is consistent with SANDAG Intergovernmental Review Procedures, and is consistent with SANDAG Public Participation Policy, as amended.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 7th day of November 2008.
3. STATE ROUTE (SR) 76 CORRIDOR UPDATE AND BUDGET ADJUSTMENT (RECOMMEND)

Allan Kosup, Caltrans Corridor Director provided an update on the SR 76 Corridor. Mr. Kosup will provide an update on the status of transportation improvements to the SR 76 corridor and a proposed budget adjustment to the Transportation Committee meeting at its October 17, 2008, meeting.

Mr. Kosup stated that the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) SR 76 corridor projects will widen and realign eleven miles of conventional highway through the environmentally sensitive San Luis Rey River Valley. This corridor is recognized in the TransNet extension ordinance as having implementation priority as it was one of the uncompleted projects included in the Expenditure Plan for the original TransNet program. The 2005 baseline estimate for the corridor is $483 million.

The corridor is comprised of three projects with approved 2007 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budgets. The three projects are the SR 76 Middle from Melrose Drive to S. Mission Road with a budget of $158 million; the SR 76 East from South Mission Road to Interstate 15 (I-15) with a budget of $242 million; and the SR 76 Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) with a budget of $83 million. This project was identified as one that would have a net environmental benefit and Mr. Kosup reviewed mitigation and enhancement examples that would be used in this project.

Caltrans anticipates federal approval of the Final Environmental Document and Project Report for SR 76 Middle in November 2008. The Final Project Report contains an updated estimate for SR 76 Middle of $244 million, which exceeds the current approved CIP budget by $86 million.

The $158 million baseline budget for SR 76 Middle was established in 2004 based on an escalated 1999 planning level estimate. The current $244 million estimate reflects increased commodity prices, the addition of more stringent water quality standards, revisions to grading methodology and extensive roadway protection adjacent to the river. Additional scope was added in the form of environmental enhancements that include animal crossings, wildlife fencing, and native revegetation of barren slopes. To control the project cost, the team has, through extensive value analysis efforts, reduced the project footprint, limiting wetland impacts while at the same time reducing right of way impacts. Given the middle project’s schedule for environmental approval, full construction funding must be programmed at this time.

The baseline schedule for the middle project anticipated a construction start of July 2009. That start will be delayed until early 2010 although the use of the “Design Sequencing” delivery methodology will allow Caltrans to open SR 76 Middle in advance of the current December 2012 baseline date. Design Sequencing will save approximately 12 months on the project. Legislation for design sequencing expires in 2010 so Caltrans is focused on beginning construction in 2009.

SR 76 East environmental studies are underway and Caltrans has scheduled the release of the Draft Environmental Document in early 2009. Formal consultation with federal and state resource agencies began with a June 2008 meeting. Project alternatives are in development and will be refined based on data gathered and public input at a scheduled October 22, 2008, public meeting. The current $242 million estimate for SR 76 East is a planning level estimate. Based on this estimate,
the final corridor cost would exceed the current budget by $86 million. However, Caltrans is not proposing a cost increase at this time due to ongoing alternative development, incomplete scope definition, and potential new revenue sources including developer contributions, County Transportation Impact Fees, and casino development agreements for expansion mitigation.

While the baseline schedule for delivery of the SR 76 East environmental document has moved to early 2010, Caltrans anticipates completing all corridor construction in advance of the 2014 completion date included in the current CIP.

The SR 76 EMP project has purchased two mitigation properties to date and is actively pursuing additional parcels at this time. This item transfers $12 million from SR 76 EMP to SR 76 Middle to fund environmental enhancements included in the project’s scope.

In early 2008 the region requested state funding for SR 76 Middle as a part of the 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process. The region did not receive those funds due to a statewide shortage of funding for the STIP. This item proposes to fully fund the Middle project by advancing TransNet funds previously programmed for right-of-way on SR 76 East as well as using funds from the SR 52 corridor. These programming actions will not jeopardize timely delivery of any previously approved early action projects. This approach allows the region to use available federal dollars prior to using TransNet funds and in the spring of 2009, the annual comprehensive review of the TransNet Plan of Finance will be performed to assess other potential modifications to project budgets, including the utilization of past and anticipated construction bid savings.

Richard Chavez, Principal Engineer emphasized that this action does not revise the budget. The action will shift funds from the East project to fully fund the Middle project. The Middle project must be fully funded in order to get the environmental approval. Mr. Chavez stated that the shortfall to the East project would be funded with other sources as the funding becomes necessary.

Mr. Cummins requested clarification regarding the $12 million in biological mitigation program (BMP) funds that are being shifted to the Middle project from the East project and the source of those funds to backfill the East project, and whether any other BMP funds would be taken from the Mitigation project.

Mr. Kosup stated that the proposed funding of $244 million for the Middle project includes “hardscape” features. Some of that is built in to the project and not considered enhancements. The mitigation enhancement portion will be funded with the $12 million which are not included in the projects scope. Mr. Kosup stated that only the $12 million is proposed to be moved from the Mitigation project to fund the Middle project. Potentially the East project may require funding for “hardscape” features but will not know the dollar amount until the scope is developed.

Mr. Chavez stated that the $12 million would fund the difference between the cost of what would normally be done for mitigation purposes on the project and what is required for the enhanced mitigation features for this project. This is a budget action to show that the Middle project is fully funded to meet the requirement for environmental approval.

Ms. Harrison asked whether the funding for the Middle project can take into account the potential new revenue of $40 million from the casino expansion mitigations, developer contributions, and the County’s Transportation Impact Fee to show the project as fully funded. Ms. Harrison also requested clarification of how those potential new revenues would be tracked and budgeted into the project.
Mr. Kosup stated that those funds are targeted specifically for the East project and can’t be used now for the Middle project. If no other revenue sources are found for the East project, and we can’t find a way to reduce to cost for the East project, we would either ask to reduce the scope of the project or request additional funding. At that time, we would propose use of these potential new revenue sources because at that time we would have agreements in place that would specify the amount of the funds available. The funds would then be placed in Plan of Finance and the RTIP and identified for funding the East project.

Ms. Harrison requested clarification regarding combining two projects in this area into one.

Mr. Kosup stated that there were originally three construction segments for the Middle project but the plan is to bid the Middle project as one construction project instead of three segments. The potential new revenue sources are targeted for the East project and those agreements are not in place. Even if they were, it would be difficult to get agreement to use that funding for the Middle project.

Chair Meyer expressed his concern that the $168 million in funding identified for the East project was not a realistic number and stated it would be more appropriate to show a deficit. The East segment from S. Mission Road to I-15 is a very large segment for funding.

Mr. Kosup stated that the $168 million is a placeholder and funding for this project will be readdressed as part of a comprehensive program discussion next year. He stated that this action would not delay the East project because we are currently working on finding funds to continue the project but it is important now to move the funds to ensure the Middle project does not get delayed.

Chair Meyer stated that Palomar College passed a bond several years ago and it did not include funding improvements to SR 76. He asked whether Caltrans was negotiating this as part of their development fees negotiations.

Mr. Kosup stated that in addition to Palomar College there are two other major developments in that area; the environmental document for Palomar College does address mitigation because of those concerns.

Chair Meyer requested clarification of the timeline. He stated that the Middle project timeline indicates the final environmental document is expected in 2008 and construction begins in early 2010 but no activity is indicated during 2009.

Mr. Kosup stated that during 2009 the design manager develop a design package for the project, we will undergo rights of way acquisitions, utility companies will move their utilities, as well as working with the resource agencies on biological surveys and resource management.

Chair Meyer stated that Mr. Kosup should include that information in his presentation to the Transportation Committee.

Mr. Cummins expressed his concerns regarding the budget numbers for SR 76 East. He stated that he would like to have a breakdown of projects costs and where they are allocated. He stated that he would like the Transportation Committee to be given a clear explanation of the ramifications of
this action and any possible alternatives, including a no-build option. He stated that he would like to have staff give a presentation on design sequencing at a future ITOC meeting. Mr. Cummins expressed his concerns regarding the budget for the BMP and stated that the costs identified are underestimated in the regional plan and could have negative impacts on the 40 year TransNet program.

Mr. Garcia asked whether the environmental document addresses a no build option, and Mr. Kosup stated that it addresses the existing alignment, moving the alignment to the south of the river, and a no build option. He stated the existing alignment was the most cost effective and least environmentally damaging so that was selected.

Mr. Kosup stated that for Middle project there were no alternatives that would keep the existing scope of four lanes. Caltrans has done several studies on alternatives and that is what resulted in the current scope. The East project has several different alternatives to the scope. When the project comes forward and if there is a cost increase, those alternatives will be addressed and decisions will need to be made.

Mr. Cummins requested clarification regarding why Caltrans did not originally allocate BMP funds for the $12 million of mitigation dollars that are being moved out of the project.

Mr. Chavez stated that they did not know how many hardscape features would be included in the Middle project and the cost estimate for the enhanced mitigation features is $12 million.

Chair Meyer expressed his concerns that the placeholder funds for the East project of $168 million are not valid and way too low, and that needs to be made very clear in the report.

Mr. Garcia stated that he would like to see all changes to the Plan of Finance presented at one time if possible.

Mr. Stoll stated that he would schedule a report to the ITOC on design sequencing. He stated that staff does an annual TransNet Plan of Finance update which is scheduled for the first of the year and that update will address overall issues on each of the corridors, updating the estimates, and providing a status report of revenue and cost for each project. He stated that the SR 76 Middle project could not get its final environmental document without being fully funded so that is why it has come before the ITOC now.

Action: Upon a motion by Mr. Garcia and a second by Mr. Gerow, the ITOC recommended that the Transportation Committee recommend that the Board of Directors approve the redistribution of funds between State Route 76 corridor projects to fully fund the construction phase of State Route 76 Middle. The ITOC recommendation is based on the fact that information requested by the members would be provided to them for consideration. (Mr. Cummins opposed due to concerns with BMP program and funding.)
5. FUNDING EXCHANGE FOR SPRINTER PROJECT (RECOMMEND)

Jose Nuncio, Senior Engineer Financial Programming stated that in December 2006, the Board of Directors approved an amendment to the TransNet Ordinance to add the SPRINTER project to the Early Action Program. This amendment was the result of a $98.6 million budget increase. The funding plan supporting this budget increase included $50 million in anticipated Proposition 1B funds distributed through the State Transit Assistance (STA) process. The state has appropriated only approximately $8.6 million of these funds, and it now appears that the state will appropriate the remainder of the funds over a period of several years, thus causing a cash flow problem for the North County Transit District (NCTD). This report outlines a proposed funding exchange to insure that NCTD will have adequate and timely resources to pay for the SPRINTER’s remaining expenditures. The SPRINTER approved budget would remain unchanged at $484.1 million.

The state legislature approved an initial appropriation in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 of $600 million, which represents one sixth of the funds intended to be distributed to transit agencies according to the STA formula. Of these funds, NCTD’s share amounted to approximately $8.6 million. The FY 2009 state budget, just recently approved after a nearly three-month delay, includes an appropriation of $350 million from this same account, or just under one tenth of the funds approved by the voters. On a formula basis, this represents approximately $5 million that could be applied to the SPRINTER project. The process to access these funds, however, has not yet been made public and could take several months before the funds are actually received. The remainder of the Proposition 1B STA funds ($2.65 billion statewide) remains to be appropriated and it is unclear at this time how the state legislature intends to appropriate them in the future.

NCTD has provided a cash flow analysis that indicates a negative monthly ending balance began in September 2008, in the amount of approximately $2.5 million. This negative monthly ending balance is projected to grow to nearly $33 million in the absence of additional funds by the end of the fiscal year. Due to the uncertainty and the delay in the determination of the distribution of this year’s funds and the lack of a longer-term distribution plan for the remainder of the Proposition 1B STA funds, it is therefore proposed that the funding plan previously approved be revised to replace the remaining Proposition 1B STA funds yet to be received with TransNet Major Corridor funds.

As was previously reported by staff to the Transportation Committee at its September 19, 2008, meeting, the current estimate at completion (EAC) is $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 Federal Transit Administration is $484.1 million, giving NCTD an additional $5 million of capacity between budget and EAC.

Mr. Nuncio reviewed the proposed revised SPRINTER funding plan. The main element of the plan is exchanging the nearly $41.4 million in pending Proposition 1B STA funds for TransNet funds. It should be noted the proposed funding exchange does not adversely impact the schedule of any currently programmed TransNet project.

Other minor revisions are also proposed. As mentioned previously, approximately $8.6 million of the originally anticipated $50.0 million have been received. These funds would remain in the funding plan. The remaining approximately $41.4 million would be exchanged with TransNet Major Corridor funds. As the legislature appropriates and the state makes available the remaining Proposition 1B
funds, these will be programmed by SANDAG in eligible TransNet projects, thereby replacing previously programmed TransNet funds. SANDAG is currently developing several TransNet projects that can potentially receive the Proposition 1B funds as they are appropriated. Among these projects are the Mid-Coast, the Super Loop, the South Bay Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), and the Blue Line Stations Improvement and Low-Floor Vehicle Acquisition. Staff will propose amendments to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to program these funds as more information on the future Proposition 1B funds becomes available.

Staff will provide the Transportation Committee with oral comments regarding any feedback the ITOC may have. Pending approval by the Transportation Committee, this item will be brought to the full board at its October 24, 2008, meeting for final approval. If approved, a request to add the revised SPRINTER funding plan to the RTIP would be brought to the Transportation Committee for approval at its November 7, 2008, meeting.

Mr. Bahadori expressed his concerns that the $41.4 million swap would not be backfilled by Proposition 1B funds due to the State's budget crisis and current economic conditions, and whether any other projects in the TransNet program are impacted if these funds are not replaced. He commented that after the elections there will be new budget negotiations by the State and we can't assume the funds will be disbursed, and if we use these funds now there is no guarantee that there will be funds for future projects. Mr. Bahadori questioned why TransNet funds were being used and not another type of funds. He expressed his concerns that using TransNet funds in this manner jeopardized the entire program. Mr. Bahadori stated that this is not a loan but a request for more TransNet funds and increase in the TransNet budget.

Ms. Harrison expressed her agreement with Mr. Bahadori’s concerns and requested clarification from staff regarding what other funding options would be available if this recommendation does not get approved.

Mr. Nuncio stated that Proposition 1B was voter approved and we expect the funds to be disbursed, the only question is the timing of disbursement. This is an Early Action Program (EAP) TransNet project so using TransNet funds is authorized. The Board of Directors has made similar funding swaps within TransNet to deliver projects. Mr. Nuncio stated that the TransNet funds are readily available and there are no other funds that would be available to meet the timeline for the SPRINTER. The SPRINTER project is complete and needs to be paid for with a method that doesn’t increase costs or delay the project. This action does not increase the budget for the SPRINTER; staff is managing the funds that are currently available.

Chair Meyer commented that there is a difference between authorization and appropriation of federal funding and asked whether Proposition 1B was first approved by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and why it has to go back through the legislature.

Mr. Nuncio stated that there are a number of funding elements in Proposition 1B and the CTC does allocated some of those funds for individual projects. The funding for transit was subject to annual appropriation by the legislature and distributed according to the State Transit Assistance (STA) funding formula.

Mr. Garcia requested clarification regarding how the bond debt is paid and staff confirmed it was paid from the general fund.
Mr. Stoll stated that Proposition 1B is a voter commitment and a large part of our Plan of Finance is dependent of Proposition 1B funds. It may be possible that the State would not fund Proposition 1B but not probable. Staff is not presenting this as an increase in TransNet funding but as a method of managing funding that is available.

Discussion ensued regarding the lack of assurances that Proposition 1B funds would be made available or assurances that this funding would happen sooner rather than later, and the members expressed concerns that they are being asked to make this decision without knowing what other alternative funding sources are available.

Mr. Gerow stated that the ITOC must consider that because Proposition 1B is voter approved, and that the ITOC is obligated to assume that those funds will become available and not take any action that would jeopardize a project.

Ms. Harrison stated that those funds should be used when they are actually available and look at alternative funding for this project that is available now.

Richard Hannasch, NCTD Finance Director stated that we do need to use funds that are available and the TransNet funds are readily available. Use of the TransNet funds will not delay any other projects, and in the short run if we don’t use these funds it could potentially drive the cost of the project up because of penalties and other costs.

Mr. Boda stated that if funding under Proposition 1B does not occur it would negatively impact projects statewide. The voters want Proposition 1B and the option to not go forward with Proposition 1B would bring transportation projects statewide to a halt. He stated that all of Proposition 1B will eventually be funded, to include the replacement of the TransNet funds under consideration.

Susan Brown, Financial Manager of Programming stated that 94 percent of all our other funding is committed to the TransNet EAP which limits our ability to substitute any other funds.

Mr. Nuncio stated that 94 percent of our non-TransNet funds are already programmed for TransNet EAP and programmed in the RTIP. One of the options, in this type of cash flow situation, when programmed funds are available but not needed yet, is to move those funds to the project that needs funding now. Staff has looked at alternative funding options but the recommendation minimizes the impact to the schedule and delivery of any other TransNet transit projects. Additionally the only other funding availability at this time is federal funding that can not be used for projects that are already built.

Mr. Bahadori expressed his concerns that TransNet funds are being used as a reserve fund when other funding options are not available and that SANDAG is taking this approach too often jeopardizing the TransNet program. He stated his desire that when the Proposition 1B funds are available they be prioritized to repay the TransNet loan to the SPRINTER project before any other debt or project.

Staff responded that the Proposition 1B funds would be programmed for eligible TransNet projects and funds are prioritized to those projects based on readiness. The SPRINTER is already built and would have the highest priority. Staff responded that when the Proposition 1B funds are received they would be prioritized to repay the SPRINTER loan before funding any other project.
Ms. Harrison requested staff at SANDAG and NCTD provide a report to the ITOC on any other funding alternatives and the impacts of using those alternative funding options versus using TransNet funds.

Mr. Stoll stated that the item goes to the Transportation Committee this same week on Friday and that staff can take direction from the ITOC and report the advice, input and concerns to the Transportation Committee. He stated that staff could provide information on any other funding options available and the impact of using that funding over TransNet.

Ms. Harrison stated that they did not want staff to give the impression to the Transportation Committee that they would approve this action.

Mr. Garcia asked whether in the history of bonding in California whether any bond issue has not been fulfilled and Mr. Bahadori replied that he didn’t think it had ever happened but that did not change his concerns at this time.

Mr. Cummins stated that he could not support the action at this time. He commented that there was not enough time to consider the item and make a decision and provide a response by Friday. Mr. Cummins requested staff to report back to the ITOC on the action taken on this item by the Transportation Committee. He stated that this action gives NCTD more TransNet funds and asked whether SANDAG can require NCTD to repay the funds by a particular deadline if Proposition 1B funds do not become available or are not available soon enough.

Mr. Nuncio replied that the SPRINTER is a TransNet project and placing those conditions on NCTD would be too constricting. He stated the Board of Directors has never required this condition and it would not appear to be a fair proposal for the region.

Mr. Stoll stated that it would be possible to recommend that NCTD be required to repay the loan if Proposition 1B funds do not become available and let the NCTD Board of Directors determine whether to accept the funds under that condition but it is doubtful if this would be approved.

Mr. Bahadori stated that NCTD has requested additional funding for the SPRINTER in the past and are now asking for even more funding. He expressed his concerns that NCTD would request more funding because there are outstanding risks to the budget from claims.

Mr. Stoll stated that these two requests are very different. NCTD requested a budget adjustment in 2006 but this request is not to increase the budget but to swap funds already budgeted for the project.

Mr. Linthicum stated that risks to the budget from claims are already addressed in developing the budget.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mr. Bahadori and a second by Mr. Garcia the ITOC voted to approve the staff recommendation with the following conditions: (1) staff will provide additional assurances regarding the timeliness for the receipt of Proposition 1B funds, (2) that the first priority for distribution of any Proposition 1B funds would be for repayment of the $41.4 million loan, (3) NCTD would not be authorized to borrow any other funds until the $41.4 million loan is repaid in full, and (4) express to the Transportation Committee the ITOC concerns that with the downturn in the
economy and lower sales taxes numbers that use of TransNet funds to backfill projects that are not receiving funding from other sources will cause problems in the future. The motion failed by a tie vote.

After further discussion the consensus of the ITOC was to direct staff to report to the Transportation Committee that: (1) the ITOC made no decision on this item, and (2) to express the ITOC concerns and comments to the Transportation Committee, and (3) to inform the Transportation Committee of the failed motion and conditions of the failed motion.

6. 2008 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP): AMENDMENT NO. 1 (RECOMMEND)

Sookyung Kim, Financial Programming Manager presented the item. SANDAG, at its meeting on July 25, 2008, approved the 2008 RTIP, the multibillion dollar program of projects covering the period from FY 2009 to FY 2013 and funded by federal, state, TransNet local sales tax, and other local funding sources. SANDAG is processing Amendment No. 1 to the 2008 RTIP as part of its quarterly amendment cycle in response to requests for changes from member agencies.

Based on the provisions of the TransNet Extension Ordinance, the ITOC is responsible for reviewing projects proposed for funding with TransNet funds and providing comments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee and to the Board of Directors for consideration when actions are taken on the RTIP.

The quarterly amendment for this period usually falls in October of each year; however, SANDAG anticipates federal approval of the 2008 RTIP to be delayed until the first week of November. As a result the first quarterly amendment to the 2008 RTIP has been delayed until the November Transportation Committee meeting. Amendment No. 1 includes changes as requested by member agencies. Ms. Kim stated that Table 1 of the report provides the project descriptions, proposed changes, and funding for projects proposed for amendment, and Table 2 provides the TransNet capacity analysis for the two jurisdictions proposing to program TransNet Local Street Improvements in this amendment. She reviewed each project and responded to questions and comments.

Members expressed concerns that the estimated total cost for the SR 76 East project was under budgeted and requested a notation on that item noting that the estimate is low and does not reflect actual cost of the project.

Ms. Kim stated that SANDAG identified funds remaining under the original TransNet program for each of our member agencies and requested they use those funds for existing projects prior to using funds under the TransNet Extension Ordinance. The City of Encinitas submitted a list of projects where they swapped the originally programmed TransNet Extension funding with general funds or original TransNet Ordinance funds.

Mr. Bahadori questioned the use of TransNet Congestion Relief funds for project ENC19 Traffic Safety/Calming stating that these funds are to be used for this type of project in growth management areas only or the project should be categorized as Maintenance. Mr. Cummins stated that he is very familiar with this area and stated that he did not believe this project was in a smart growth area nor was it eligible for Congestion Relief funds. Mr. Stoll and Ms. Kim stated that they would research the type of project, whether it is in a smart growth area and whether it is eligible for this funding.
Ms. Kim stated that staff reviews the projects to make sure they are eligible under the program and Mr. Cummins requested that the RTIP reflect that the project is eligible and how each project is eligible for funding under TransNet.

Mr. Cummins expressed concerns regarding the budgeting of $100 million for biological mitigation program and that he felt there was too much money programmed if the focus was on advanced acquisitions to cut costs. He stated that this may not be a good use of TransNet funds.

Ms. Kim stated that the amount that is programmed does not indicate the actual funds that would be expended in that year. The numbers are programmed annually and based on the previous year; actual numbers could be less.

Mr. Bahadori asked whether the environmental agreement included deadlines for advanced acquisitions.

Mr. Stoll stated that the concept in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the resource agencies was to push forward acquisitions sooner so that any values could be established in advance. He stated that he could have Keith Greer report to the ITOC on the acquisition strategy.

Discussion ensued regarding the advance acquisition of properties in accordance with the MOA and the strategy and process for purchasing property, how the current and future values of property will affect advance acquisitions and how the funds are programmed, and the fact that certain properties need to be mitigated now and purchased right away.

Mr. Bahadori requested clarification regarding the thirty percent of funds identified for maintenance requirements and whether it was calculated annually or over the life of the program, and Ms. Kim stated that it is calculated annually.

Ms. Kim stated that the draft Amendment No. 1 to the 2008 RTIP was distributed for public review and comment on September 30, 2008. The draft also is available on the SANDAG RTIP web page, as well as the Caltrans programming web page. The comment period ends October 22, 2008. As of the date of this report, SANDAG has not received any public comments.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mr. Bahadori and a second by Chair Meyer, the ITOC found the proposed RTIP modifications eligible and qualified expenditures for TransNet funds except for the Sprinter project.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mr. Bahadori and a second by Chair Meyer, the ITOC found that proposed modifications to the RTIP the best and most efficient use of TransNet funds with no significant cost increases and/or scope changes on the major corridor projects as identified in the expenditure plan except for the SPRINTER project. (Mr. Cummins abstained due to his concerns regarding the BMP program funding.)
### Table 1
2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
Amendment No. 01
San Diego Region (in $000s)

**Caltrans**

- **MPO ID:** CAL26
- **Capacity Status:** CI
- **RTIP #:** 08-01

**TITLE:** State Route 52 Freeway (E&F)

**DESCRIPTION:** In San Diego, Santee and Lakeside, from SR 125 to Cuyamaca Street to SR 67. - construct 4 lane freeway.

**CHANGE REASON:** Reduce funding, Revise funding between fiscal years, Revise funding between phases

**EA NO:** 010611  **PPNO:** 0260  **EST TOTAL COST:** $526,477

**RTP PAGE NO:** A-5  **SANDAG ID:** 1205203

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARMARK NO: CA424/604, HPP 1134/2735</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMO</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$47,330</td>
<td>$22,438</td>
<td>$24,892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,438</td>
<td>$24,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP - Conversion</td>
<td>$22,177</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,555</td>
<td>$19,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP NHS</td>
<td>$3,010</td>
<td>$3,010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,125</td>
<td>$885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP State Cash</td>
<td>$5,355</td>
<td>$5,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,732</td>
<td>$623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP NHS</td>
<td>$26,558</td>
<td>$26,558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,848</td>
<td>$20,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP Prior NHS</td>
<td>$16,375</td>
<td>$16,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP Prior State Cash</td>
<td>$802</td>
<td>$802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP State Cash</td>
<td>$192,669</td>
<td>$192,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,140</td>
<td>$26,205</td>
<td>$155,324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSP</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - H</td>
<td>$44,340</td>
<td>$44,340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$671</td>
<td>$43,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$109,611</td>
<td>$67,847</td>
<td>$9,925</td>
<td>$13,942</td>
<td>$6,230</td>
<td>$4,667</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$11,460</td>
<td>$54,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC AC</td>
<td>$22,177</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(2,555)</td>
<td>$(19,622)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$526,477</strong></td>
<td><strong>$457,821</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,817</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,942</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,667</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,976</strong></td>
<td><strong>$234,133</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMO</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP Conversion</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$47,330</td>
<td>$22,438</td>
<td>$24,892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,438</td>
<td>$24,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP - Conversion</td>
<td>$45,101</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,555</td>
<td>$25,146</td>
<td>$17,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP NHS</td>
<td>$3,010</td>
<td>$3,010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,125</td>
<td>$885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP State Cash</td>
<td>$5,355</td>
<td>$5,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,732</td>
<td>$623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP NHS</td>
<td>$26,558</td>
<td>$26,558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,848</td>
<td>$20,710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP Prior NHS</td>
<td>$16,375</td>
<td>$16,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP Prior State Cash</td>
<td>$802</td>
<td>$802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP State Cash</td>
<td>$218,791</td>
<td>$218,791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,140</td>
<td>$26,205</td>
<td>$181,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSP</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - H</td>
<td>$44,340</td>
<td>$44,340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$671</td>
<td>$43,669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$132,542</td>
<td>$67,847</td>
<td>$4,636</td>
<td>$14,675</td>
<td>$41,190</td>
<td>$2,097</td>
<td>$2,097</td>
<td>$9,960</td>
<td>$54,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC AC</td>
<td>$45,101</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(2,555)</td>
<td>$(25,146)</td>
<td>$(17,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$234,133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$598,454</strong></td>
<td><strong>$506,867</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,528</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,942</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,667</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,476</strong></td>
<td><strong>$234,133</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**San Diego Region (in $000s)**

**2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program**

**Amendment No. 01**

**San Diego Region**

---

**Caltrans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID: CAL26B</th>
<th>Capacity Status: CI</th>
<th>RTIP #: 08-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE: SR 52 Auxiliary Lanes, Truck Lane and Inside Widening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: From SR 52/I-15 to Mast Blvd. Undercrossing (7.4/13.3)(Aux Lanes); from Mast Blvd. Undercrossing to SR 52/SR 125 separation(13.3/14.9)(IW); and from west of Santo Road Overcrossing to west of Oak Canyon Bridge (truck lanes). - In San Diego County in San Diego: Phase 1, construct eastbound and westbound auxiliary lanes and construct truck lanes; Phase 2, add one mixed flow lane in each direction, widen two structures and install a ramp meter at Mission Gorge Road (PE only) and widen existing roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE REASON: Reduce funding, Revise project description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHANGE REASON:** Reduce funding, Revise project description

**EA NO:** 2T061X, 2T020X, 267300  **PPNO:** 0706B, 0698, 0702  **EST TOTAL COST:** $41,225

**RTP PAGE NO:** A-5  **SANDAG ID:** 1205202

---

**EA NO:** 2T061X, 2T020X, 267300  **PPNO:** 0706B, 0698, 0702

**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP - State Cash</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$59,369</td>
<td>$23,399</td>
<td>$22,119</td>
<td>$13,851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,234</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$51,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$62,369</td>
<td>$26,399</td>
<td>$22,119</td>
<td>$13,851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,234</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$51,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CHANGE REASON:** Reduce funding, Revise project description

**EA NO:** 2T061X, 2T020X, 267300  **PPNO:** 0706B, 0698, 0702

**EST TOTAL COST:** $41,225

**RTP PAGE NO:** A-5  **SANDAG ID:** 1205202

---

**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP - State Cash</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$38,225</td>
<td>$10,426</td>
<td>$26,436</td>
<td>$1,363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,415</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$33,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$41,225</td>
<td>$13,426</td>
<td>$26,436</td>
<td>$1,363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,415</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$33,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

### Amendment No. 01

**San Diego Region (in $000s)**

**MPO ID:** CAL29

**Title:** SR 76 Middle

**Description:** From Melrose Dr. to So. Mission Rd. - In San Diego County in and near Oceanside - widen from 2 to 4 lanes

**Change Reason:** Add new funding source, Increase funding

**EA No.:** 08010  **PPNo.:** 0759

**EST Total Cost:** $244,201

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earmark No.: CA603/2719</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Prior to Amendment</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$230,908</td>
<td>$35,453</td>
<td>$22,287</td>
<td>$42,050</td>
<td>$11,541</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$13,603</td>
<td>$59,305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The State contributed $13.3M for environmental support outside of the STIP or RTIP*

### Caltrans

**MPO ID:** CAL29B

**Title:** SR 76 East

**Description:** From Mission Rd. to I-15 - widen from 2 to 4 lanes

**Change Reason:** Reduce funding

**EA No.:** 25711

**EST Total Cost:** $241,610

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earmark No.: CA603/2749</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Prior to Amendment</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$234,011</td>
<td>$6,201</td>
<td>$3,714</td>
<td>$1,499</td>
<td>$4,698</td>
<td>$2,594</td>
<td>$21,279</td>
<td>$59,473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Prior to Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$2,892</td>
<td>$2,892</td>
<td>$3,711</td>
<td>$1,499</td>
<td>$4,698</td>
<td>$2,594</td>
<td>$23,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-MC</td>
<td>$20,509</td>
<td>$3,309</td>
<td>$6,187</td>
<td>$1,499</td>
<td>$4,698</td>
<td>$2,594</td>
<td>$23,401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $23,401 | $6,201 | $3,711 | $1,499 | $4,698 | $2,594 | $23,401 | $59,473 | $118,000
### Caltrans

**MPO ID:** CAL31  
**Capacity Status:** CI  
**RTIP #:** 08-01

**TITLE:** SR 125 (Toll, Gap, Connector)

**DESCRIPTION:** From SR 905 to SR 54 - construct 4-lane facility and 6-lane freeway with interchange and HOV provisions

**CHANGE REASON:** Increase funding

**EA NO:** 00300  
**RTP PAGE NO:** A-6

**EST TOTAL COST:** $492,244

#### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$332,946</td>
<td>$332,946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$136,702</td>
<td>$136,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - H</td>
<td>$22,596</td>
<td>$21,403</td>
<td>$1,193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$477,244</strong></td>
<td><strong>$476,051</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,193</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## San Diego Region (in $000s)

### 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

#### Amendment No. 01

**Caltrans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID:</th>
<th>CAL38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Status:</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTIP #:</td>
<td>08-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE:</td>
<td>SR-905 New Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>From I-805 to Otay Mesa Port of Entry - construct 6-lane freeway (Phase 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE REASON:</td>
<td>Revise funding between fiscal years, Revise funding between phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA NO:</td>
<td>093160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPNO:</td>
<td>0374K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP PAGE NO:</td>
<td>A-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARMARK NO:</td>
<td>CA612, HPP 2813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EST TOTAL COST: $450,500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>$105,342</td>
<td>$93,639</td>
<td>$11,703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO - Sec 115</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO - TEA 21</td>
<td>$40,485</td>
<td>$40,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$4,720</td>
<td>$7,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>$11,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP Interstate</td>
<td>$100,666</td>
<td>$100,666</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,944</td>
<td>$28,087</td>
<td>$59,635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP Prior NHS</td>
<td>$6,406</td>
<td>$6,406</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,976</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$4,426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP Prior State Cash</td>
<td>$12,966</td>
<td>$12,966</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$5,966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP State Cash</td>
<td>$23,296</td>
<td>$23,296</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,933</td>
<td>$9,176</td>
<td>$12,187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP Interstate</td>
<td>$20,974</td>
<td>$20,974</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,912</td>
<td>$9,062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP - Sec 117</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$23,365</td>
<td>$23,365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Corridor Program</td>
<td>$91,605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Border</td>
<td>$8,395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$450,500</td>
<td>$336,397</td>
<td>$114,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,373</td>
<td>$229,337</td>
<td>$196,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>$105,342</td>
<td>$93,639</td>
<td>$11,703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO - Sec 115</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO - TEA 21</td>
<td>$40,485</td>
<td>$40,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP Interstate</td>
<td>$100,666</td>
<td>$100,666</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,944</td>
<td>$28,087</td>
<td>$59,635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP Prior NHS</td>
<td>$6,406</td>
<td>$6,406</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,976</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$4,426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP Prior State Cash</td>
<td>$12,966</td>
<td>$12,966</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$5,966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP State Cash</td>
<td>$23,296</td>
<td>$23,296</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,933</td>
<td>$9,176</td>
<td>$12,187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP Interstate</td>
<td>$20,974</td>
<td>$20,974</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,912</td>
<td>$9,062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP - Sec 117</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$23,365</td>
<td>$23,365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Corridor Program</td>
<td>$91,605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Border</td>
<td>$8,395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$450,500</td>
<td>$336,397</td>
<td>$114,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,353</td>
<td>$229,337</td>
<td>$196,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### San Diego Region (in $000s)

#### Caltrans

**MPO ID:** CAL46B  
**Title:** SHOPP Collision Reduction  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Safety - Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**CHANGE REASON:** Increase funding  
**EST TOTAL COST:** $91,099

#### Project Prior to Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (AC)</td>
<td>$72,126</td>
<td>$29,441</td>
<td>$14,157</td>
<td>$17,565</td>
<td>$10,963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP - State Cash</td>
<td>$10,448</td>
<td>$4,918</td>
<td>$1,834</td>
<td>$2,276</td>
<td>$1,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP STP - Collision Reduction</td>
<td>$8,525</td>
<td>$8,525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,099</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,884</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,991</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,841</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,383</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$91,099</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project After Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (AC)</td>
<td>$70,145</td>
<td>$29,441</td>
<td>$12,176</td>
<td>$17,565</td>
<td>$10,963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP - State Cash</td>
<td>$10,191</td>
<td>$4,918</td>
<td>$1,577</td>
<td>$2,276</td>
<td>$1,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP STP - Collision Reduction</td>
<td>$8,525</td>
<td>$8,525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$88,861</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,884</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,753</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,841</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,383</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$88,861</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**MPO ID:** CAL71  
**Title:** I-5/SR 78  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Other - Engineering studies  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**CHANGE REASON:** Increase funding  
**EST TOTAL COST:** $1,000

#### Project Prior to Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP - Sec 117</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project After Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Caltrans

**MPO ID:** CAL104  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**TITLE:** Safe Routes to School  
**Exempt Category:** Air Quality - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities  

**DESCRIPTION:** Various locations - various projects to promote safety around schools including replacing school signs, installing ADA-compliant pedestrian ramps and bike and pedestrian trail, et. al.

**CHANGE REASON:** Carry over from 06-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$474</td>
<td></td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>$6,448</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,057</td>
<td>$1,515</td>
<td>$2,354</td>
<td>$522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,922</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,057</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,713</strong></td>
<td><strong>$522</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$6,922</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EST TOTAL COST:** $6,922

---

**MPO ID:** CAL105  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**TITLE:** Highway Safety Improvement Program  
**Exempt Category:** Safety - Safety Improvement Program

**DESCRIPTION:** Various locations - lump sum for safety improvement projects including constructing medians, turn lanes, reconstruct roadway to increase vertical clearance, installation of pedestrian head, et. al.

**CHANGE REASON:** Increase funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>$5,887</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,807</td>
<td>$943</td>
<td>$3,137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$1,072</td>
<td></td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>$630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,959</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,014</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,178</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,767</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$6,959</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EST TOTAL COST:** $6,959

---

**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>$1,601</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td>$1,544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td></td>
<td>$178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,779</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,722</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,779</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### San Diego Region (in $000s)

**Caltrans**

**MPO ID:** CAL107  
**Title:** 32nd Street - Grade Separation  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Safety - Railroad/highway crossing  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**DESCRIPTION:** From 32nd Street to Harbor Drive - in San Diego, grade separation  
**CHANGE REASON:** Revise funding between fiscal years, Revise funding between phases  
**EA NO:** 29321  
**RTP PAGE NO:** B-5  
**EARMARK NO:** CA380/618  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPP</strong></td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Funds</strong></td>
<td>$66,995</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$20,860</td>
<td>$42,535</td>
<td>$11,350</td>
<td>$13,110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade Corridor Program</strong></td>
<td>$50,665</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,665</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$118,460</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$20,860</td>
<td>$93,200</td>
<td>$12,150</td>
<td>$13,110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPP</strong></td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Funds</strong></td>
<td>$66,995</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$66,795</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$66,795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade Corridor Program</strong></td>
<td>$50,665</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,665</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$118,460</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$117,460</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$117,460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tecate International Border Crossing, Pedestrian Facilities**

**MPO ID:** CAL116  
**Title:** Tecate International Border Crossing, Pedestrian Facilities  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Air Quality - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**DESCRIPTION:** From Tecate International Border Crossing to Thing Road - In San Diego County - improve pedestrian facilities  
**CHANGE REASON:** New project  
**EA NO:** 29490  
**PPNO:** 0743  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STIP-IIP STP TE</strong></td>
<td>$2,110</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td>$311</td>
<td>$1,702</td>
<td>$399</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$1,702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STIP-IIP State Cash</strong></td>
<td>$273</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,383</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$351</td>
<td>$1,922</td>
<td>$451</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$1,922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Otay POE Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities - Paseo De La Amistad International Border Crossing**

**MPO ID:** CAL117  
**Title:** Otay POE Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities - Paseo De La Amistad International Border Crossing  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Air Quality - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**DESCRIPTION:** From Otay Mesa IBC to Siempre Viva Road Overcrossing South - In San Ysidro, on Route 905 from the Otay Mesa International Border Crossing into Mexico to Siempre Viva Road Overcrossing South - improve pedestrian and bicycle aesthetics, accessibility, and safety  
**CHANGE REASON:** New project  
**EA NO:** 26630  
**PPNO:** 0962  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STIP-IIP STP TE</strong></td>
<td>$1,824</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>$1,527</td>
<td>$284</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$1,527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STIP-IIP State Cash</strong></td>
<td>$236</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,060</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>$1,725</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$1,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Encinitas, City of

**MPO ID:** ENC14A  
**Josh:** Street Overlay Program  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Safety - Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L (Cash)</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$910</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$5,760</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION:** Encinitas Boulevard – Willowspring to Rancho Santa Fe Road, Rancho Santa Fe Road – Manchester Ave. to La Bajada Bridge, San Elijo Avenue – Manchester Ave. to Montgomery, Willowspring Drive – Cerro St. to the ERGC Golf Cart Crossing, Cerro Street – Encinitas Blvd. to Willowspring Drive, Leucadia Blvd. – Hermes to Hyemettus Avenue, San Dieguito – Requeza to Melba, Woodmoos Ct. – Willowspring Dr. to End, Winsome Place – Mountain Vista to End - asphalt grinding, 6" dig outs, and 1-1/2" polymer modified asphalt overlay

**CHANGE REASON:** Revise fund source

**EST TOTAL COST:** $5,760

---

### Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Program

**MPO ID:** ENC17  
**Josh:** Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Program  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Air Quality - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$227</td>
<td>$227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$1,370</td>
<td>$1,370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L (Cash)</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,997</td>
<td>$1,597</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION:** Sidewalks on Balour Drive from Santa Fe Drive to Melba, on Cereus Street from Hermes Avenue to Hygeia Ave., on Westminster/Summit from Verdi to Montgomery, Hygeia Ave. from Leucadia Blvd. to 200’ south and on Regal from Golden Road to 300’ north - installation of pathways to include curb, gutter, drainage improvements and landscaping where appropriate

**CHANGE REASON:** Increase funding

**EST TOTAL COST:** $2,997
## Encinitas, City of

**MPO ID:** ENC19  
**Title:** Traffic Safety/Calming  
**Exempt Category:** Safety - Safer non-Federal-aid system roads (Maint)

### DESCRIPTION:

On Rubenstein Avenue, Summit Avenue and Westminster Drive - install traffic safety and calming improvements such as speed humps, chicanes, narrowing roadway, landscaped pop-outs and stop signs.

### CHANGE REASON:

Revise fund source

### EST TOTAL COST:

$1,380

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L Carry Over</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,380</td>
<td>$630</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$1,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L Carry Over</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,380</td>
<td>$630</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$1,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## MPO ID: ENC20

**Title:** North Coast Highway 101 Beautification  
**Exempt Category:** Air Quality - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities (CR)

### DESCRIPTION:

N. Coast Hwy. 101 from A Street to La Costa Avenue - design/construct comprehensive streetscape improvements: new curb, gutter, sidewalk and landscaping - the preferred design includes pedestrian and bicycle improvements, lane reconfiguration, and five traffic circles to facilitate and ease traffic congestion and more efficiently move vehicular traffic.

### CHANGE REASON:

Revise fund source

### EST TOTAL COST:

$3,100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L (Cash)</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L Carry Over</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L (Cash)</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Encinitas, City of

**MPO ID:** ENC28  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**TITLE:** Traffic Signal Modifications  
**Exempt Category:** Other - Traffic signal synchronization projects  
**RTIP #:** 08-01

**DESCRIPTION:** On Santa Fe Drive, El Camino Real and Encinitas Boulevard - install radio communication to traffic signals, hard wiring system to traffic signals

**CHANGE REASON:** Revise fund source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L (Cash)</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$650</strong></td>
<td><strong>$400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$650</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L (Cash)</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$650</strong></td>
<td><strong>$400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$650</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Waiting

**MPO ID:** ENC41  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**RTIP #:** 08-01

**TITLE:** Improvements to the Leucadia Blvd./Coast Hwy. 101/Vulcan Avenue Intersection  
**Exempt Category:** Safety - Railroad/highway crossing

**DESCRIPTION:** Leucadia Blvd. from Vulcan Ave. to N. Coast Hwy. 101 - Installation of curb and gutter on both sides of Leucadia Boulevard; construction of 2’ wide median on Leucadia Blvd. and a sidewalk on north side of railroad equipment. Also includes advance preemption

**CHANGE REASON:** Revise project description, Revise fund source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L Carry Over</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,050</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$750</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,050</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,050</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$750</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Encinitas, City of

MPO ID: ENC43  EXCEPT CATEGORY: Air Quality - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities
TITLE: Encinitas Recreational Trail  RTIP #: 08-01
CAPACITY STATUS: NCI

DESCRIPTION: 3000 Block of from Lone Jack Road to Camino del Rancho - provide trail link between two existing trails - Brookside Trail and Trail 93 - consisting of a 380 linear foot non-motorized, recreational/all-purpose trail; will eliminate equestrian shortcutting along private property and further progress on the City’s Trails Master Plan.

CHANGE REASON: New project

EST TOTAL COST: $37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program  
Amendment No. 01  
San Diego Region (in $000s)

North County Transit District  
MPO ID: NCTD16  
TITLE: Oceanside-Escondido Rail Project  
Capacity Status: CI  
RTIP #: 08-01  

DESCRIPTION: From Oceanside to Escondido - design & construct 22 mile light rail (Sprinter) including 15 stations and maintenance facility  
CHANGE REASON: Revise fund source  

EA NO: R599FB  
PPNO: 8192A  
EST TOTAL COST: $460,266

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (NS)</td>
<td>$152,100</td>
<td>$152,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,930</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,097</td>
<td>$142,073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$14,623</td>
<td>$14,623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 108</td>
<td>$17,615</td>
<td>$17,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-GF RIP State Cash</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bond - STA</td>
<td>$8,603</td>
<td>$8,603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$65,888</td>
<td>$24,070</td>
<td>$41,818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$109,876</td>
<td>$109,876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,421</td>
<td>$82,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$460,266</td>
<td>$418,448</td>
<td>$41,818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,530</td>
<td>$47,133</td>
<td>$401,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (NS)</td>
<td>$152,100</td>
<td>$152,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,930</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,097</td>
<td>$142,073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$14,608</td>
<td>$14,608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds AC</td>
<td>$41,397</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(16,397)</td>
<td>$(12,500)</td>
<td>$(12,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(14,608)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 108</td>
<td>$17,615</td>
<td>$17,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-GF RIP State Cash</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bond - STA</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$8,603</td>
<td>$16,397</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$24,070</td>
<td>$24,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$110,312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,421</td>
<td>$82,891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$460,266</td>
<td>$460,266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,530</td>
<td>$47,133</td>
<td>$401,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5317 New Freedom Program

**MPO ID:** SAN58  
**TITLE:** 5317 New Freedom Program  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Mass Transit - Transit operating assistance  
**CHANGE REASON:** Lump sum for new federal program to provide transit service to elderly and disabled residents

**DESCRIPTION:** Change reason: Revise funding between fiscal years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5317 - NF</td>
<td>$2,141</td>
<td>$1,065</td>
<td>$1,076</td>
<td>$1,989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td>$527</td>
<td>$554</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,223</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - SS</td>
<td>$526</td>
<td></td>
<td>$211</td>
<td>$156</td>
<td>$159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$468</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,987</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,592</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,841</strong></td>
<td><strong>$275</strong></td>
<td><strong>$279</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,680</strong></td>
<td><strong>$307</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Senior Mini-Grant Program

**MPO ID:** SAN84  
**TITLE:** Senior Mini-Grant Program  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Mass Transit - Transit operating assistance

**DESCRIPTION:** TransNet Ordinance created program for senior transportation programs specializing in services for seniors

**CHANGE REASON:** New project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$969</td>
<td></td>
<td>$368</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - SS</td>
<td>$2,945</td>
<td></td>
<td>$940</td>
<td>$951</td>
<td>$1,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,914</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,308</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,232</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,374</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,914</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID: MTS30</th>
<th>Capacity Status: NCI</th>
<th>Exempt Category: Mass Transit - Purchase of office, shop and operating equipment for existing facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE: Bus/Rail Support Equipment and Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>DESCRIPTION: MTS facilities - bus video cameras, bus/rail facility and station security improvements, office/computer equipment, rail traction motors, rail rehabilitation, other misc capital equipment for transit maintenance; design, procure, and install fare collection system for all operators in the County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE REASON: Increase funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>EST TOTAL COST: $59,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$27,604</td>
<td>$11,604</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$27,604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>$1,179</td>
<td>$1,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>$7,690</td>
<td>$2,810</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>$1,086</td>
<td>$1,602</td>
<td>$1,602</td>
<td>$7,690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$5,116</td>
<td>$5,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$3,074</td>
<td>$3,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>$5,919</td>
<td>$699</td>
<td>$1,148</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$5,919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$7,224</td>
<td>$7,224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Security (TSGP)</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59,006</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,706</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,938</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,358</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59,006</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$27,604</td>
<td>$11,604</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$27,604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>$1,179</td>
<td>$1,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>$7,690</td>
<td>$2,810</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>$1,086</td>
<td>$1,602</td>
<td>$1,602</td>
<td>$7,690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$5,116</td>
<td>$5,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$3,074</td>
<td>$3,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>$5,919</td>
<td>$699</td>
<td>$1,148</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$5,919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$7,224</td>
<td>$7,224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57,806</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,706</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,738</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,358</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57,806</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

**MPO ID:** MTS42  
**TITLE:** Job Access Reverse Commute funded Transit Operating Assistance  
**Exempt Category:** Mass Transit - Transit operating assistance Operating Assistance  
**DESCRIPTION:** Route 905 (San Ysidro to Otay Mesa), Route 960 (UTC-Euclid Station) and Route 30 (Weekend Service) - transit operating assistance to fund an unmet need identified in previous Welfare to Work Transit Study and SD Regional Welfare to work transportation plan to mitigate transit service deficiencies; new service will be added for these routes including AM peak northbound trip for Route 960 and expanding the current service in the other two routes; purchase HASTOPS - a module that works with HASTUS software that allows automatic production of bus stop posters and distribute them in a more efficient and effective manner  
**CHANGE REASON:** Increase funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5316 - JARC</td>
<td>$3,494</td>
<td>$2,290</td>
<td>$1,204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$3,447</td>
<td>$2,290</td>
<td>$1,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,941</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,580</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,361</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5316 - JARC</td>
<td>$3,294</td>
<td>$2,290</td>
<td>$1,004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$3,247</td>
<td>$2,290</td>
<td>$957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,541</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,580</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,961</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Old Otay Mesa Road
**MPO ID:** SD155  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Title:** Old Otay Mesa Road  
**Exempt Category:** Air Quality - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities

**Description:** Old Otay Mesa Road from Hawkin Dr. to 1,100 feet west of Crescent Bay Dr. - in San Diego, widen road by approximately 20 feet for the purpose of installing new sidewalk with concrete curb and gutter, and to allow for the installation of bike lanes, guardrails, fence, minor drainage facilities and retaining walls. This project will not increase traffic lanes (CIP 52-775.0/52-642.0)

**Change Reason:** Revise project description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sea World Drive Widening and I-5 Interchange Improvements
**MPO ID:** SD189  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Other - Engineering studies

**Description:** Sea World Drive from Friars Road to Morena Boulevard - in San Diego, future replacement of existing 4-lane bridge with an 8-lane bridge, with new on/off ramps; future widening of approachways to add right turn lanes to improve access to I-5 (CIP 52-706.0) - PE only

**Change Reason:** New project (RAS (A-6))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$12,875</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,175</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,875</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,175</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,875</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Palm Avenue/Interstate 805 Interchange
**MPO ID:** SD190  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Other - Interchange reconfiguration projects

**Description:** On Palm Avenue at Interstate 805 - In San Diego, future widening of Palm Avenue Bridge including providing for repairs to the bridge approaches and abutments, installing sidewalks, signals, striping and signage modifications: also modify freeway on and off ramps (CIP 52-640.0)

**Change Reason:** New project (RAS (TA 7-48))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$13,863</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,188</td>
<td>$2,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,863</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,188</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,863</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Region (in $000s)

2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
Amendment No. 01
San Marcos, City of

MPO ID: SM31 Capacity Status: CI
TITLE: Discovery Street Improvements

DESCRIPTION: Discovery Street from McMahr Rd to Bent Ave/ Craven Rd - In San Marcos, widen roadway to four lane secondary arterial
CHANGE REASON: New project

EST TOTAL COST: $4,100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MPO ID: SM32 Capacity Status: CI
TITLE: Via Vera Cruz Bridge and Street Improvements

DESCRIPTION: Via Vera Cruz from San Marcos Boulevard to Discovery Street - In San Marcos, widen to four lane secondary arterial and construct a bridge at San Marcos Creek
CHANGE REASON: New project

EST TOTAL COST: $14,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mast Boulevard Street Lighting

**MPO ID:** SNT08  
**TITLE:** Mast Boulevard Street Lighting  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Safety - Lighting improvements  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**EST TOTAL COST:** $180

#### DESCRIPTION:
Mast Boulevard from Carlton Hills Boulevard to Cuyamaca Street - In Santee, install street lighting on Mast Boulevard due to utility undergrounding project from Carlton Hills Boulevard to Cuyamaca Street; pull traffic signal interconnect in existing conduit and install pull boxes along same location.

#### CHANGE REASON:
Reduce funding, Revise project description, Revise project scope

#### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prospect Avenue and Fanita Drive Signal Improvements

**MPO ID:** SNT09  
**TITLE:** Prospect Avenue and Fanita Drive Signal Improvements  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Other - Intersection signalization projects  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**EST TOTAL COST:** $194

#### DESCRIPTION:
Prospect Avenue from Fanita Drive @ to Propsect Avenue - In Santee at the intersection of Prospect Avenue and Fanita Drive, relocate existing traffic signal pole to allow for the installation of a dedicated south bound to west bound turn lane; install pavement widening, curb, gutter, sidewalk and drainage improvements.

#### CHANGE REASON:
New project

#### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$194</td>
<td>$194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$194</td>
<td>$194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Magnolia Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization

**MPO ID:** SNT10  
**TITLE:** Magnolia Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Other - Traffic signal synchronization projects  
**RTIP #:** 08-01  
**EST TOTAL COST:** $176

#### DESCRIPTION:
Magnolia Avenue from Mission Gorge Road to Prospect Avenue - In Santee, Magnolia Avenue between Mission Gorge Road and Prospect Avenue replace existing NEMA type signal controllers with 170 type controllers and provide signal interconnect for signal coordination between Santee controllers and the signal controllers being installed at the on and off-ramps by Caltrans for the SR 52 project.

#### CHANGE REASON:
New project

#### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local RTCIP</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bond - TLSP</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$176</td>
<td>$176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Mission Gorge Road Traffic Signal Synchronization

**DESCRIPTION:** Mission Gorge Road from Magnolia Avenue to Fanita Drive - In Santee, Mission Gorge Road between Magnolia Avenue and Fanita Drive replace existing NEMA type signal controllers with 170 controllers and provide interconnect for signal coordination between Santee controllers and the Caltrans signal controllers for the SR 125 and SR 52 on/off-ramps

**CHANGE REASON:** New project

**EST TOTAL COST:** $609

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td></td>
<td>$104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local RTCIP</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bond - TLSP</td>
<td>$415</td>
<td>$415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$90</td>
<td></td>
<td>$415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$609</strong></td>
<td><strong>$609</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$90</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$519</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Various Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID: V07</th>
<th>Capacity Status: NCI</th>
<th>Exempt Category: Other - Advance land acquisitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE: Biological Mitigation Program</td>
<td>RTIP #: 08-01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION:**
Countywide - habitat acquisition, restoration, creation, enhancement, management and monitoring necessary for meeting project mitigation requirements; mitigation efforts will focus on TransNet Early Action Program projects, then Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Revenue Constrained projects, then the remaining RTP projects in this order.

**CHANGE REASON:** Reduce funding

**SANDAG ID:** 1200200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EST TOTAL COST: $440,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - REMP</td>
<td>$336,964</td>
<td>$21,964</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$144,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$336,964</td>
<td>$21,964</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$144,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
#### Amendment No. 01
#### San Diego Region (in $000s)

**RTIP Fund Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Advanced Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Bureau of Indian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP</td>
<td>Border Infrastructure Program (Federal under SAFETEA-LU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA</td>
<td>Bicycle Transportation Account (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>Corridors and Borders Infrastructure Program (Federal under TEA-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (Federal formula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIA</td>
<td>Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (Prop. 1B state bond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO</td>
<td>High Priority Demonstration Program under TEA-21 (Federal discretionary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO-Sec 115</td>
<td>High Priority Demonstration Program under FY 2004 Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO-Sec 117/STP</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program under FHWA Administrative Program (congressionally directed appropriations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (State legislation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBP</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Program under SAFETEA-LU (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation under TEA-21 (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>Hazard Elimination System (Federal administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>High Priority Demonstration Program under SAFETEA-LU (Federal discretionary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRCSA</td>
<td>Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account (Prop. 1B state bond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (State administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRC</td>
<td>Innovative Bridge Research &amp; Construction (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Interstate Maintenance Discretionary (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Indian Reservation Roads program (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCPD</td>
<td>National Corridor Planning &amp; Development (Federal - same as CBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLH</td>
<td>Public Lands Highway (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Public Transportation Account (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTMISE</td>
<td>Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement (Prop. 1B state bond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Recreational Trails Program (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP AC</td>
<td>State Highway Operation &amp; Protection Program federal share (for Caltrans use only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP State Cash</td>
<td>State Highway Operation &amp; Protection Program cash match (for Caltrans use only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School (Federal program administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Interregional Program (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Regional Improvement Program (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5307</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Fixed Guideway Modernization (Formula program)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

**Amendment No. 01**

**San Diego Region (in $000s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 (NS)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary - New Starts Program (Discretionary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5310</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Elderly &amp; Disabled Program (Discretionary allocated by CTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5311</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Rural Program (Formula and Discretionary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5316 (JARC)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Jobs Access Reverse Commute (Discretionary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5317 (NF)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration New Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCIF</td>
<td>Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (Prop. 1B state bond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion Relief Program (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSP</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Community &amp; System Preservation (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA-B</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act-Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Facilities (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>Transportation Enhancement Activities Program (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>Traffic Light Synchronization Program (Prop. 1B state bond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSGP</td>
<td>Transit Security Grant Program (Prop. 1B state bond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>Transportation Systems Management (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-78</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - SR 78 (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-ADA</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - compliance with federal Americans with Disabilities Act (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-B</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Bike (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-BRT/Ops</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Bus Rapid Transit/New Service (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-Border</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Border, part of Major Corridor (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-H</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Highway (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-L</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local Streets &amp; Roads (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax -Local System Improvements (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-MC</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Major Corridors (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-REMP</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Regional Environmental Mitigation (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-S&amp;D</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Senior/Disabled (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-SS</td>
<td>Prop A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Senior Services (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-T</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Transit (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-TSI</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Transit System Improvements (Local)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2a

### 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

#### San Diego Region

**Amendment No. 1 (in $000s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$480,677</td>
<td>$353,724</td>
<td>$459,689</td>
<td>$430,854</td>
<td>$462,114</td>
<td>$463,218</td>
<td>$416,747</td>
<td>$420,550</td>
<td>$1,850,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$467,668</td>
<td>$322,715</td>
<td>$446,097</td>
<td>$417,062</td>
<td>$447,883</td>
<td>$448,987</td>
<td>$401,861</td>
<td>$405,664</td>
<td>$1,794,428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Local Funds</strong></td>
<td>$13,009</td>
<td>$13,009</td>
<td>$13,592</td>
<td>$13,592</td>
<td>$14,231</td>
<td>$14,231</td>
<td>$14,886</td>
<td>$14,886</td>
<td>$55,718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>$1,400,730</td>
<td>$1,600,177</td>
<td>$1,655,051</td>
<td>$1,660,301</td>
<td>$2,006,476</td>
<td>$2,155,979</td>
<td>$1,705,527</td>
<td>$2,100,087</td>
<td>$752,544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other State Funds</strong></td>
<td>$178,925</td>
<td>$158,252</td>
<td>$164,520</td>
<td>$160,770</td>
<td>$205,402</td>
<td>$214,905</td>
<td>$170,427</td>
<td>$209,987</td>
<td>$748,914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,400,730</td>
<td>$1,600,177</td>
<td>$1,655,051</td>
<td>$1,660,301</td>
<td>$2,006,476</td>
<td>$2,155,979</td>
<td>$1,705,527</td>
<td>$2,100,087</td>
<td>$752,544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2012 Revenue Sources

#### Local

- **Sales Tax**
  - City: $467,668
  - County: $522,715
  - Other (e.g., Transportation Development Act): $13,009

#### State

- **State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPPP)**
  - SHOPPP (Including Augmentation): $52,453
  - SHOPPP Prior: $0

- **State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**
  - STIP (Including Augmentation): $8,313
  - STIP Prior: $0

- **Proposition 1 B**
  - GARVEE Bonds*: $108,002

- **Federal Highway Non-Discretionary**

- **Local**
  - Other (registration fees (AB434) and Prop 42): $56,511

- **State**

  - **Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)**: $1,784
  - **Clean Fuel Program (5309)**: $0
  - **Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)**: $19,383
  - **Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program**
    - Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program: $490
  - **Recreational Trails**
    - Recreational Trails: $142
  - **Public Lands Highway Discretionary**
    - Public Lands Highway Discretionary: $0

### FY 2011 Revenue Sources

#### Local

- **Sales Tax**
  - City: $467,668
  - County: $522,715
  - Other (e.g., Transportation Development Act): $13,009

#### State

- **State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPPP)**
  - SHOPPP (Including Augmentation): $52,453
  - SHOPPP Prior: $0

- **State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**
  - STIP (Including Augmentation): $8,313
  - STIP Prior: $0

- **Proposition 1 B**
  - GARVEE Bonds*: $108,002

- **Federal Highway Non-Discretionary**

- **Local**
  - Other (registration fees (AB434) and Prop 42): $56,511

- **State**

  - **Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)**: $1,784
  - **Clean Fuel Program (5309)**: $0
  - **Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)**: $19,383
  - **Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program**
    - Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program: $490
  - **Recreational Trails**
    - Recreational Trails: $142
  - **Public Lands Highway Discretionary**
    - Public Lands Highway Discretionary: $0

### FY 2010 Revenue Sources

#### Local

- **Sales Tax**
  - City: $467,668
  - County: $522,715
  - Other (e.g., Transportation Development Act): $13,009

#### State

- **State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPPP)**
  - SHOPPP (Including Augmentation): $52,453
  - SHOPPP Prior: $0

- **State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**
  - STIP (Including Augmentation): $8,313
  - STIP Prior: $0

- **Proposition 1 B**
  - GARVEE Bonds*: $108,002

- **Federal Highway Non-Discretionary**

- **Local**
  - Other (registration fees (AB434) and Prop 42): $56,511

- **State**

  - **Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)**: $1,784
  - **Clean Fuel Program (5309)**: $0
  - **Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)**: $19,383
  - **Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program**
    - Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program: $490
  - **Recreational Trails**
    - Recreational Trails: $142
  - **Public Lands Highway Discretionary**
    - Public Lands Highway Discretionary: $0

### FY 2009 Revenue Sources

#### Local

- **Sales Tax**
  - City: $467,668
  - County: $522,715
  - Other (e.g., Transportation Development Act): $13,009

#### State

- **State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPPP)**
  - SHOPPP (Including Augmentation): $52,453
  - SHOPPP Prior: $0

- **State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**
  - STIP (Including Augmentation): $8,313
  - STIP Prior: $0

- **Proposition 1 B**
  - GARVEE Bonds*: $108,002

- **Federal Highway Non-Discretionary**

- **Local**
  - Other (registration fees (AB434) and Prop 42): $56,511

- **State**

  - **Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)**: $1,784
  - **Clean Fuel Program (5309)**: $0
  - **Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)**: $19,383
  - **Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program**
    - Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program: $490
  - **Recreational Trails**
    - Recreational Trails: $142
  - **Public Lands Highway Discretionary**
    - Public Lands Highway Discretionary: $0

### Summary

- **Total** includes debt service to 2015.

10/22/2008
### Table 2b

**2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)**

**San Diego Region**

**Amendment No. 1 (in $000s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMED</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>Current Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Previous</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$556,368</td>
<td>$649,978</td>
<td>$536,819</td>
<td>$589,748</td>
<td>$591,330</td>
<td>$571,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$52,453</td>
<td>$54,691</td>
<td>$53,040</td>
<td>$58,117</td>
<td>$58,326</td>
<td>$34,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$58,117</td>
<td>$58,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$58,117</td>
<td>$58,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL TRANSPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$202,753</td>
<td>$189,126</td>
<td>$165,793</td>
<td>$153,293</td>
<td>$238,697</td>
<td>$226,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$108,002</td>
<td>$92,137</td>
<td>$70,698</td>
<td>$58,198</td>
<td>$58,326</td>
<td>$99,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$52,453</td>
<td>$54,691</td>
<td>$53,040</td>
<td>$58,117</td>
<td>$58,326</td>
<td>$34,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$58,117</td>
<td>$58,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL TRANSPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$202,753</td>
<td>$189,126</td>
<td>$165,793</td>
<td>$153,293</td>
<td>$238,697</td>
<td>$226,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$58,117</td>
<td>$58,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL HIGHWAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$78,043</td>
<td>$80,010</td>
<td>$76,991</td>
<td>$79,175</td>
<td>$81,767</td>
<td>$81,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$58,117</td>
<td>$58,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL TRANSPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$202,753</td>
<td>$189,126</td>
<td>$165,793</td>
<td>$153,293</td>
<td>$238,697</td>
<td>$226,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$8,313</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$7,323</td>
<td>$58,117</td>
<td>$58,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL TRANSPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$202,753</td>
<td>$189,126</td>
<td>$165,793</td>
<td>$153,293</td>
<td>$238,697</td>
<td>$226,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63,281</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64,599</strong></td>
<td><strong>$72,909</strong></td>
<td><strong>$75,307</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64,007</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnotes:

- **Total includes debt service to 2015**

10/22/2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE VS. PROGRAMMED</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>Current Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Total</td>
<td>$65,039</td>
<td>$45,923</td>
<td>$87,921</td>
<td>$7,207</td>
<td>$283,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (Including Augmentation)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP Prior</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP (Including Augmentation)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP Prior</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1 B</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARVEE Bonds*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Congestion Relief Program</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STATA)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (FSP, Prop 116)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL TRANSIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Total</td>
<td>$2,318</td>
<td>$2,092</td>
<td>$25,817</td>
<td>$25,817</td>
<td>$25,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Non-Discretionary</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Program (Regional)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Bus (5311)</td>
<td>$1,612</td>
<td>$3,710</td>
<td>$3,906</td>
<td>$3,906</td>
<td>$12,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Bridge Program (HBP)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Urbanized Area Formula Program (5311)</td>
<td>$277</td>
<td>$277</td>
<td>$288</td>
<td>$288</td>
<td>$1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School (SR2S)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit in the Parks (S320)</td>
<td>$1,612</td>
<td>$1,612</td>
<td>$3,710</td>
<td>$3,710</td>
<td>$12,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area Formula Program (S307)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (TSGP)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$2,092</td>
<td>$2,092</td>
<td>$25,817</td>
<td>$25,817</td>
<td>$27,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Discretionary Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Discretionary Program</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Boat Discretionary</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority Projects (HRP)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scenic Byways Program</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lands Highway Discretionary</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (ITS, IM, Sec 112/117, value pricing, STP)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$2,092</td>
<td>$2,092</td>
<td>$25,817</td>
<td>$25,817</td>
<td>$27,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,318</td>
<td>$4,769</td>
<td>$6,622</td>
<td>$6,622</td>
<td>$53,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMMED TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$28,387</td>
<td>$50,692</td>
<td>$94,543</td>
<td>$13,829</td>
<td>$337,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes debt service to 2015
ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR MID-CITY RAPID BUS PROJECT

Introduction

The Mid-City Rapid Bus Project includes the design and implementation of a 10-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. 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. 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. Funding also is expected from the federal Very Small Starts program.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project.

Discussion

A draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared for the project and was circulated for a 30-day public review period. The draft MND was available for review at public libraries, on the SANDAG Web site, and in hard copy and disk. The document was distributed to interested parties, to the State Clearinghouse, and to the County Recorder.

The 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.

A number of comments on the draft MND were received. A number of reviewers raised questions about the parking and traffic impacts of the proposed pop-out stations and bus storage pockets. There also were questions about estimated transit travel time and dwell time at the stations. The comments are incorporated into the final MND (Attachment 1), with responses, and with changes to the MND where appropriate.

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.

Adoption of the MND by the Transportation Committee is needed before final design can proceed.
Next Steps

If the Transportation Committee adopts the final MND, staff also will proceed 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 to the station design drawings to reflect changed conditions and community input. In addition, staff will address the issue brought up by the Transportation Committee regarding combining Rapid Bus and local bus stops.

- Refinement of the shelter design and bus branding. The basic shelter concept has undergone community review at previous workshops and the September 11, 2008, community workshop. Staff anticipates revising the design based on community input and consistency with the Mid-Range Transit Plan (currently underway) that will develop regional guidelines on Bus Rapid Transit project attributes (including stations) to ensure consistency across projects. Staff also will collaborate with the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) to develop a branding design for the articulated buses that will be purchased as part of the Rapid Bus project.

- Collaboration with MTS on the operating plan that will be funded jointly by TransNet and existing MTS resources on Route 15. Operating cost estimates will include frequency enhancements to the existing Route 15 service, maintenance of shelters, fare vending equipment, and on-vehicle signal priority equipment.

- Collaboration with the City of San Diego on issues including station design, traffic control, 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. The current plan is to install the landscaping and irrigation, 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 is in compliance with the requirements of the federal Very Small Starts program.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Mid-City Rapid Bus Project Final Environmental Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration October 2008

Key Staff Contact: Miriam Kirshner, (619) 699-6995, mki@sandag.org
Printed copies of the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project Final Environmental Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration October 2008 may be obtained from the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/midcityrapidbusmnd or by contacting the SANDAG Public Information Office at (619) 699-1950.
**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 transportation system, develop programs 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 the September 19 meeting, the Transportation Committee accepted the Draft 2008 CMP Update for distribution and 30-day public comment period, and scheduled a public hearing for the November 7, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting. Subsequent to the Committee action, copies of the Draft 2008 CMP Update were distributed to SANDAG technical working groups, local jurisdictions, and other interested parties. The Draft CMP also was posted on the SANDAG Web site.

**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.

**Recommendation**

The Transportation Committee is asked to conduct a public hearing on the Draft 2008 CMP Update, and following consideration of public testimony, approve the 2008 CMP Update. The Transportation Committee also is asked to discuss the options outlined in this report for future CMP updates and possible modifications to the CMP arterial network, and to provide direction to staff on these matters for further consideration at a future Transportation Committee meeting.
2008 CMP Update Highlights

Updated CMP Roadway LOS Analysis

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

Eleven CMP transit corridors were evaluated in terms of miles of service provided, number of trips operated, ridership, and average bus speed. 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.

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 or equivalent analysis are included in Attachment 1.

Impacts of the 2030 RTP Improvements on Future Congestion

<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 Segments</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficient Mileage</td>
<td>105.31</td>
<td>100.75</td>
<td>80.90</td>
<td>79.86</td>
<td>81.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1  CMP 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 still will 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 should 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 eliminate the need for specific Deficiency Plans. Corridor System Management Plans are underway for the Interstate 5 (I-5) North and I-805 Corridors in addition to a corridor study for the I-5 South Corridor. 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 FY 2010 budget process.

Changes to the Draft 2008 CMP

The 30-day public comment period ended on October 22, 2008. SANDAG received comments on the Draft 2008 CMP Update from four agencies. The comments and responses are shown in Attachment 2. The comments focus on minor wording changes, Deficiency Plans, and future additions to the CMP arterial network. Minor corrections and edits will be incorporated into the Final 2008 CMP Update, however, there are no substantive changes proposed for the Final 2008 CMP Update.

Options for Future Direction of the CMP

Staff evaluated two strategies for future CMP analysis to determine whether the state CMP process can be conducted on a more cost effective manner, and whether the efficiencies gained would outweigh the policy considerations. One strategy is to streamline the SANDAG CMP process and the other is to opt out of the state CMP process. A description of these strategies and some of the consequences of each are discussed below.

Streamlined CMP Approach

As previously described, the basic state legislative requirements of the CMP are to monitor the performance of the 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.

Staff evaluated incorporating the CMP requirements and monitoring into other SANDAG ongoing planning and monitoring activities, such as the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Annual Performance Monitoring Report and Intergovernmental Review Program. To continue to follow the state CMP requirements, the Office of General Counsel and staff believe it is not necessary to prepare a stand-alone CMP document in the future.

In order to implement the streamlined approach for the CMP monitoring and reporting process, the RCP Annual Monitoring Report would continue to include CMP deficiency analysis information, but it would be expanded to include the other information that is required to be reported for the CMP. The current public review process for the RCP Annual Monitoring Report could serve as the public review process for the CMP as well. This streamlined approach for state mandated CMP monitoring would be fully incorporated into the 2010 RCP performance monitoring report.

CMP Opt Out

The CMP legislation allows 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. All six counties in the Sacramento region, as well as Fresno County, have opted out of the state CMP requirement. One major reason to consider opting out of the State CMP process is that under the law, local jurisdictions are responsible for preparing Deficiency Plans for deficient
Under this option, SANDAG would still comply with federal congestion management provisions; however, this could be done through existing SANDAG planning and performance monitoring activities, such as the RTP.

Benefits and limitations of the state CMP are outlined below as well trade-offs of opting out of the state CMP requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of the State CMP</th>
<th>Limitations of the State CMP</th>
<th>Trade-offs of Opting Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensures that monitoring of the region's transportation system is conducted on a regular basis</td>
<td>• Mandates use of one measure (peak hour LOS) to determine roadway deficiencies</td>
<td>• Local jurisdictions would not be required to prepare and adopt Deficiency Plans or be subject to loss of gas taxes if found noncompliant with state CMP requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies Deficiency Plans that local jurisdictions must prepare for deficient segments</td>
<td>• Requires that Deficiency Plans be prepared and adopted, but not implemented</td>
<td>• Resources allocated to prepare, implement, and enforce the CMP could be used on other planning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies Deficiency Plans that local jurisdictions must prepare for deficient segments</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The process of “opting out” would require a one-time investment of staff time from SANDAG and local jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
If SANDAG continues to update the state CMP, 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, City of San Diego staff disagrees with the criteria used to evaluate new arterials. SANDAG staff modified the criteria based on suggestions from CTAC and staff from the City of San Diego. City of San Diego staff requested additional changes to the criteria, such as a higher threshold of average daily trips, developing a new definition for prime arterials, and an exception for arterials that are located adjacent to or within smart growth areas. SANDAG staff feels the additional proposed changes are not appropriate and could result in a majority of the existing CMP arterials not meeting revised indicators. Therefore, SANDAG staff recommends that both Telegraph Canyon Road/Otay Lakes Road and Mira Mesa Boulevard be added to the CMP network and be included in future CMP updates, should they be continued. 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**

Based on direction received from the Transportation Committee, staff will bring back further information regarding the options for future CMP updates as outlined above, as well as possible modifications to the CMP arterial network, for action at a future Transportation Committee meeting.

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments:  
1. CMP Roadway Segments Requiring Deficiency Plans  
2. Draft 2008 CMP Update Comments and Responses

Key Staff Contact: Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967, hwe@sandag.org
<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></td>
<td>Mission Bay Drive to Gilman Drive</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 8</td>
<td>I-5 to El Cajon Boulevard</td>
<td>Cities of San Diego and La Mesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></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>City of San Diego</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>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/16/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/16/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/16/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/16/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/20/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10/20/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10/20/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10/20/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10/20/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10/22/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10/22/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE REGARDING REVENUE SHARING FOR REGIONAL DAY PASSES

Introduction

In June 2008, the Board of Directors gave a second and final reading to amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance (Fare Ordinance) that included eliminating the North County Transit District (NCTD) Adult Day Pass and replacing it with the Regional Day Pass. Implementation of this change is scheduled for January 1, 2009. This June 2008 amendment was approved contingent upon a new revenue sharing agreement being in place between SANDAG and the transit operators concerning day pass sales by October 2008. Staffs from NCTD, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and SANDAG have now reached agreement on a proposed revenue sharing formula for Regional Day Passes. The First Reading of the proposed amendments to the Fare Ordinance was held on October 17, 2008.

Discussion

The revenue sharing agreements are detailed in Exhibit 1 to the Fare Ordinance, the affected portion of which is included as Attachment 1. The proposed amendments add new language to the portion of the Fare Ordinance entitled “REGULAR AND PREMIUM REGIONAL DAY PASS REVENUE ALLOCATION FORMULA.” Attachment 1 contains only the portion of the Fare Ordinance that is being amended; all other portions of the Fare Ordinance will be unaffected by the proposed amendments. The proposed amendments would go into effect on January 1, 2009, and would apply only to paper pass sales. The amendments allow each transit operator to retain all revenue from Regional Day Passes sold in their district and used exclusively on their vehicles. At the same time, revenue will be shared equally for passes purchased on one system and used on the other system, but only if the number of passes favors one district by 10 percent, and at least 25 passes. Based on surveys conducted in June and September of 2008, the number of passes sold in each district and used in the other district is virtually in balance at this time, and no revenue sharing is required. SANDAG will repeat the survey annually to determine if the new revenue sharing provisions are triggered. The proposed amendments include an expiration date of June 30, 2011, or sooner if the Fare Ordinance is revised to adopt any new revenue sharing recommendations stemming from the regional fare study, a draft of which is scheduled to be discussed at the Transportation Committee meeting on December 12, 2008.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to hold a second reading and adopt proposed amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance in substantially the same form as Attachment 1 that would implement a new revenue sharing formula for Regional Day Passes.
It should be noted that Regional Day Passes are issued primarily on paper from bus fareboxes and ticket vending machines. Regional Day Passes include a magnetic strip; however, the technology does not permit tracking of where the Day Passes are being used, only where they are sold. As a result, SANDAG will conduct an annual survey to determine if the number of passes being used to cross district boundaries is in balance, or if revenue sharing is required. The cost to conduct the survey is about $2,000, which will be shared equitably between SANDAG and the transit operators.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance with proposed amendments

Key Staff Contact: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE

An Ordinance Establishing a Regional
Fare Pricing Schedule

(Excerpt from Exhibit 1 of Fare Ordinance)

REGULAR AND PREMIUM REGIONAL DAY PASS
REVENUE ALLOCATION FORMULA

PROCEDURE DESCRIPTION FOR REGIONAL DAY PASS  EFFECTIVE UNTIL DECEMBER 31, 2008

This procedure shall in effect until such time as the BREEZE/SPRINTER Day Pass is no longer being sold, at which time a new revenue sharing formula shall be adopted.

The total number of Regional Day Passes issued by MTS and NCTD shall be collected and verified.

Each boarding on a MTS bus or NCTD bus with a Regional Day Pass shall be recorded and the total number of boardings shall be reported to SANDAG.

A monthly survey of Trolley riders and a quarterly survey of SPRINTER riders shall be conducted using the statistical procedures developed by SANDAG. From this survey the monthly or quarterly number of Regional Day Pass passengers shall be determined.

The NCTD percentage share of Day Pass revenue shall be calculated by dividing the number of NCTD Regional Day Pass boardings by the total (MTS + NCTD) number of boardings each reporting period. The MTS percentage share of Day Pass revenue shall be calculated by dividing the number of MTS Regional Day Pass boardings by the total (MTS + NCTD) number of boardings each reporting period.

The total revenue from the distribution of all Regional Day Passes shall be determined by adding the revenue received from 1, 2, 3, and 4 day Regional Day Passes and 1 to 7 day Regional Group Advance Day Passes. The revenue allocation for MTS shall be the total revenue times the percentage of Regional Day Pass Boardings on MTS. The revenue allocation for NCTD shall be the total revenue times the percentage of Regional Day Pass Boardings on NCTD.

PROCEDURE DESCRIPTION FOR REGIONAL DAY PASS  EFFECTIVE AS OF JANUARY 1, 2009

I. Applicability
This fare revenue allocation formula is applicable only to Regional Day Passes used by passengers that cross the boundary between the MTS and NCTD service areas. Regional Day Passes are passes that may be used on regular MTS and NCTD bus services (not rural or premium services), the Sprinter and the Trolley. When conducting the revenue allocation formula calculations SANDAG shall treat multiple day Regional Day Passes in the same manner as a single day Regional Day Pass. Each transit operator shall retain 100 percent of revenue earned from the sale of day passes used exclusively on services within their own service area.
II. Paper Regional Day Passes

1. At least once every year SANDAG shall conduct a survey of Regional Day Pass use on bus routes that cross the transit service area boundary between MTS and NCTD. The survey shall be conducted during the school year. Each transit operator shall retain 100 percent of the revenue earned from the sale of paper Regional Day Passes within their service area onboard buses and at ticket vending machines unless the following conditions occur as determined by the SANDAG survey:

   a. The number of paper Regional Day Passes purchased in the NCTD service area and used on MTS services exceeds by more than ten percent the number of Regional Day Passes sold in the MTS service area and used on NCTD services; or

   b. The number of paper Regional Day Passes purchased in the MTS service area and used on NCTD services exceeds by more than 10 percent the number of Regional Day Passes sold in the NCTD service area and used on MTS services; and

   c. If the 10 percent margin is exceeded and there is a difference of more than 25 passes per weekday between the number of passes sold on each system, the revenue from the number of passes in the imbalance shall be shared equally between the two operators. The number of day passes used annually shall be calculated by SANDAG based on the ratio of Regional Day Passes to other fares and applied to the annual ridership of the services that cross the boundary between the MTS and NCTD transit service areas. If the ten percent margin is exceeded and there is a difference of less than 25 passes, then no revenue sharing shall be required.

Sample Survey Data Used in Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passengers Transferring Between Transit Service Areas</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS Purchase</td>
<td>NCTD Purchase</td>
<td>Other Fare</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>FY 2008 Annual Ridership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Route 20350</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>606,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Route 101</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>738,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>1,344,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Day Pass Imbalance (B3-A3)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Day Pass Imbalance as % of day passes (B4/B3)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Day Pass Imbalances as share of total ridership</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 1: A survey found that NCTD sold 11 more Regional Day Passes that were used on MTS than MTS sold for use on NCTD for passengers that cross the boundary between the MTS and NCTD service areas. The 11 Regional Day Passes represents 10 percent of the total number of Regional Day Passes sold in the NCTD service area and used on MTS services. The condition in part 1a is met, but not part 1c. Therefore, no revenue sharing is required.
**Example 2:** A survey found that MTS sold 18 more Regional Day Passes for use on NCTD than NCTD sold for use on MTS for passengers that cross the boundary between the MTS and NCTD service areas. This represents 11 percent of the total number of Regional Day Passes sold in the MTS service area and used on NCTD services. The condition in part 1b is met, but not part 1c. Therefore, no revenue sharing would be required because the difference is less than 25 passes.

**Example 3:** A survey found that NCTD sold 28 more Regional Day Passes for use on MTS than MTS sold for use on NCTD. This represents 11 percent of the total passes sold in the MTS service area for use on NCTD services. Revenue sharing would be required because the conditions in parts 1a and 1c are met. NCTD would be required to pay MTS one half of the revenue from the 28 Regional Day Passes that exceed the number of MTS Regional Day Passes used on MTS services. The 28 passes represented 0.899 percent of the total ridership on the routes 101 and 350 (e.g. 345 passengers) on the day of the survey, therefore the amount of revenue payable to MTS would be $2.50 (half the cost of a day pass) X 0.0089 percent of the total annual ridership of routes 101 and 350. In this example, the amount due to MTS would be $2.50 X (0.0089 X 1,344,306) = $30,213.

2. All payments owed by one operator to another under this revenue allocation formula shall be paid in one installment within 30 days of the end of the fiscal year. Amounts owed for revenue sharing shall be calculated retroactively based on ridership during the previous fiscal year.

3. The survey of Regional Day Pass use between NCTD and MTS shall be conducted by SANDAG at no cost to the transit operator if no revenue sharing is required. If revenue sharing is determined to be required, the cost of conducting the survey, not to exceed $2,000, shall be shared equitably between SANDAG and the transit operators.

4. This revenue allocation formula shall be in effect until June 30, 2011, at which time it shall be reviewed by SANDAG and the transit operators to determine if changes are appropriate.
UTC TRANSIT CENTER FUNDING

Introduction

The San Diego City Council recently approved redevelopment plans for the Westfield Shoppingtown University Towne Centre (UTC) which includes construction of a new transit center. SANDAG staff worked with Westfield, City of San Diego, and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) staff to ensure that the conceptual design of the new transit center meets the needs of existing and future local and express bus services as well as future bus rapid transit (BRT) services. The proposed Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project LRT station is located adjacent to the new transit center and was designed at the conceptual level to ensure that once constructed the LRT station would function as an integral part of the transit center. Westfield, the developer, and the City of San Diego have each committed to funding a portion of the $22 million cost of the bus transit center. SANDAG staff has committed to explore opportunities to fund a share of the cost of the bus transit center.

Discussion

The UTC revitalization project is a phased renovation and expansion of the existing regional shopping center. The project includes adding up to 750,000 square feet of retail space and up to 300 multi-family homes. In support of public transit, the project includes a relocated and expanded new bus transit center. As stated above, the new transit center will accommodate existing and future bus services and was designed at the conceptual level to ensure that once constructed the LRT station would function as an integral part of the transit center. The Westfield project also will include direct pedestrian links between UTC Shoppingtown and nearby residential and commercial development.

Attachment 1 presents a conceptual plan for the new transit center as well as the proposed LRT alignment and station. Attachment 2 presents a rendering of the new transit center.

Development of the Nobel Drive Station has been on hold leaving in excess of $5.7 million in a 2001 federal grant unspent. In the current climate of scarce resources, experience has shown that grants for projects that show no progress for an extended duration are vulnerable to potential de-obligation by the granting agency. If approved by FTA, using the Nobel Drive COASTER Station

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors direct staff to take the necessary programming actions, including obtaining approval from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), to utilize approximately $5.7 million in Section 5309 New Starts funds currently programmed for the Nobel Drive COASTER Station as a contribution towards construction of the new bus transit center.
funds for this UTC Transit Center would help protect these federal funds and put them to work for the region serving the Mid-Coast area for which the funds were originally appropriated.

RENÉE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Attachments: 1. Proposed UTC Transit Center & LRT Station
2. Rendering of Proposed Transit Center

Key Staff Contact: Susan Brown, (619) 699-1913, sbr@sandag.org
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# Transit Center Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land area</td>
<td>.35 acres</td>
<td>1.84 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus bays</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to adjacent properties</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus transit access</td>
<td>Conflicts with shopper traffic</td>
<td>Dedicated access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility from street</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future rail connectivity</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike racks &amp; lockers</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td>50/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Association of Governments

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

November 7, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 10

Action Requested: APPROVE

COMPASS CARD CAPITAL BUDGET AMENDMENT

File Number 1145700

Introduction

The Compass Card is preparing to launch to the general public in January 2009 and will eliminate all paper monthly passes by July 1, 2009. The final capital improvement still under construction is the installation of remaining rail platform Compass Card Validators (validators). The platform validators will be used by patrons to “tap on” before boarding the Trolley, COASTER, or SPRINT and will act as a virtual gate. Completion of this work and the reprogramming of the Trolley Ticket Vending Machines (TVMs) to support the Fare Ordinance requires an amendment to the capital budget.

Discussion

The original engineer’s estimate for installation of the validators was $1.2 million. To date validators have been installed on the COASTER line, SPRINT line, and the Trolley Green Line with the remaining work to be performed on the Trolley Orange and Blue Lines. The previous estimate to complete these two lines was $600,000. In October 2007, SANDAG began negotiating with an electrical contractor under our Job Order Contract (JOC). In April 2008, that contractor was not making the anticipated progress necessary to complete the work in time to begin full operations by January 2009. In order to accelerate the completion of this work, SANDAG staff executed a time and materials contract with one prime contractor and five electrical subcontracts.

Work commenced again in August 2008; however, SANDAG staff has revised the estimate to complete remaining stations, increasing it from $600,000 to $970,000. The estimate to complete was increased due to several factors including an increase in the amount of concrete work, the existing condition of electrical and communication conduits, and the need for additional underground work.

In addition to the validator installation work, MTS requested SANDAG to execute an amendment to the existing SANDAG contract with Cubic Transportations Systems, Inc. for reprogramming of TVMs.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to amend the Automated Fare Collection Project (CIP Project No. 1145700) budget for the installation of rail station Compass Card validators and reprogramming of ticket vending machines by $327,904 through:

1. the allocation of $200,000 in interest earned on the project’s bond deposit; and
2. authorizing the Executive Director to execute the Memorandum of Understanding with Metropolitan Transit System in substantially the same form as Attachment 1 with terms including the transfer of $127,904 from MTS to SANDAG. Additional actions by the Executive Director and possible action by the Executive Committee totaling $170,000 will result in an aggregate budget increase of $497,904 to the project.
This additional work is to support a flat Trolley fare and simplification of the TVM menus/screens. The estimate for this work is $127,904 and will be funded from two MTS capital projects and is detailed in the attached Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU has been approved by the MTS Board of Directors at its October 30, 2008, meeting.

SANDAG staff has put together a budget plan to meet the total increased budget need of $497,904 (validators - $370,000 and TVM programming - $127,904). The budget needs would be met through the Transportation Committee’s approval of: (1) the allocation of interest revenue earned on the investments of bond proceeds; and (2) the MOU with MTS to transfer funds. Additional actions by (1) the Executive Director, under Policy No. 017, authorized the transfer of project funds from savings in the Regional Transit Management System (RTMS) (CIP Project No.1094000); and (2) pending action by the SANDAG Executive Committee would authorize the allocation of SANDAG Contingency Reserves to complete the funding plan. The table below details the plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Approval Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Interest Revenue</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from MTS Projects</td>
<td>$ 127,904</td>
<td>Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTMS Project Savings</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>Executive Director per Board Policy No. 017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG Contingency Reserves</td>
<td>$  70,000</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$497,904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contact: James Dreisbach-Towle, (619) 699-1914, jdr@sandag.org

Attachment: 1. Draft Memorandum of Understanding between San Diego Association of Governments and Metropolitan Transit System regarding Fund Transfer for Ticket Vending Machine Reprogramming
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AND METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
REGARDING FUND TRANSFER FOR TICKET VENDING MACHINE REPROGRAMMING
SANDAG CONTRACT NO. 5001__

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

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Agreement:

WHEREAS, SANDAG has a contract with Cubic Transportation Systems (Cubic) concerning the regional automated fare collection system; and

WHEREAS, amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance were made in June 2008 and those changes necessitated reprogramming of the Ticket Vending Machines ("TVMs") to implement the Trolley fare structure (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, Cubic completed the work to implement the new fare structure on the TVMs in September 2008 and the cost for the reprogramming was $127,904; and

WHEREAS, at its October 30, 2008, meeting, the MTS Board of Directors approved a fund transfer from MTS Capital Improvement Program (CIP) 11166 (CCTV Surveillance Equipment) to SANDAG’s CIP 1049400 (Fare Technology) to pay for the TVM reprogramming needed to implement adjustments in the Trolley fare structure; 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 use the funding transferred from MTS pursuant to this MOU to pay Cubic to reprogram the TVMs to implement the Trolley fare adjustments.

2. 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.
3. Neither MTS nor any officer 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, all officers and employees from all claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by SANDAG under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to SANDAG under this MOU.

MTS AGREES:

1. To fund the reprogramming performed by Cubic on the Project in an amount not to exceed $127,904 within 30 (thirty) days of full execution of this MOU.

2. 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.

3. Neither SANDAG nor any officer 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, all officers and employees from all claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by MTS under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to MTS under this MOU.

THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE:

1. 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.

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

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

3. That unless it is amended by the parties in writing, this MOU shall terminate on June 30, 2009, or on such earlier or later date as the parties may agree to in writing.

4. The indemnification provisions of this MOU shall survive termination of the MOU.
5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Office of General Counsel

OCT30-08.XX.AttA.TVM REPROGRAM.COONEY.doc
UPDATE ON PLANNING FOR I-15 BUS RAPID TRANSIT STATIONS AT EL CAJON BOULEVARD AND UNIVERSITY AVENUE  

**Introduction**

Over the last year, SANDAG, Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and City of San Diego staff have worked with a community working group selected by Councilmember Toni Atkins to develop and evaluate station concepts at El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue for the planned Interstate 15 (I-15) Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service. An earlier design was deemed infeasible due to operational issues. The result of this joint work effort has been the identification of four alternatives that are both geometrically viable from a construction standpoint and are supported by the community working group. The next step will be to carry these station alternatives into the next phase of project development (preliminary engineering and environmental analysis) that is expected to result in a recommended preferred station design by 2010.

**Discussion**

**Background**

Following on from October and December 2007 reports to the Transportation Committee, a 13-member ad hoc community working group (Attachment 1) was established by Councilmember Toni Atkins to provide input into the development and evaluation of design alternatives for the planned I-15 BRT stations that will serve the Mid-City area. The working group, which has been chaired by long-time Mid-City resident, Steve Russell, has generally met twice monthly over the last year.

The Mid-City community’s interest in the project dates back to the early planning efforts for the freeway and BRT project, memorialized in agreement between the City and Caltrans in the mid-1990s. The planned transit stations would address two key community issues: increased transit access to employment centers in Kearny Mesa, University City, and Sorrento Mesa; and the impetus they see it providing for urban development on the freeway bridge decks and surrounding areas.

**Conceptual Design Results**

The community working group and staff from the four agencies worked in tandem to develop a wide range of conceptual design options, created performance criteria, and then analyzed and evaluated the alternatives based on how well they addressed the various issues contained in the performance criteria.

Based on this evaluation, four geometrically viable alternatives were identified for further detailed evaluation in preliminary engineering and environmental analysis. There is no preferred alternative at this point. The four alternatives are shown in Attachment 2 and outlined below:
1. **Median Station with Grade Separated Crossover Access and Center Platform:** This alternative is similar to the earlier preferred median station design with a center-loading platform; the safety concerns about the earlier bus crossover feature (needed to allow for buses to load from right-hand doors given the center-loading passenger platform) would be resolved through a grade-separated crossover ramp design. Access to local bus services on the bridge decks would be achieved via stairwells and elevators. Dedicated median bus lanes from I-8 to State Route 94 (SR 94) would maximize bus speeds through the project corridor.

2. **Median Station with Side Platforms:** This alternative is a variation of the previous alternative but has side passenger platforms that avoid the need for the bus crossover. Because of right-of-way constraints in the median, the locations of the side platforms would be staggered. This alternative would also have stairwell and elevator access to the bridge decks above, along with dedicated median bus lanes to maximize bus operating speeds.

3. **Shoulder Lane Station:** This alternative would locate stations along the freeway shoulder lanes directly underneath the bridge decks, with stairwell and elevator access up to the bridge decks. Freeway transit lanes located in the existing shoulder lanes between I-8 and SR 94 would create low-speed bypasses when the main lanes are congested. This alternative also would allow the creation of BRT stations at Adams Avenue, which is served by MTS Route 11.

4. **Ramp Stations:** This alternative is a variation of the existing freeway ramp stops, but would create larger stations to accommodate the expected I-15 BRT demand through stations located on the freeway on-ramps. Signal priority treatments and freeway shoulder lanes as congestion bypasses would help improve travel speeds. Like the previous alternative, BRT stations at Adams Avenue could be created with this alternative.

**Topics to be Analyzed in Next Phase**

The next step is to develop preliminary engineering design, determine environmental impacts, and establish capital and operating costs for each alternative with the intent of clearing alternatives environmentally and selecting a preferred alternative. Work on this next phase will begin this month and is scheduled for completion in 2010.

Each of the project partners in the project has specific areas of interest and in the next stage of analysis these will be investigated to help determine a preferred alternative. The stakeholders and their areas of interest include:

- **Mid-City Community**
  - Access to Employment via Transit
  - Community Development opportunities at stations

- **Caltrans/California Highway Patrol**
  - Ownership/Liability
  - Geometric Design
  - Freeway Operations and Safety
  - Freeway Maintenance
  - Enforcement
• MTS
  - Optimal Service Provided to Patrons
  - Bus Operations Flexibility
  - Station Management, Maintenance, and Costs
  - Station Security

• City of San Diego
  - Multimodal Street Design, Operations, and Maintenance
  - Economic Development
  - Land Use Coordination

• SANDAG
  - Implementation of TransNet Program
  - Cost-Effectiveness of Implementation Staging
  - System Connectivity
  - Funding

Staff will continue to provide the Transportation Committee with periodic updates on the Mid-City BRT station planning.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Community Working Group Members
             2. Alternative Station Design Concepts

Key Staff Contact: Barrow Emerson, (619) 699-1961, bem@sandag.org
I-15 Mid-City BRT Stations Working Group

Theresa Quiroz

Jay Powell City Heights Community Development Corporation

Steve Russell City Heights Community Development Corporation

Enrique Gandarilla City Heights Business Association

Joe Sciarretta City Heights Business Association

Jay Levine El Cajon Boulevard Business Improvement Association

Gary Weber El Cajon Boulevard Business Improvement Association

Karen Bucey City Heights Planning Area Committee

Dave Nelson City Heights Planning Committee

Jim Baross Normal Heights Planning Committee

Fred Lindahl Ken-Tal Planning Committee

Maria Cortez Teralta West Neighborhood Alliance

Al Stasukevich Cherokee Point Neighborhood Association
ALTERNATIVE #2
MEDIAN BUS LANE WITH
AT-GRADE CENTER PLATFORM STATIONS,
CONTRAFLOW OPERATION &
GRADE SEPARATED CROSOVERS

BUS LANE CHARACTERISTICS
• Contraflow operation for right-sided boarding and alighting in the
  station segment.
• Grade separated crossovers in median southbound between Meade & Adams,
  and northbound south of Wightman.
• Southbound bus lane provided in median north of I-8 to crossover location
  between Meade & Adams.
• Barrier separated from general traffic.
• Barrier separation of BRT lanes except at stations.
• Bus bypass provided full length of bus lane.
• HOV lanes provided north and south of station segment.
• General purpose or extended HOV entry/exit lane in the station segment.
• Gate and popup protection at entrances.
• Escape areas at entrances for errant vehicles.
• Southbound uphill BRT climbing lane.
• BRT Lanes provided with room for bus bypass.

STATION CHARACTERISTICS
• In-line stations at El Cajon Blvd & University Ave.
• Single direction center platforms on both sides of bridge with room for
  bus bypass.
• 14-foot wide by 150-foot long platforms.
• 11-foot bus lanes and 11-foot bypass.
• Elevator and stair connections to street level; locations to be determined.
• Bus transfers on bridges.
• Access to either bus direction via BRT platform or elevated walkway
  under bridge.
• Noise barrier and/or enclosures provided.
• Locations of bus stops on cross streets (El Cajon Blvd, University Ave)
  to be analyzed.
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LEGEND

- BRT ONLY LANE
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- PLATFORM LANE
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- RIGHT LANE
- SN
- SHOULDER
- TL
- TRUCK LANE
- TT
- THIRD TRAFFIC LANE
ALTERNATIVE #9
MEDIAN BUS LANE WITH
AT-GRADE OFFSET
SIDE PLATFORM STATIONS

BUS LANE CHARACTERISTICS
• Operation in same direction as general traffic.
• At-grade access to median bus lane southbound near I-8 and northbound between I-805 and Wightman.
• Barrier separated from general traffic.
• Barrier separation of BRT lanes.
• Gate and popup protection at entrances.
• Escape areas at entrances for errant vehicles.
• General purpose or extended HOV entry/exit lane in the station segment.
• Southbound uphill BRT climbing lane.
• BRT Lanes provided with room for bus bypass.

STATION CHARACTERISTICS
• In-line stations at El Cajon Blvd & University Ave.
• Offset side platforms to enable bus bypass.
• 18-foot wide by 130-foot long platforms.
• Elevator and stair connections to street level; locations to be determined.
• Pedestrian crossing at-grade to reach other side of bridge; possible elevated walkway under bridge.
• Bus transfers on bridges.
• Access to either on-street bus direction via BRT platform.
• Noise barrier and/or enclosures provided.
• Locations of bus stops on cross streets (El Cajon Blvd, University Ave) to be analyzed.

BUS LANE CROSS SECTION ‘B-B’
ALTERNATIVE #12
SHOULDER BUS LANE WITH
SHOULDER STATIONS

BUS LANE CHARACTERISTICS
• Operation on shoulder lanes between north of Adams Ave and south of University Ave.
• Connections to median HOV or managed lanes north and south of station segment to be determined.
• Detailed analysis of vehicle flow and choke points needed at stations and connections (focus on northbound University Ave off and southbound El Cajon Blvd off).
• On-Ramp traffic controlled by ramp meter throughout the day to allow the bus to merge with on & off ramp traffic.

STATION CHARACTERISTICS
• Stations on shoulders at Adams Ave, El Cajon Blvd, and University Ave.
• All stations in both directions would be farside, adjacent to on ramps (to be confirmed).
• 18-foot wide by 130-foot long platforms.
• Stations located on north or south side of abutments to be determined.
• Elevator connections to street level at locations to be determined.
• Bus transfers on bridges with signal protected street crossings or elevated walkways under bridges.
• Without the walkway under the bridge, either the 4th leg of the intersection will need a signalized cross walk, or a grade separated pedestrian overpass system will be required.
ALTERNATIVE #16
SHOULDER BUS LANE WITH RAMP STATIONS

BUS LANE CHARACTERISTICS
- Operation on shoulder lanes between north of Adams Ave and south of University Ave.
- Operation on collector-distributor shoulders between El Cajon Blvd and University Ave.
- Connections to median HOV or managed lanes north and south of station segment to be determined.
- Exclusive bus lanes on the off and on ramps to reach the stations (need to be confirmed).
- Adams Avenue southbound stop is on the shoulder, northbound stop is on the ramp.

STATION CHARACTERISTICS
- Stations on the on ramps at Adams Ave, El Cajon Blvd, and University Ave.
- Stops on both the off and on ramps to be considered, inc. capital cost and travel time impacts.
- Signal protected access to stations.
- Bus transfers on bridges via signal protected crossings.
- Queue jumps at all stations.
- Locations of bus stops on cross streets (Adams Ave, El Cajon Blvd, University Ave) to be analyzed.
- Without the walkway under the bridge, either the 4th leg of the intersection will need a signalized cross walk, or a grade separated pedestrian overpass system will be required.
San Diego Association of Governments
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
November 7, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 12

Action Requested: RECOMMEND

REVISION TO FY 2009 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT
AND TransNet REVENUES

File Number 4000500

Introduction

The transit operators within the SANDAG region receive various federal, state, and local revenues to support both ongoing operations and capital projects. The Transportation Development Act (TDA) and TransNet are two of the major sources of funding for North County Transit District (NCTD) and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). Unfortunately, the San Diego region continues to experience downward trend in sales tax revenues from which these two vital sources of revenues are derived. FY 2008 TransNet receipts were 1.4 percent lower than FY 2007. Although receipts for the quarter just ended are not available yet, it is clear that the decline is continuing. Accordingly, a revision is proposed to reduce the FY 2009 revenue estimates for TDA and TransNet from the amount approved by the Board of Directors in February 2008.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the revised FY 2009 Transportation Development Act allocation to $113.8 million, which equates to a 4.96 percent decline; and (2) approve the revised FY 2009 TransNet allocation to $37.5 million, which equates to a 4.63 percent decline.

Background

San Diego’s economy, like many regions across the nation, has been impacted by the increasingly global economic slowdown. Nationwide, employment is down more than 750,000 jobs with losses occurring in each month during the year through September 2008, the latest information available. Over the same time period (January 2008 through September 2008), the San Diego region recorded an increase of 5,500 jobs; however, the number of jobs has not risen each month during the year, month to month declines were recorded during the first quarter of 2008 as well as during September. A similar trend has occurred when viewed on a year over year basis; employment is up 3,900 jobs between September 2007 and September 2008 with some months on a year over year basis showing declines.

Although most of the weakness, both locally and nationwide over the past two years, has been in the construction and financial activities sectors, a noteworthy trend in San Diego has been the stability in the construction sector that has emerged since the beginning of 2008. The number of workers in construction during September 2008 was at about the same level as it was in January (80,000 workers). The employment trend for financial activities was slightly less stable during 2008 with 1,100 fewer jobs (down 1.5 percent) in this sector during September than recorded at the start of 2008. Overall, the employment trends for these two sectors during 2008 is very encouraging and significantly different than what has happened nationwide with both sectors continuing to decline each month.
Although the number of persons employed in the San Diego region is up over the past year, the job growth has not been sufficient to keep the unemployment rate in check. The region’s unemployment rate increased to 6.4 percent in September 2008 from 4.8 percent recorded one year ago and 5.0 percent recorded in January 2008. The local unemployment rate is slightly higher than the national rate of 6.0 percent recorded during September.

Consumer expenditures nationwide were weak going into the third quarter of calendar year 2008 and early indications suggest expenditures may have fallen more than 2 percent during the third quarter. The downturn in consumer expenditures nationwide has been made worse by the deepening financial crises, as credit availability to finance major purchases is tightening. The automobile market has been hit especially hard; sales of light vehicles have fallen to a 16 year low, down 19 percent over the year. Consumer spending for home furnishings is down because of the housing market weakness. More recently consumers are spending less for clothes, personal care, and restaurant dining as consumer confidence shrinks. Similar trends are emerging in San Diego.

Sales tax receipts received by the Regional Transportation Commission declined by 1.42 percent during fiscal year 2008. The sector hit hardest by the slowdown has been construction with sales tax receipts declining 13.7 percent on a year over year basis, using the last quarter of fiscal year 2008 and comparing it against the same quarter for the previous year. A second area of weakness locally as well as nationally is auto sales. Sales tax receipts from new auto sales declined 11.2 percent during the final quarter of fiscal year 2008 compared to the same quarter for the previous year. A noteworthy trend that exemplifies the diversity of our local economy is the increase in sales tax receipts for restaurants, the regions largest sales tax segment (1.8 percent increase for the second calendar quarter of 2008 compared to the prior year).

There seems to be a growing consensus nationwide that the current economic slowdown will significantly impact the third and fourth quarter of 2008 and all of 2009. In light of these expected trends SANDAG is projecting a 4.0 percent decline in sales tax revenues during fiscal year 2009, with much of the weakness occurring during last quarter of 2008 and the first two quarters of 2009. The national and local economies are not expected to fully recover from the downturn until 2011 while the transition to more normal rates of revenue growth may take three years (2013). SANDAG is expecting our sales tax revenue to follow a similar path. Following are the projected growth rates for TransNet sales tax receipts through FY 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Current &amp; Projected Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Development Act**

The TDA is the major subsidy source that supports the region’s public transit operators and non-motorized transportation projects. The TDA comes from 1/4 percent of state sales tax assessed in the region. SANDAG, as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), is responsible for the apportionment of TDA funds each year in conformance with legislative priorities. The transit operators
and other member agencies submit their annual TDA claims based on these apportionments and in compliance with SANDAG’s TDA Administration Policy (Board Policy No. 027).

The Board of Directors approved to apportion $119.7 million of TDA funds for FY 2009 which was provided by the County of San Diego Auditor and Controller Office in cooperation with SANDAG. The County is statutorily responsible for the apportionment for TDA. SANDAG again has been conferring with the County Auditor’s office regarding this latest revision. Based on the latest information available, SANDAG proposes to reduce this to $113.8 million which equates to a 4.96 percent decline from the initial apportionment. Attachment 1 provides a breakdown of the different programs with TDA that are affected.

**TransNet**

This half-cent sales tax approved by the voters of San Diego County includes the Transit System Improvements (16.5 percent) funding from which the transit revenues are derived. Within the transit share, services provided pursuant to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and subsidies for seniors have specific earmarks (2.5 percent and 3.25 percent, respectively). The remaining revenues can be used for operating or miscellaneous capital purposes.

The Board of Directors previously approved a TransNet allocation of $39.3 million for FY 2009. Based on the latest information available, SANDAG proposes to reduce this to $37.5 million which equates to a 4.63 percent decline. Attachment 2 provides the breakdown of the distribution of the program. Also, as an informational item, the table includes the impact to the SANDAG Overall Work Plan as well as the TransNet-Major Corridor program which funds all of the Board-adopted Early Action Program projects.

Approval of the revised TDA and TransNet estimates will provide the transit operators, SANDAG, and FACT, community transit service provider, with sufficient time to revise their budgets for the remainder of the fiscal year. Staff will continue to monitor the receipts as well as regionwide and nationwide trends and will provide monthly updates to the Board of Directors.

RENEE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Attachments: 1. Proposed Revision to FY 2009 Apportionment - TDA
2. Proposed Revision to FY 2009 Estimate - TransNet Transit Service Program/SANDAG

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, ski@sandag.org
### Transportation Development Act (TDA)

#### Proposed Revision to FY 2009 Apportionment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approved FY 2009</th>
<th>Revised FY 2009</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Apportionment</td>
<td>$119,734,000</td>
<td>$113,800,000</td>
<td>($5,934,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less County Auditor Expenses (PUC 99233.1)</td>
<td>($42,000)</td>
<td>($42,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less SANDAG Administration (PUC 99233.1)</td>
<td>($443,459)</td>
<td>($421,481)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 3% Planning Funds (PUC 99233.2)</td>
<td>($3,577,456)</td>
<td>($3,400,096)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 2% Bicycle/Pedestrian Funds (PUC 99233.3)</td>
<td>($2,313,422)</td>
<td>($2,198,728)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 5% Community Transit Service (PUC 99233.7)</td>
<td>($5,669,983)</td>
<td>($5,388,985)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$107,687,680</strong></td>
<td><strong>$102,348,710</strong></td>
<td>($5,338,970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available for MTS</td>
<td>$76,370,386</td>
<td>$72,584,074</td>
<td>($3,786,312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Regional Planning/Capital Projects</td>
<td>($951,080)</td>
<td>($951,080)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Transferred Functions</td>
<td>($2,233,346)</td>
<td>($2,121,958)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Transit Service</td>
<td>$3,965,784</td>
<td>$3,745,346</td>
<td>($220,438)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,151,744</strong></td>
<td><strong>$73,256,383</strong></td>
<td>($3,895,362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available to Claim</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,151,744</strong></td>
<td><strong>$73,256,383</strong></td>
<td>($3,895,362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available for NCTD</td>
<td>$31,317,293</td>
<td>$29,764,636</td>
<td>($1,552,657)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Regional Planning/Capital Projects</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Transferred Functions</td>
<td>($524,560)</td>
<td>($498,558)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Transit Service</td>
<td>$1,591,000</td>
<td>$1,535,859</td>
<td>($55,141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,833,733</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,801,997</strong></td>
<td>($2,031,736)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Carryover</td>
<td>$4,618,837</td>
<td>$4,618,837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available to Claim</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,002,571</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,420,774</strong></td>
<td>($1,581,796)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total Available for SANDAG:
  Regional Planning/Capital Projects | $951,080 | $951,080 |               |
  Transferred Functions | $2,757,906 | $2,620,516 |               |
  SANDAG Expenses | $443,459 | $421,481 |               |
  3% Planning Funds | $3,577,456 | $3,400,096 |               |
| **Total Available to Claim** | **$7,729,901** | **$7,393,172** | ($336,728)     |
| **Total Community Transit Service (CTSA)** | **$113,400** | **$107,780** | ($5,620)      |
TransNet Transit Service Program/SANDAG

Proposed Revision to FY 2009 Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Available For Transit Purposes:</th>
<th>Approved FY 2009</th>
<th>Revised FY 2009</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Available For Transit Purposes:</td>
<td>$39,320,896</td>
<td>$37,499,078</td>
<td>($1,821,818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 2.5% for ADA-related Services</td>
<td>($983,022)</td>
<td>($937,477)</td>
<td>$45,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 3.25% for Senior Services</td>
<td>($1,277,929)</td>
<td>($1,218,720)</td>
<td>$59,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,059,945</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,342,881</strong></td>
<td><strong>($1,717,063)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTS Projects And Services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available for Transit Service Improvements (Operations and Supporting Capital Improvements)</th>
<th>Approved FY 2009</th>
<th>Revised FY 2009</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$26,282,322</td>
<td>$25,064,608</td>
<td>($1,217,714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Pass Sales Subsidy to SANDAG</td>
<td>($5,500,000)</td>
<td>($5,500,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Available</strong></td>
<td>$20,782,322</td>
<td>$19,564,608</td>
<td>($1,217,714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for ADA Services</td>
<td>$697,144</td>
<td>$664,844</td>
<td>($32,300)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCTD Projects And Services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available for Transit Service Improvements (Operations and Supporting Capital Improvements)</th>
<th>Approved FY 2009</th>
<th>Revised FY 2009</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,777,622</td>
<td>$10,278,273</td>
<td>($499,349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for ADA Services</td>
<td>$285,879</td>
<td>$272,633</td>
<td>($13,245)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Discretionary Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitive Grant Program for Senior Transportation Services</th>
<th>Approved FY 2009</th>
<th>Revised FY 2009</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,277,929</td>
<td>$1,218,720</td>
<td>($59,209)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SANDAG:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass Sales Program</th>
<th>Approved FY 2009</th>
<th>Revised FY 2009</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass Sales Program</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG 1% Administration</td>
<td>$2,460,128</td>
<td>$2,346,300</td>
<td>($113,828)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TransNet-Major Corridor Capital</strong></td>
<td>$101,042,787</td>
<td>$96,361,788</td>
<td>($4,681,519)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Plan) is being developed to support implementation of the both the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RCP calls for more transportation options and a balanced regional transportation system to support smart growth and a more sustainable region. The RTP calls for a multi-modal regional transportation network that includes a regional bicycle network. In addition, bicycle transportation plays a role in public health, reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT), improving air quality, and lessening the dependence on motor vehicle travel.

Last fiscal year, SANDAG was awarded a Caltrans planning grant to prepare a regional bicycle plan. In April 2008, Alta Planning and Design was selected as the consultant to assist SANDAG with the planning project. The Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG) has been identified as the technical advisory committee for the project and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) along with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) have been asked to provide input.

This report provides an overview of the purpose of the plan, the public involvement process, issues related to the proposed network, and next steps.

Discussion

The main purpose of the Plan is to develop a unified bicycle system throughout the San Diego region that serves a wide variety of bicycle trips with connections to pedestrian paths, trails, and transit. The Plan will accomplish the following:

- Define a network of regionally significant bicycle routes, facilities, and necessary support programs and facilities;
- Identify gaps in the network and recommend specific improvements needed to fill these gaps in the system;
- Develop cost estimates for build-out of the entire regional network;
- Develop a funding strategy to implement the regional bike network;
- Identify programs to help local jurisdictions to become more bicycle-friendly; and
- Recommend a series of policies and actions to encourage and increase bicycling at the local and regional level.
The Process

The planning process includes an important public involvement component as well as strong technical elements and has been organized into four phases. The first three phases have focused on the network development and are summarized below. The fourth and final phase will focus on the development of bicycle supportive programs and a funding strategy to implement the Plan.

Phase One

This initial work on the Plan began in April 2008 and included the following:

- Gathered existing data from SANDAG, local circulation elements, and local bicycle master plans;
- Conducted first set of public workshops to discuss;
  - Preliminary plan goals and objectives,
  - Existing Regional Bikeway Corridors Map (Attachment 1),
  - Detailed corridor maps, and
  - Bicycle crash data;
- Launched project Web site (www.sandag.org/bicycleplan), and
- Collected data from 1,577 rider preference questionnaires regarding riding behavior, facility preferences, facility deficiencies and awareness of bicycle supportive programs.

Phase Two

The second phase of the project focused on data collection and analysis to draft the existing conditions report. The full Draft Existing Conditions Report has been posted to the project Web site and presents a summary of existing bicycling conditions, facilities, programs, and policies in the San Diego region, as well as a preliminary assessment of the region in terms of relative priority for bicycle improvements.

Phase Three

This phase of the Plan is currently underway and focuses on identifying options toward meeting the diverse needs of existing and future bicyclists. The Proposed Corridor Alignments and Classifications & Regional Bicycle-Related Programs Report has been drafted for public review and provides a summary of further refinement to the regional network, facility types, facility classifications, and bicycle programs. This document has been posted to the project Web site and was presented to the public in a second set of workshops in October 2008.

Phase Four

The final phase of the Plan will include development of goals and objectives, development of bicycle design guidelines and standards for regional facilities, further refinement of the regional network and facility types, preliminary analysis and cost estimates for the priority projects, and development of short-term and long-term funding strategy.
Issues Under Discussion

In order to develop the existing conditions report and refined regional network, rider preference questionnaires completed in Phase One provided extensive data regarding riding behavior, facility preferences, facility deficiencies, and awareness of bicycle support programs. The data was collected through a questionnaire that was distributed to participants at the public workshops and posted on the project Web site. Between the workshops and the project Web site, 1,577 surveys were completed. The data in the following three tables (Tables 1, 2, and 3) illustrates that riding behaviors and facility preferences vary broadly. (Additional data from the rider preference survey can be found in Attachment 2.)

When asked why they ride (Table 1) the majority of respondents (90.0%) are motivated to bike due to the health benefits associated with biking. The pleasure of riding a bicycle also is an incentive for 81.3 percent of respondents. Transportation-related purposes were cited less frequently by survey respondents with 58.2 percent biking to get to work, 36.6 percent for shopping or running errands, 15.2 percent to connect to transit, and 9 percent to travel to school. Response frequencies do not sum to 100 percent because survey respondents were allowed to select multiple responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For exercise/health reasons</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For pleasure</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get to work</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For shopping/ errands</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get to transit</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get to school</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t bike</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the greatest number of respondents are most interested in riding on separated bike paths (71%), then on on-street bike lanes (42.6%), and thirdly, on bicycle boulevards (41.9%) which are shared roadway facilities on local and neighborhood streets that favor through bicycle travel. Fewer respondents favor bike routes, which are defined as shared roadway facilities that are delineated only with signage and no pavement markings. The highest percent (34.6%) of respondents ranked bike routes second on a scale from one to four with one being most preferred. Trails or dirt paths are least preferred; with 36.9 percent responding that they are not at all interested in riding on this type of facility. Overall, these results indicate a preference for urban facilities that provide for separate bicycling rights-of-way, or secondarily, on-street lanes.
### Table 2
**Please Rate Your Level of Preference for each of the Following Bicycle Facilities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle Facility Type</th>
<th>1 Highly Interested</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 Not at all Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Paved Bike Paths</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Bike Lanes</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Boulevards</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Routes</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved Trails or Dirt Paths</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey asked community members about those improvements that most likely would influence increased riding. More bike lanes (Class II) and more multi-use paths (Class I) were mentioned as being very likely to encourage increased riding by over 60 percent of the respondents. Maintenance and wider shoulders were mentioned as being very likely to increase riding by approximately 50 percent of respondents. Bicycle boulevards were mentioned by about 43 percent of the respondent as being very likely to increase riding. These results are summarized in Table 3. Response frequencies do not sum to 100 percent because survey respondents were allowed to select multiple responses.

### Table 3
**Would the Following Improvements Influence You to Bike More Often?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Bike Lanes on Major Streets</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Paved (off-street) Bike Paths</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Maintenance</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Outside/Curb Lanes on Major Streets</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Boulevards</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Bike Routes</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More On-Road Bike Signage</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Regional Network and Facility Types

One of the big challenges in refining the regional network, for a region the size of San Diego is determining how to address the vast diversity in the area – including topographical challenges, right-of-way constraints, and the many different types of riders and rider preferences. The solution will be found with a comprehensive approach that uses a variety of strategies and facility types depending on the context of the situation.

In an effort to address this diversity, an intercommunity bikeway network is under development that will combine standard facility types as identified by the California Highway Design Manual (Table 4) as well as consideration of two emerging facility types that may be used in corridors where
a standard facility will not meet the needs of a wide variety of cyclists. Additional information about the use and implementation of two such facilities, cycle tracks and bicycle boulevards, is contained in Attachment 3. The application of a corridor classification system upon the Regional Network using these five classification types will take place in the Phase Four of the Plan. It also is important to recognize that all roadways are open to bicycle travel unless it is specifically prohibited and should be considered as part of the greater regional and local bicycle network that serves to supplement streets and roadways that include Class I, II, and III facilities.

### Table 4
**Bicycle Facility Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle Facility Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Path (Multi-Use Trail), Class I</td>
<td>An 8- to 12-foot paved path within its own right-of-way to provide a non-motorized connection or access where it cannot be provided on the roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes, Class II</td>
<td>Five-foot lanes striped on the outside of the roadway and identified with signs and pavement markings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Route, Class III</td>
<td>Roads designated by signs as preferred routes for bicycle travel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed changes to the existing Regional Bikeway Corridors consist of five new corridors as shown in Attachment 4, while Attachment 5 shows the location of four corridors that are proposed for realignment to serve higher density areas. In addition, given previous direction from the Transportation Committee and the nature of the citizen input generated from the public outreach efforts, a sub-network showing a “spine” of potential Class I facility locations is shown in Attachment 6.

**Next Steps**

In December the Transportation Committee will be asked to select a preferred network and facility types, as well as provide input on a preferred funding strategy. The Transportation Committee also will be asked to provide input on the recommended goals and objectives of the Plan.

A first draft of the Plan is expected to be complete in early 2009 followed by a 30-day public review period. Necessary revisions to the Plan will follow public review. The Final Report is expected in the spring of 2009.

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments:  
1. Overview of the San Diego Regional Bikeway Corridors  
2. Summary of Public Input  
3. Cycle Tracks and Bicycle Boulevards  
4. New Proposed Regional Corridors  
5. Proposed Regional Corridors with Adjusted Realignments  
6. Regionwide Proposed Class I Facilities

Key Staff Contact: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, ckl@sandag.org
Figure 3-4: Overview of San Diego Regional Bicycle Corridors
San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan – Summary of Public Input

Riding Behavior

Table 1 reports bicycling frequency during the typical week. Responses are fairly evenly distributed across the week, with the most common response being three days per week (21.3%). This pattern suggests that the community members surveyed represent a broad cross-section of bicyclists in terms of riding frequency and also shows consistency with other regions across the United States.

Table 1
How Many Days Per Week Do You Ride?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days per Week</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked why they do not ride more often (Table 2), survey respondents cited lack of bicycle facilities (53.9%), excessive traffic (50%), and motorists not providing room for bicycles on roadways (47.3%) as the strongest factors. However, several other deterrents, such as poorly maintained roads or bike facilities (43.5%) also were indicated. Response frequencies do not sum to 100 percent because survey respondents were allowed to select multiple responses.

Table 2
What Prevents You From Biking More Often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No bike paths, lanes, or bike routes</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many cars / cars drive too fast</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers don’t share the road</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeways / roads in poor condition</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destinations are too far away</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to carry things</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient lighting</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I travel with small children</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 displays a summary of the top five locations where survey respondents referenced a gap that fell within the currently adopted regional bicycle network. A total of 583 comments were made about gap locations that correspond to locations along the currently adopted regional bicycle corridors. References to gaps along the Coastal Rail Trail were by far the most frequently cited, with almost 30 percent of the gap references related to this facility. The next most common gap reference was made in relation to areas along the San Diego River Bikeway, the Central Coast Corridor, and the Bayshore Bikeway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Corridor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego River Bikeway</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Corridor</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 56 Bike Path</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bicycle Supportive Programs**

Table 4 summarizes respondents’ interest in developing education and encouragement program types. The table suggests that individuals are highly interested in expanding most program types. Responses indicate that public awareness campaigns and user-friendly bicycle maps and guides are the most desired program types, with only a few respondents not at all interested in program development. Interest in maps and guides is consistent with the results presented in Table 4-4. Approximately 95 percent of respondents use the San Diego Region Bicycle Map and 90 percent are interested or highly interested in additional maps and guides. Public awareness campaigns focused on bicyclists’ rights, responsibilities, and the health and environmental benefits of bicycling are deficient regionally compared to education- and enforcement-related programs. Respondents’ strong interest in this program type makes a case for increasing awareness-related programs. Respondents were permitted to select multiple answers. As a result, the number of responses does not equal 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>1 Highly Interested</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 Not at all Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User-friendly Bicycle Maps and Guides</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness Campaign Focused on Bicyclists Rights, Responsibilities, and the Health and Environmental Benefits of Bicycling</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-stop Bicycle Information Website</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Planning for Bicyclists (511 service)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs for Motorists</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Please Rate Your Level Of Interest In Developing Or Expanding The Following Bicycle Programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>1 Highly Interested</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 Not at all Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs for Elementary, Middle/Junior, and High School Students</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs for Law Enforcement Personnel</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs for Adult Cyclists</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support Encouragement Programs, such as the Diamond Awards Program</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cycle Tracks

- Bicycle facilities that combine the experience of separated bike paths with the infrastructure of bike lanes.
- Provide space in the roadway right-of-way that is exclusively for bicycle travel.
- Typically one-way on both sides of a street.
- Separated from pedestrian and vehicles by on-street parking or a barrier, such as pavement markings or coloring, bollards, curbs/medians or a combination of these elements.
- Recommended width is 7 feet minimum.
- Visual and physical queues are included to understand where bicyclists and pedestrians should be moving.

Placement:
- Along urban or suburban arterials with longer blocks and with few driveway or midblock access points for vehicles
- Along corridors with adequate right-of-way

Intersection Treatments:
- Protected bicycle phases at signals
- Signal phases in advance of vehicle phases
- Warning signs, special markings and on-street parking removal (if present) prior to the intersection at non-signalized intersections

Access Management:
- Reduce potential conflict points with medians, driveway consolidations, or restricted movements.
Bicycle Boulevards

- Signed shared roadways with additional treatments.
- Extent of treatments depend on roadway conditions, street and land use characteristics.
- Bikeways developed on existing low-traffic neighborhood streets where speeds and traffic volumes are kept low enough so it is comfortable for cyclists to share the lane with motorists.
- Bikeways where the movement of bicycles is given priority over through motor vehicle traffic movement.
- Intersection treatments to help cyclists safely cross major streets.
Figure 2-8: Bicycle Support Facilities
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Attachment 6
SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT

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

Only punch list work remains for the Mainline contractor. All work could be completed within one month if the contractor devoted the resources to do so. Concurrently, other contractors are working on maintaining the landscaping and providing additional stormwater protection measures.

The Inland Rail Trail is complete except for punch list work. Operations and maintenance agreements are being negotiated with the Cities of Escondido and San Marcos with a goal of turning over the facility to each city next month.

Although daily ridership decreased slightly from 8,658 in early September to 8,308 in mid October, it continues to trend upwards. A survey of the station parking lots in September showed an average occupancy of 36 percent with the Rancho del Oro and Escondido Transit Center parking lots over 50 percent full.

Claims and Disputes

No formal claims have been filed on the Mainline contract; however, there are outstanding disputes concerning the signal and communication work and the connections of the rail to the bridges. The contractor also believes they were delayed by changes to the work since the settlement agreement was signed in spring 2007. The contractor has not yet validated the delay via the required “time impact analyses” and, therefore, is subject to potential liquidated damages that now total $4.6 million.

NCTD has a tentative agreement with the contractor to close out the San Marcos Loop contract. The Vehicle Maintenance facility contract was completed with no claims. The DMU vehicle contract is still open for retention purposes but there are no outstanding disputes.
**Estimate at Completion**

The October estimate at completion (EAC) is $479.3 million. It 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 outstanding invoices and 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 $4.8 million of capacity between budget and EAC.

Risks to budget lie only 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.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contact: Jim Linthicum, (619) 699-1970, jlin@sandag.org
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.

Well the end is rapidly approaching Mr. chair and want you to know it has been a pleasure to speak before this board from time to time over these last few years. Wish you and all the members of the board the best of good fortune in the coming New Year.
Coastal Commission needs a major change

Recently, I attended the California Coastal Commission’s three-day hearing in San Diego where the Poseidon desalination plant in Carlsbad was on the agenda. The Coastal Commission staff had issued a negative report that opposed the project as the staff had done in trying to stop the historic USS Midway project in San Diego Bay. Fortunately, the appointed 12-member commissioners voted to support the Midway project, which is now a great benefit to the Navy and the region. Also, the commissioners voted to support the Carlsbad project that will be the 11th plant in California ($1.00 billion in the world) and will provide a crucial new water source for eight water agencies in San Diego County.

The testimonial support for the desalination plant at the hearing was overwhelming with labor, local governments and the business community enthusiastically urging the approval of the additional water sources for San Diego. The few opponents included Mark Massara of San Francisco, director of the Sierra Club Coastal Programs. The Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce brought about 100 people to both testify and support. The many, many support presentations included more background on future problems, like water rationing and not getting the current 85 percent of our water supply from Northern California.

San Diego is at the end of the line and we face future water rationing even with more water conservation and reclamation.

I testified of my personal experience of playing golf in Monterey, Calif., 25 years ago, during water rationing. The fairways had been cut down to grass four yards wide. You hit a shot, then picked up the ball and dropped it in the grass area.

The men’s locker room had a sign above the urinals “do not flush.” I mentioned about being personally evacuated in a 1970 fire. San Diego’s very real fire problems were discussed with the lack of rainfall in the San Diego area between May 1 and Nov. 1. This is a fact of life and must be corrected with more sources of water.

Friends of mine in Santa Barbara told me about their problems. Opponents such as the Sierra Club had led the way in a vote to oppose Santa Barbara going into the large state water project. The major dam in the area almost went dry and residents were not allowed to water their lawns. A company that sprayed lawns green made a lot of money. Now Santa Barbara is in the state water project and also has a desalination plant in the works. San Diego now faces a “you can’t water your lawn” situation in the future.

In listening to the commission’s staff discussion of several projects on the agenda, I continually noticed the negative tone of voice of staff members.

The sound was dictatorial. The staff negatives were even after the staff and commissioners had received support letters from all five San Diego area members of Congress (all five signed the same letter), all 11 San Diego state legislators also signed a letter.

In looking at a recent organizational chart of the executive branch of California state government, it was shocking to learn that, even though the Coastal Commission is listed as part of the Resources Agency, neither the secretary of the agency nor the governor have any control over the staff of the commission.

The commission appoints the executive director. The total budget amounts have to be approved but they have no control over the executive director.

What is the solution? In serving full-time in state government as chief deputy and assistant secretary of business and transportation, it was a real thrill for me to see the teamwork with everyone working together. The Coastal Commission’s 12-member panel is now appointed by the governor, assembly speaker and president pro-tem of the senate (four appointees each) and seems to work well.

A real positive solution to end the negative, unfair and hostile positions of the staff — have the executive director be appointed by the governor and not the commission. The secretary of the Resources Agency already has departments that oversee bay conservation, waterways, rivers, fish and game, forestry energy, etc.

Have the secretary also oversee the commission’s executive director and staff and then provide teamwork with other State Agencies like Business, Transportation and Housing, which oversees housing, real estate and transportation. Also the main office of the commission should be shifted from San Francisco to Sacramento.

With all 11 San Diego area state legislators in support of desalination and their observation of the Coastal Commission staff’s negative opposition to the water needs of San Diego and other areas, they can introduce a bi-partisan bill in Sacramento. The bill should make the Coastal Commission staff and its executive director appointed by the governor and report to the Resources Agency secretary.

They would then be teammates with other Agencies and Departments, and help bring fairness and quick service to vital projects like the badly needed desalination plant in Carlsbad that will serve many areas of the San Diego region.

Let’s do it in Sacramento with January legislation. The negative approach to almost all major projects by the commission staff needs to be corrected.

The desalination project is part of San Diego’s urgent need for more water sources and fire protection. Lets do it!

Schmidt is a retired banker and attorney who is active with the chamber and in civic affairs in transportation, housing and sports. He also serves on three public boards and was Gov. Reagan’s appointee to three positions in state government.
Approval of SR-241 toll road means traffic congestion relief

By Jim Schmidt

The 16.9-mile Foothill-South extension of the state Route 241 toll road will connect Orange County to Interstate 5 in San Diego County. The extension will provide relief from not only I-5 to the north, but also will reduce some I-15 traffic from Riverside County that uses SR-78 to travel to the Oceanside-Carlsbad area in order to avoid the current congestion on I-5 from the north. Point: the extension means reduced traffic gridlock.

The approval of this important road extension is on the Coastal Commission agenda at the Oceanside City Hall on Feb. 6. The Coastal Commission staff has issued a report urging the rejection of the congestion relief road like they did at the Commission hearing in November on the Carlsbad desalination plant. Fortunately, the Commission overrode the staff recommendation by a 9-3 vote. San Diego’s water needs, and the probability of less water availability, makes the use of seawater a viable source to help accommodate San Diego’s future. Thank you Commission members for your action.

The typical opponents to freeways and roads contend that the extension will hurt parks and the coast. The Transportation Corridor Agency will give a $100 million grant to the State Department of Parks and Recreation in addition to providing specific environmental protection.

The urgent need for this traffic congestion relief road and the environmental protection in the plan is the main reason that Gov. Schwarzenegger strongly supports the SR-241 extension. A Jan. 17 San Diego Union-Tribune editorial supports the extension commenting on the reputation of the continual opposition to projects by the Coastal Commission staff with the comment, “Other more impartial agencies concluded that the promised mitigation would sharply reduce risks to the environment and endangered species, and that there would be no effect on the surf at the Trestles,” referring to the Trestles Beach.

While there are some other opponents apart from the Coastal Commission staff, there are many supporters including: the San Diego North Economic Development Council, the San Diego Convention & Visitors Bureau, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce and the Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce.

The mayor of Carlsbad supports the extension with a comment that SR-241 will provide an alternate emergency evacuation route if I-5 is closed. There are many comments regarding the fact that studies show that the SR-241 extension will reduce peak-hour congestion on I-5 by 70 percent in 2025 and that without the extension, traffic will increase by 2025 by 60 percent.

At a meeting on the project at the recent San Diego Highway Development Association meeting, it was mentioned the toll for the 16.9 miles is projected to be $2.50 each way. SR-241 will be a State Highway with the maintenance paid by the state. The Transportation Corridor Agency will issue tax exempt bonds and use $8 million in federal funds. No construction funding for the project will come from either the state highway funds or our local sales tax funds for transportation handled by SANDAG. Like the state plan for our San Diego Coronado Bay Bridge, the SR-241 extension will be a toll-free state highway when the estimated $675 million in bonds are paid off. The use of land for the toll-road project will not require the removal of any homes or businesses and the protection of water quality is a top priority.

What about parks? In California, many of the parks are not natural but are built — like Balboa Park. The trees were all planted and were added around local roads that were in existence (one road was converted to the current SR-163) a d the historical Cabrillo Bridge was built to connect the new park to Sixth Avenue and Laurel Street. With the environmental protection expertise and the $100 million in funds provided, the park situation will be protected and could be enhanced. SR-241 must happen.

Strong support is already there, but more support is needed.

A question: Would someone today oppose the building of the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge in the Bay Area that now connects traffic from Contra Costa County to Marin County? The argument for the bridge was that it would relieve traffic on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, which it did. Also, remember what the SR-52 extension from I-15 to SR 125 did to relieve I-8 traffic congestion? The public needs for traffic congestion and gridlock relief needs the Coastal Commission approval of the SR-241 project. The road will help accommodate our future growth, which is now primarily the net increase in births over deaths and not people moving here.

Schmidt is a retired banker and attorney who is active with the chamber and in civic affairs in transportation, housing and sports. He also serves on three public boards and was Gov. Reagan’s appointee to three positions in state government.
Toll roads, toll bridges: Good news, bad news for 241

By Jim Schmidt

Toll roads are becoming necessary options for traffic relief in California with one major reason being the continual diversion of transportation funding for other uses by state government. The diversions and borrowing of designated funding for transportation of gas taxes and sales taxes on gasoline was started by Pat Brown and later done by Jerry Brown, Gray Davis and now our current governor, who has been diverting funding for transit.

Orange County has a number of toll roads and hopefully the 241 road will be approved by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce to end the traffic congestion on Interstate 5. The 241 will also relieve traffic on I-15 as many Orange County drivers now go east to Riverside County, then take I-15 south to San Diego County and drive on SR 76 to the coastal areas. It is a longer trip from a distance standpoint but much shorter time wise by not facing the I-5 traffic congestion. The 241 will help Orange, Riverside and San Diego counties.

Many 241 supporters testified at the Sept. 22 Commerce Department hearing in Del Mar.

Bad news in the Bay Area came with the recent announcement that the one-way toll on the Golden Gate Bridge, which links San Francisco with Marin County, is increasing to $6 with $5 for Pacatrk, up from $8 and $4 respectively. In 1967 Bay Area politicians fought to keep the Golden Gate Bridge from becoming a free state highway as the bonds had been just paid off. In a compromise that the state under Ronald Reagan did not like, six counties (San Francisco, Marin, Napa, Mendocino, Sonoma and Del Norte) agreed to not require the state to pay for future maintenance and toll collection staffing and costs if the state would agree to turn the bridge over to them. Legislation then turned the bridge over to the six counties. They re-bonded the bridge and have used the revenues as they want.

The other seven toll bridges in the Bay Area are all state bridges where the state continues to pay for the maintenance. The bridges were all constructed with plans to be “toll free” once the construction bonds were paid off. Many Bay Area politicians were successful in fighting to keep the tolls on and re-bond the bridges for other projects like the BART tube under the bay for trains.

The Bay Area Toll Authority now oversees everything and uses the toll revenues for upgrades and also to subsidize BART and buses in the Bay Area. The seven state Bay Area bridges never had one-way toll.

Drivers in the Bay Area are forced to use the bridges as there are no options besides BART trains or buses or taking longer drives going south to the San Jose area and then driving north on the west side of the bay to areas including San Francisco.

Compare this to the good news in San Diego. In 1993 SANDAG took over control of the San Diego Coronado Bridge by state legislation and then with opposition from the city of Coronado, took action in 2001 to end the toll on July 1, 2002.

SANDAG’s action put in place Ronald Reagan’s plan, when he was governor, to make our bridge toll free when the bonds were paid off. Now workers and navy personnel who commute to the bases can drive there free. A real plus for the city of San Diego was that the parking area for the “nicked snatcher” pedestrian ferry was eliminated by the bridge and now that location is the site of the wonderful Seaport Village. At first it was controversial to lose the parking area, but the new tolls for commuters on the bridge (53 cents each way) helped to offset the loss. The bridge has been a bonanza for Coronado with more hotels, the Cays, high-rise condos, higher home values and the saving of Hotel del Coronado, which was in financial trouble before the bridge opened in 1969. The bridge has also helped many other Coronado businesses and restaurants.

The Sept. 22 toll road hearing was much different from the February hearing before at the Coastal Commission at the same location where the Coastal Commission voted 5-3 against 241. It was a rancorous hearing and opponents were in charge, supported by the staff of the Coastal Commission. This writer spoke at both meetings representing the San Diego Highway Development Association and the East County Chamber, and also the hearing was a terrible situation for supporters of the 241. The opponents’ bus loaded in over 2,000 people to make noise and interfere with the proceedings. When this writer finally was able to get two minutes to speak in favor of 241, after being there for over 10 hours, the opponents were allowed to make noise and wave signs near me as I spoke. This time the federal agency did a great job in keeping things under control. We are hopeful that the agency will approve the road, which will be a state toll road and eventually will be free for drivers. It will be good news for Orange County and commuters on I-5 and I-15.

San Diego also has good news in that Sen. Ducheny’s bill to build the SR-11 toll road to connect to the new third border crossing passed the legislature and was signed by the governor. The legislation will allow SR-11 to be a 100 percent state toll road with SANDAG issuing tax-exempt bonds to finance the construction, CalTrans paying for the maintenance and toll collection staffing and costs and the Highway Patrol handling traffic issues. When the bonds are paid off, SR-11 will be a free state highway. Further good news is that in 2067 the currently private 12-mile SR-125 toll road from SR-6 to the border area will be a free state highway when the state lease ends and the state takes the property.

In conclusion, thanks to San Diego’s business leaders, politicians, state legislators, CalTrans District 11 (the best CalTrans district in state) and especially California’s best transportation planning organization, SANDAG, for its leadership and positive actions to help San Diego area residents with toll roads, our former toll bridge and hopefully the 241 to help relieve traffic congestion for our citizens. A job well done. San Diego’s good news is unlike the bad news in the Bay Area, which is costly for drivers.
State Route 905 Phase 1A
From Britannia Blvd to the Otay Mesa Port of Entry

PHASE 1A

Project Summary
• Project limits: Britannia Blvd to Siempre Viva Road.
• Estimated cost to construct: $76.5 million.
• Began construction: April 2008.
• End construction: November 2010.

Recent Activities
• Construction ongoing.
• Approximately $14.9 M paid-out for work completed to date.
• Time Elapsed 19% / Work Complete 24%

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, 67 acquired, 2 lawsuits pending on remaining 6 parcels.
• Trial dates: 1 in November 2008 and 1 in February 2009.
• Sesi parcel condemnation suit was settled on October 30, 2008.
• 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**
- Project Ready to List for advertising October 20, 2008.
- TCIF funding voted by CTC on October 30, 2008.

**Schedule**
- Project Ready to List for advertising October 2008.
- Bid Opening January 2009.
- Award February 2009.
- End Construction May 2012.
State Route 11 and Otay Mesa East Port of Entry
From SR 125/905 interchange to the U.S./Mexico Border

Project Status and Schedule

- Project is currently in the environmental stage and will be completed in two phases or "Tiers".
- Transportation Border Congestion Relief Program (TBCRP), SR-11/OME selected by USDOT/FHWA - September 18, 2008.
- Phase 1/Tier 1: Programming phase - FHWA Record of Decision, October 3, 2008.
- Approval for Presidential Permit from State Department, November 2008 (Pending final approval by Under Secretary, State Department).
- 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 $300 to $350 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.
**REvised**
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SANDAG

BOARD POLICY NO. 031

TRANSNET ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN RULES

Rule #21: Accommodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians

Adoption Date: February 22, 2008

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context/Facility Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context/Facility Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Urban Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street (design speed &gt;35 mph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street (design speed (\leq 35) mph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Local Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context/Facility Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Collector Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Local Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2. Unpaved pathways of decomposed granite or other suitable material that are set back from the roadway where feasible would be considered appropriate only on roads serving areas that are rural in nature.

Where a local jurisdiction has a bicycle or pedestrian master plan adopted by the city council or Board of Supervisors and approved by SANDAG, the local agency may use that plan to determine the appropriate means of accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians in a given project and at a minimum provide the facilities called for in the plan. These plans must be updated and approved no less than every five years to qualify as a means of satisfying this provision.

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

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

This provision only requires an agency to provide appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facilities that are within the construction or reconstruction area of the project. Consideration of the provision of sidewalks as part of major rehabilitation roadway projects involving only new pavement overlays of 1-inch thickness or greater (see Rule 18 under Board Policy 031) on streets where sidewalks do not currently exist would only be required if curb, gutter, and related drainage facilities were already in place.

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

Pedestrian Access. Sidewalks or other walkways may be excluded from a project when it can be demonstrated that there are no uses (including bus stops) that would create demand for pedestrian access. In making this determination, the agency must consider the potential for future demand within the useful life of the project. Access to and from public transit, including crossing improvements, also must be considered and accommodated where there is existing or planned transit service.

Bicycle Access. A new project or major reconstruction project may not include the expected bikeway treatment when a suitable parallel route with the appropriate accommodations exists that would require no more than ¼-mile total out of direction travel.
Procedures for Excluding Accommodations for Pedestrians and Bicyclists from Projects. When an agency determines not to include bicycle or pedestrian accommodations in a project because the cost of doing so would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use, the agency must include a notice of that decision in the notice of the public hearing required by Sections 5(A) and Section 6 of the Ordinance. In submitting the project to SANDAG for inclusion in the TransNet Program of Projects as part of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process, the agency must notify SANDAG that bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, as described in Table 1 or in its bicycle or pedestrian master plan, will not be included in the project along with written justification for that decision. The decision and justification is subject to review and comment by SANDAG through the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, which would forward its comments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee also would review and comment on such projects as part of its role in the RTIP process. The Transportation Committee in approving the TransNet Program of Projects must make a finding that the local decision not to provide bicycle or pedestrian facilities is consistent with the provisions of this Ordinance prior to approving the project for funding under the TransNet Program. If this consistency finding is not made, the agency would have the opportunity to revise its fund programming request for consideration in a future RTIP amendment.

Effective Implementation. This rule will be effective for projects added to the TransNet Program of Projects subsequent to their adoption by the SANDAG Board of Directors. Within three years of their adoption, the rule will be re-evaluated by SANDAG to ensure they are effectively encouraging provision of a balance transportation network without imposing an excessive cost burden on projects funded under the program.
2008 Congestion Management Program Update

November 7, 2008

Overview

- 2008 CMP Update highlights
- Changes to the Draft 2008 CMP
- Discussion of options for future CMP updates and potential modifications to the CMP arterial network
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

2008 CMP Update

- Updated roadway Level of Service
- Updated transit analysis
- Analysis of deficient segments
- Identification of required Deficiency Plans
Roadway LOS and Transit Corridor Analysis

- Decrease of 27 highway and arterial deficient segments
- Deficient mileage declined by 67 miles
- Overall increase in number of transit trips and ridership

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)

Deficient Segments

- SR 163: Ash St to Friars Rd (San Diego)
- SR 67: Mapview 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

Comments on the Draft 2008 CMP Update

• No substantial changes
• Comments received from four agencies relating to:
  – Deficiency Plans
  – Additions to the CMP network
  – Minor wording changes
Two Options for Future Direction of the CMP

1. Streamline CMP approach
   - RCP Monitoring Report
   - All other CMP requirements remain including Deficiency Plan requirements and enforcement

OR

2. CMP Opt Out
   - Still comply with federal CMP provisions

Benefits and Limitations of the CMP

• Benefits
  - Ensures monitoring is conducting on a regular basis
  - Identifies Deficiency Plans that local jurisdictions must prepare

• Limitations
  - Mandates use of peak hour LOS to determine deficiencies
  - Requires that Plans be prepared and adopted but not implemented
Trade-offs of Opting Out

- Local jurisdictions would not be required to prepare Deficiency Plans or subject to loss of gas taxes if found non-compliant
- Resources allocated to prepare, implement, and enforce the CMP could be used on other planning activities
- Requires one-time investment of staff time

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

- Conduct a public hearing on the Draft 2008 CMP Update
- Following consideration of public testimony, approve the 2008 CMP Update
- Discuss options for future direction for CMP and possible modifications to CMP arterial network
UTC Transit Center Funding

UTC Transit Center Location

Future Routes and Stations
- Super-knee Routes
- High-Cap Commuter transit
- Mid-Cost Commuter Limited
- Mid-Cost/Local
- Dial-a-Ride
- Project O&R Transit System

UTC Transit Center

November 7, 2008

SANDAG

SANDAG

November 7, 2008
Transit Center

Perspective View Looking North On Genesee Avenue

UTC Transit Center
Sustainability Program

• Existing Transit
  – Accommodates 6 buses

• Future Transit
  – Accommodates 11 buses
  – Designed for SuperLoop
  – Meets future needs, trolley service or BRT
Recommendation:

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors direct staff to take the necessary programming actions, including obtaining approval from the Federal Transit Administration, to utilize approximately $5.7 million in Section 5309 New Starts funds currently programmed for the Nobel Drive COASTER Station as a contribution towards construction of the new bus transit center.
Transportation Committee

1-15 Mid-City Bus Rapid Transit Planning
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I-15 Mid-City Bus Rapid Transit Planning

- November 2007

  Community Working Group, appointed by Councilmember Toni Atkins, to assist in the development of I-15 Bus Rapid Transit Mid-City facility alternatives.
Community Group
I-15 Mid-City BRT Stations Working Group

Theresa Quiroz Mid-City Resident
Jay Powell City Heights Community Development Corporation
Steve Russell City Heights Community Development Corporation
Enrique Gandarilla City Heights Business Association
Joe Scarretta City Heights Business Association
Jay Levine El Cajon Boulevard Business Improvement Association
Gary Weber El Cajon Boulevard Business Improvement Association
Karen Bucey City Heights Planning Area Committee
Dave Nelson City Heights Planning Committee
Jim Baross Normal Heights Planning Committee
Fred Lindahl Ken-Tal Planning Committee
Maria Cortez Teralta West Neighborhood Alliance
Al Stasukevich Cherokee Point Neighborhood Association

*Chaired by Steve Russell
*Met twice a month with agency staff and project consultant team.

Alternatives

- Four geometrically viable alternatives developed by Working Group, SANDAG, Caltrans, MTS, and City of San Diego staffs for facilities at University Avenue, El Cajon Boulevard, and in some cases, Adams Avenue.

- Next Step: Environmental Analysis and Preliminary Engineering

- Goal: Preferred alternative by 2010.
Alternatives for Further Analysis

2. Median Station with Grade Separated Cross-Over Access and Center Platform
9. Median Station with Side Platforms
12. Shoulder Lane Stations
16. Ramp Stations

Topics for Environmental Analysis and Preliminary Engineering

Mid-City Community
- Access to employment via transit
- Community development opportunities at stations

Caltrans/CHP
- Ownership/ LIABILITY
- Geometric Design
- Freeway operations and safety
- Freeway maintenance
- Enforcement
Topics for Environmental Analysis and Preliminary Engineering

MTS
- Optimal service provided to patrons
- Bus operations flexibility
- Station management, maintenance, and costs
- Station security

City of San Diego
- Multi-modal street design, operations, and maintenance
- Economic development
- Land Use coordination

Topics for Environmental Analysis and Preliminary Engineering

SANDAG
- Implementation of TransNet Program
- Cost-Effectiveness of Implementation Staging
- System Connectivity
- Funding
Next Steps

- Staff will provide periodic updates to Transportation Committee
- Preferred alternative proposed in 2010

Transportation Committee
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San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan

Progress Report

Introduction

• Purpose of the plan
• Plan development process
• Proposed network and facility types
• Next steps
Purpose of the Plan

- Develop a unified bicycle system throughout the San Diego region that serves a wide variety of bicycle trips with connections to pedestrian paths, trails, and transit

Purpose of the Plan

- Supports implementation of
  - Regional Comprehensive Plan
  - Regional Transportation Plan
- Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
- Improved air quality
- Improved public health
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Process – Phase One

- Gather existing data
- First set of public workshops
- Project website
- 1577 rider preference questionnaires

Process – Phase Two

- Data analysis
- Draft Existing Conditions Report
  - Existing bicycling conditions
  - Existing facilities
  - Bicycle supportive programs
  - Project priority areas
Process – Phase Three

- Technical Memo – *Proposed Corridor Alignments and Classifications & Regional Bicycle-Related Programs*
  - Regional network
  - Facility types
  - Facility classifications
- Second set of public workshops

Process – Phase Four

- Goals, objectives, and policy actions
- Final refinement regional network and facility types
- Regional bicycle facility design guidelines
- Preliminary cost estimates for top priority projects
- Short-term and long-term funding strategy
Rider Behavior and Preferences

Why do you bike?

- 80% - 90%  Exercise and Pleasure
- 50% - 60%  Work, School or Shopping
- 15%  Get to Transit

What Bicycle Facility Types Do You Prefer?

- 90%  Off-Street Paved Bike Paths
- 85%  On-Street Bike Lanes
- 80%  Bicycle Boulevards
- 60%  Bicycle Routes
- 35%  Unpaved Trails
Rider Behavior and Preferences

What would influence you to ride more?

- More bike lanes  88%
- More bike paths  79%
- Wider curb lanes  78%
- Increased maintenance  74%
- Bicycle boulevards  69%
- More bike routes  67%

Proposed Regional Network and Facilities

- Create a Class I Network
  - Existing and planned Class I
  - Additional opportunities for Class I based on ROW
Proposed Regional Network and Facilities

- Opportunities for Facilities that provide Separation from Vehicular Traffic
  - *Cycle Tracks* along arterials with few crossings, available ROW, limited alternatives
  - *Bicycle Boulevards* where low-volume parallel roadways provide direct connections

Next Steps

- Select preferred network and facility types
- Preferred funding strategy
- Recommend goals and objectives
- Draft Plan early 2009
- Final Plan spring 2009
Current Progress

• Mainline contractor: punch list work
• Other contractors performing landscape maintenance and stormwater work
• Inland Rail Trail: maintenance agreements pending
• Financial close-out of contracts
  – With claims resolved: spring 2009
  – With claims unresolved: TBD
Weekday Ridership Trends

SPRINTER Ridership, April – October 2008

Claims & Disputes

- Signal and communication changes
- Re-work of the rail-bridge connections
- Delay
  - Schedule analysis pending
  - Potential liquidated damages of $4.6M
Estimate at Completion (EAC)

- October EAC: $479.3M
- Includes full $15.5M maximum value of settlement agreement
- Includes $472.8M base cost and $6.5M contingency
- Project budget: $484.1M
- Total funds available: $484.1M - $472.8M = $11.3M

Estimate at Completion (EAC)

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