**REVISED**

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**AGENDA**

Friday, June 26, 2009
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

**AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS**

- FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ALLOCATIONS
- TRANSIT IMPEDIMENTS STUDY
- SMART GROWTH DESIGN GUIDELINES

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

**MISSION STATEMENT**

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board 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 the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Board of Directors 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 the SANDAG 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 12 noon, two working days prior to the Board of Directors meeting.

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
+1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

   +A. MAY 8, 2009, BOARD POLICY MEETING MINUTES
   +B. MAY 22, 2009, MEETING MINUTES

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Board members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

+3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

This item summarizes the actions taken by the Borders Committee on May 22, the Transportation, joint Transportation/Regional Planning, and Regional Planning Committees on June 5, the Executive Committee on June 12, and the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on June 19, 2009.

CONSENT ITEMS (4 through 11)

+4. SANDAG/NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT FY 2009 PROPOSITION 1B CALIFORNIA TRANSIT SECURITY GRANT APPLICATION (Sookyung Kim)

Proposition 1B, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, authorizes the issuance of general obligation bonds for specified purposes, including funding for the Transit Security Grant program for transit system safety, security, and disaster response projects. Consistent with existing State Transit Assistance requirements, SANDAG must apply for the Proposition 1B funds on behalf of the North County Transit District (NCTD). The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2009-35 (Attachment 1) in substantially the same form as attached, authorizing the Executive Director to apply for FY 2009 Proposition 1B Transit Security Grant Program funds on behalf of North County Transit District.
+5. FY 2010 BUDGET AND OVERALL WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT: SANDAG ASSUMING ROLE AS THE FISCAL AGENT FOR THE U.S. ATTORNEY’S OFFICE PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS (Cynthia Burke)  APPROVE

Since 2003, a national federal effort called Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) has been coordinated through the local U.S. Attorney’s Office to target gun- and gang-related violence. The SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division has been involved in this effort locally since its inception, currently serving as the research partner. The U.S. Attorney’s Office has approached SANDAG to assume the role of the fiscal agent beginning in FY 2010, per Department of Justice requirements for a local government agency to fulfill these contracting and reporting tasks. The Public Safety Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2010 Budget and Overall Work Program to accept $669,866 in funding and authorize the Executive Director to execute the Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and the Southern District of California’s Project Safe Neighborhoods Task Force in substantially the same form as attached (Attachment 1).

+6. MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN SANDAG AND THE CITY OF SANTEE REGARDING TransNet EXTENSION ORDINANCE COMMERCIAL PAPER PROGRAM AND REQUEST FOR AN EXCEPTION TO RULE NO. 16 OF BOARD POLICY NO. 031 (Lauren Warrem)*  APPROVE

The Santee City Council has approved the borrowing of $3.95 million in TransNet Commercial Paper funding based on the revenue projections provided by SANDAG. Participation at this level will allow the City of Santee to complete the funding needs for the Forester Creek Improvement Program. The Transportation Committee recommends that Board of Directors (1) approve the use of TransNet Commercial Paper program for the City of Santee; (2) approve an exception to Rule #16 of Board Policy No. 031 to increase the repayment period from five years to ten years; and (3) authorize the Executive Director to execute the Memorandum of Agreement in substantially the same form as attached to the report (Attachment 1).

+7. SUPPORT FOR TRIBAL-RELATED FEDERAL AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT PROPOSALS (Jane Riquelme)  APPROVE

Tribal Nations across the country are competing for tribal-specific funding available through the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association requested that SANDAG provide letters of support for project proposals submitted by San Diego tribes. The Borders Committee recommends that the Board of Directors is asked to delegate authority to the Executive Director to provide letters of support for tribal-specific ARRA project applications that are submitted by San Diego tribes, and consistent with SANDAG policies and programs as well as local agency general plans.
+8. EAST COUNTY BUS MAINTENANCE FACILITY BUDGET CONSOLIDATION (John Dorow)

The Metropolitan Transit System Board of Directors has approved budget changes and grant transfers for various East County Bus Maintenance Facility (ECBMF) projects. The changes include a consolidation of two separate SANDAG Capital Improvement Projects (CIPs) and the transfer of federal grant dollars from an MTS CIP project into a single consolidated SANDAG CIP project, to facilitate the construction of site improvements at ECBMF in the near term. The Transportation Committee recommends that Board of Directors (1) approve the transfer of the remaining $686,386 in SANDAG project 1142700 (ECBMF CNG Station) to SANDAG project 1049600 (ECBMF); and (2) accept the transfer of $501,600 in dedicated funding, including federal grant E2007-BUSP-0062, from MTS CIP 11237 (East County Land Acquisition) to SANDAG project 1049600 (ECBMF).

+9. ANNUAL REPORT ON COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS (Victoria Stackwick)

As required by SANDAG Board Policy No. 004, this item provides an annual report on the status of all standing and ad hoc committees and working groups.

+10. REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (Lauren Warrem)

In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy Nos. 003 (Investment Policy), 017 (Delegation of Authority), and 024 (Procurement and Contracting-Construction), this report summarizes certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board meeting.

+11. REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG (Kim Kawada)

Board members will provide brief reports orally or in writing on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board of Directors meeting.

REPORTS (12 through 18)

+12. FIRST READING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TransNet ORDINANCE 04-01 REGARDING AUDIT REPORTING FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (Second Vice Chair Jack Dale, Transportation Committee Chair; Charles "Muggs" Stoll)*

The TransNet Ordinance (Commission Ordinance CO-04-01) includes language requiring that all local jurisdictions have their Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) financial records available for audit
by July 1 of each calendar year. It is proposed that the audit requirements for the RTCIP be aligned with the annual fiscal and compliance audit requirements for the TransNet program. As recommended by the Transportation Committee and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee, the Board of Directors is asked to conduct the first reading of the CO-09-01, which would amend CO-04-01 to align the timeline for the RTCIP audits with the TransNet annual fiscal and compliance audit requirements (“Amendment”). The Board of Directors is further asked to approve a one-time extension of time to September 1, 2009, for jurisdictions to submit financial records pertaining to their RTCIP Funding Programs for review and audit in order to allow sufficient time for the proposed Amendment to be considered.

+13.  +A. FY 2010 TDA/TransNet BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY/TRAFFIC CALMING FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS (Second Vice Chair Jack Dale, Transportation Committee Chair; Chris Kluth)*

SANDAG is responsible for the allocation of Transportation Development Act (TDA) and TransNet funds to local agencies for bicycle, pedestrian, and neighborhood safety projects. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve (1) the list of projects for funding as shown in Attachment 6; and (2) Resolution No. 2009-30 approving the FY 2010 TDA Article 3 allocation as shown in Attachment 7.

+14.  DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION

At its April 24, 2009, meeting, the Board of Directors accepted the Transit Impediments Study report for public distribution and referred it to the Transportation Committee for review of the alternatives identified in the report. This item will report on public comments received and the Transportation Committee’s discussion at the June 19, 2009 meeting on possible next steps for the Board’s consideration. The Board of Directors is asked to consider the alternatives identified in the Transit Impediments Study for possible implementation in order to increase and maintain service levels or increase and maintain funding for transit operational expenses.
15. SMART GROWTH DESIGN GUIDELINES (Imperial Beach Mayor Jim Janney, Regional Planning Committee Chair; Stephan Vance)

The development of design guidelines for smart growth areas is one of the strategic initiatives of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Working in collaboration with local agency staff, SANDAG and its consultants have developed draft guidelines covering a broad array of topics pertaining to good design and great place-making. The Regional Planning Committee recommends that the Board of Directors accept Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region for distribution and for use as a resource in the SANDAG smart growth toolkit.

16. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: WORK PROGRAM AND SCHEDULE (Second Vice Chair Jack Dale, Transportation Committee Chair; Heather Werdick)*

This report provides an overview of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) work program and schedule. The 2050 RTP will be based on a 2050 Regional Growth Forecast, will incorporate the results of the many regional and corridor studies currently underway, and will include new components as required by Senate Bill 375. Additionally, responsibilities and roles of various working groups and the Policy Advisory Committees are outlined.

17. SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC (SDG&E) REGIONAL ENERGY INITIATIVES AND SUMMER ENERGY OUTLOOK (Hal Snyder and Rob Anderson, SDG&E; Susan Freedman)

Hal Snyder of SDG&E will present the new local government partnership with SANDAG that will expand the Sustainable Region Program to more local governments through 2011. In addition, he will provide information on an SDG&E and Nissan North America partnership to bring zero emission vehicles to the San Diego region and how SANDAG might partner in this effort. Rob Anderson will present the Summer Energy Outlook for our region based on the state forecast released in May by the California Independent System Operator.

18. FINANCIAL MARKET STATUS (Lauren Warrem and Marney Cox)

This monthly briefing is designed to keep the Board of Directors informed about the latest developments in the financial markets, the economy, and revenue forecasts, and the strategies we are exploring and implementing to minimize possible impacts to SANDAG.
19.  UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, July 10, 2009, at 10 a.m. The next Board Business meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for Friday, July 24, 2009, at 9 a.m.

20.  ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
* next to an agenda item indicates a San Diego Regional Transportation Commission item
Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (Escondido) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 10:10 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Don Stillwell, a member of the public, requested additional transit service in Mission Valley.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, introduced Renée Wasmund as the new Chief Deputy Executive Director.

REPORTS (2 through 4)

2. SECOND READING OF NEW REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE (HOLD SECOND READING AND ADOPT)

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) has declared a fiscal emergency and has taken action to reduce expenditures due to funding cutbacks from the State of California and falling sales tax revenue. The MTS Board of Directors has approved a strategy that includes $4.7 million in savings from service reductions, and $2.2 million from additional revenue resulting from increases to Regional and Premium Pass prices, elimination of the downtown Trolley Zone, and discontinuing Community and Local Circulator special fares. Staff also has completed a revision of the Regional Fare Ordinance to reflect the various changes needed to accommodate the implementation of the Compass Card.

Dan Levy, Senior Planner, provided the staff report.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Jim Desmond (San Marcos) and a second by First Vice Chair Jerome Stocks (Encinitas), the SANDAG Board of Directors held the second reading and adopted a new Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance that would implement fare increases requested by MTS and other clarifying changes. Yes – 13 (weighted vote, 92%). No – Del Mar, El Cajon, and Imperial Beach (weighted vote, 8%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – La Mesa, City of San Diego, and Santee.
3. **FUTURE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM PROCESS (APPROVE)**

SANDAG is required by state law to prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the San Diego region. The last CMP update was adopted by SANDAG in November 2008. Staff evaluated two strategies for future CMPs. One strategy is to streamline the state CMP process, and the other is to opt out of the state CMP process. SANDAG will continue to follow the federal congestion management process through ongoing planning activities. The Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors direct staff to work with local jurisdictions to prepare resolutions electing to opt out of the state CMP.

Heather Werdick, Senior Planner, provided the staff report.

**Action**: Upon a motion by Mayor Jim Wood (Oceanside) and second by Mayor Desmond, the SANDAG Board of Directors directed staff to work with local jurisdictions to prepare resolutions electing to opt out of the state Congestion Management Program. Yes – 17 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – La Mesa and City of San Diego.

4. **PRESENTATION FROM SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY (INFORMATION)**

Commissioner Mark Muir (San Diego County Water Authority), and Paul Lanspery, Deputy General Manager of the San Diego County Water Authority, provided the Board of Directors with an update on the current water supply situation in the San Diego region and the potential impact on water rates.

Lorraine Leighton, a member of the public, asked about enforcement efforts for those who waste water.

5. **UPCOMING MEETINGS (INFORMATION)**

The next Business meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for Friday, May 22, 2009, at 9 a.m. The next Policy meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for Friday, June 12, 2009, at 10 a.m.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.
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## ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS’ MEETING
#### MAY 8, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cheryl Cox (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Carrie Downey (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Crystal Crawford (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Mark Lewis (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Jerome Stocks, 1st Vice Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>James Wood (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Don Higginson (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego – A</td>
<td>Jerry Sanders (Primary, Seat A)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Ben Hueso (Primary, Seat B)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jim Desmond (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale (2nd Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Bill Horn (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price (Primary, Seat B)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado (1st. Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Bob Campbell (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Victor Carrillo (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>CAPT Steve Wirshing (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Unified Port District</td>
<td>Scott Peters (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD County Water Authority</td>
<td>Mark Muir (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California/Mexico</td>
<td>Remedios Gómez-Arnau (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Allen Lawson (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (Escondido) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:02 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)
   
   **Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Mark Lewis (El Cajon), and a second by Mayor Jim Desmond (San Marcos), the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the minutes from the April 10 and April 24, 2009, meetings.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS
   
   Mayor Jim Wood (Oceanside) expressed an offer from Major General Michael Lehnert to SANDAG Board members for a tour of Camp Pendleton.
   
   Don Stillwell, a member of the public, provided comments regarding public transportation in Mission Valley, especially the need for timed connections.
   
   Chair Pfeiler announced that SANDAG received the Golden Watchdog Award for safeguarding capital improvement projects. The San Diego County Taxpayers Association recognized SANDAG efforts to exchange TransNet funds with federal economic stimulus funds to keep regional highway, transit, and local street projects moving during these challenging economic times.
   
   Chair Pfeiler announced that our SANDAG Tribal Liaison, Jane Clough-Riquelme, received this year’s Distinguished Service Award from the San Diego Chapter of the American Planning Association. The Reservation Transportation Authority nominated Ms. Clough-Riquelme for this award, commending her ability to facilitate dialogue between tribal nations and public agencies and her high level of respect for tribal people, customs, and institutions.

3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (APPROVE)
   
   This item summarizes the actions taken by the Borders Committee on April 24, the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees on May 1, the Executive Committee on May 8, and the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on May 15, 2009.
   
   **Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) and second by Mayor Wood, the Board of Directors approved the actions taken by the Policy Advisory
Committees at the meetings noted above. Yes – 16 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – Coronado, Lemon Grove, and National City.

CONSENT ITEMS (4 through 11)

4. FY 2010 WEIGHTED VOTING FORMULA (APPROVE)

On an annual basis, SANDAG is required to recomputes the weighted vote of the Board of Directors based on updated population figures. The population figures used for this purpose have been certified by the California Department of Finance. The Board of Directors is asked to approve the FY 2010 Weighted Voting Formula.

5. FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS (APPROVE)

SANDAG is responsible for determining if the transit agencies have made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvement recommendations adopted by the Board of Directors for the current fiscal year. This item discusses the transit agency productivity improvements associated with the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claim for FY 2010. The Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors find that the Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District made a reasonable effort to implement productivity improvements and to approve continuing this program in FY 2010, which fulfills the requirements outlined in Section 99244 of the TDA law.

6. COASTAL REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN (APPROVE)

SANDAG received a grant from the California Department of Boating and Waterways to develop a Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan for the San Diego region. The Plan is a guidance and policy document that will discuss how management of sediment targeted at coastal erosion can be implemented in an expeditious, cost-effective, and resource-protective manner throughout the San Diego region. Based on the recommendations of the Shoreline Preservation Working Group and the Regional Planning Committee, the Board of Directors is asked to approve the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan.

7. ESTABLISHING THE REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (APPROVE)

The purpose of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group will be to review and provide input into key activities associated with the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy, the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, and other regional planning initiatives. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees recommended that the Board of Directors approve the establishment of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, its charter, and issue the call for membership applications. The Board also is asked to authorize staff to administer a community-based environmental justice outreach program consistent with the process set forth in the report, including the award of community-based network mini-grants.
8. QUARTERLY INVESTMENT REPORT FOR PERIOD ENDING MARCH 31, 2009 (INFORMATION)

The SANDAG Investment Policy requires that the Board be provided a quarterly report of investments held by SANDAG. This report includes all money under the direction or care of SANDAG as of March 31, 2009.

9. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS – JANUARY TO MARCH 2009 (INFORMATION)

This quarterly report summarizes the current status of major highway, transit, arterial, traffic management, and transportation demand management (TDM) projects in SANDAG’s five-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for the period January through March 2009.

10. REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (INFORMATION)

In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy Nos. 003 (Investment Policy), 017 (Delegation of Authority), and 024 (Procurement and Contracting-Construction), this report summarizes certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board meeting.

11. REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG (INFORMATION)

Board members will provide brief reports orally or in writing on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board of Directors meeting.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Matt Hall (Carlsbad), and a second by Councilmember Lesa Heebner (Solana Beach), the Board of Directors approved Consent Items Nos. 4 through 11. Yes - 16. No - 0. Abstain - 0. Absent – Coronado, Lemon Grove, and National City.

CHAIR’S REPORT (12)

12. RECOGNITION OF OUTGOING TransNet INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEMBER RON GEROW (INFORMATION)

Chair Pfeiler recognized Ron Gerow, an outgoing member of the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), who served on the Committee from May 2006 to May 2009. Hamid Bahadori, ITOC Vice Chair, accepted the award on behalf of Mr. Gerow.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
13. TransNet TRIENNIAL PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Hamid Bahadori, Vice Chair of the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee, provided a presentation to the Board of Directors on the TransNet Triennial Performance Audit, in accordance with provisions of the TransNet Extension Ordinance.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

14. REVISION TO FY 2009 AND FY 2010 TransNet REVENUES (APPROVE)

Second Vice Chair and Transportation Committee Chair Jack Dale (Santee) presented the Transportation Committee recommendation.

Marney Cox, Chief Economist, and Sookyung Kim, Financial Programming Manager, presented the staff report.

Action: Upon a motion by Council President Ben Hueso (City of San Diego) and second by Mayor Wood, the Board of Directors approved the revised the FY 2009 and FY 2010 TransNet revenue projections. Yes – 17 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – Lemon Grove and National City.

15. FINAL FY 2010 BUDGET (INCLUDING THE OVERALL WORK PROGRAM) (APPROVE)

First Vice Chair Jerome Stocks (Encinitas) introduced the item.

Tim Watson, Budget Program Manager, provided the staff report. SANDAG Bylaws require the Board of Directors to adopt a final budget by June 30 of each year. The FY 2010 Budget includes the Overall Work Program (OWP), Capital Improvement Program, TransNet Program, and Administrative and Board budgets. The Executive Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2009-26 adopting the FY 2010 Budget, including the OWP, and Resolution No. 2009-27 adopting the change in the California Public Employees Retirement System contribution for new employees hired after June 30, 2009. The Public Safety Committee at its May 15, 2009, meeting, also recommended Board approval of the revised Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) member assessment structure, along with the revised program expenses.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater-Price and second by Mayor Jim Janney (Imperial Beach), the Board of Directors approved Resolution No. 2009-26 adopting the FY 2010 Budget, including the Overall Work Program, and Resolution No. 2009-27 adopting the change in the California Public Employees Retirement System contribution for new employees hired after June 30, 2009. In addition, the Board approved the revised ARJIS member assessment structure and the revised ARJIS program expenses. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – National City.
16. MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

Second Vice Chair Jack Dale, Transportation Committee Chair, introduced this item.

A. Federal Transit Administration New Starts Program Overview and Status Update (INFORMATION)

Leslie Blanda, Project Development Program Manager, presented an overview of the Federal Transit Administration New Starts Program and an update on the status of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. The TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan specifies that implementation of the Mid-Coast project relies on the receipt of federal funds. The New Starts Program provides federal funding for new fixed guideway transit projects or extensions to existing fixed guideway transit systems. SANDAG will be seeking New Starts funding to match local TransNet capital funding for the project.

B. Public Involvement Plan and Working Group (APPROVE)

Anne Steinberger, Marketing Program Manager, presented the SANDAG draft Public Involvement Plan to support public outreach activities for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit project.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Mary Sessom (Lemon Grove) and second by Mayor Janney, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the draft Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Public Involvement Plan for public review and comment, approved the establishment of the Mid-Coast Project Working Group and its charter, and issued the call for membership applications. Chair Pfeiler also appointed San Diego Councilmember Sherri Lightner to serve on the selection committee for the Project Working Group (in addition to the two members appointed by the Transportation Committee). Yes – 17 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – La Mesa and City of San Diego.

17. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: FY 2009 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS (APPROVE)

Mayor Janney, Regional Planning Committee Chair, introduced the item.

Councilmember Carrie Downey (Coronado), Regional Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) Working Group Chair, provided comments from the EMP Working Group.

Keith Greer, Senior Planner, provided the staff report.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Downey and second by Supervisor Slater-Price, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the prioritized list of land management projects and funding allocations as described in the report, and authorized staff to enter into contracts for the selected projects totaling $1.63 million. Yes – 17 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – La Mesa and National City.
18. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM GRANT PROJECTS (APPROVE)

Mayor Janney, Regional Planning Committee Chair, introduced this item.

Stephan Vance, Senior Planner, presented the staff report.

Chair Pfeiler noted there were requests to speak on the item.

Jim Varnadore, a member of the public, spoke in opposition of the application from City Heights.

Stephen Russell, a member of the public, spoke in favor of the City Heights application.

**Action**: Upon a motion by Mayor Wood and second by Second Vice Chair Dale, the Board of Directors approved the list of projects for funding under the first cycle of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program. Yes – 17 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – La Mesa and National City.

19. REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY UPDATE (DISCUSSION)

As part of our California Energy Commission agreement, SANDAG is currently updating the Regional Energy Strategy (RES), which was last updated in December 2003. The Regional Energy Working Group (EWG) has been providing input into the RES update.

Councilmember Downey, EWG Chair, and Susan Freedman, Senior Planner, presented an overview of the draft update, our regional energy needs through 2030, and proposed goals and policies that can help position the region to meet our future energy needs in a sustainable manner.

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

20. REGIONAL CLIMATE ACTION PLAN (DISCUSSION)

Funded in part by a grant from the California Energy Commission, SANDAG is preparing a Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP) with input from the Regional Energy Working Group.

Councilmember Downey, EWG Chair, and Andrew Martin, Associate Planner, presented an overview of the draft plan, including proposed guiding principles, goals and policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and draft performance measures to monitor progress in meeting our climate action goals over time.

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

21. COMPASS CARD UPDATE AND BUDGET AMENDMENTS (APPROVE)

James Dreisbach-Towle, Principal Technology Program Analyst, summarized the current status of Compass Card launch activities. The report also included proposed budget actions to distribute the $800,000 in new revenues provided through the exclusive grocery store third-party agreement with VONS for distribution of Compass Cards.
Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Wood and second by First Vice Chair Stocks, the Board of Directors approved the distribution of the VONS payment as follows: (1) approve a budget amendment of $325,000 to project 1145700, Automated Fare Collection (AFC), for purchase of the necessary equipment for VONS stores; and (2) approve a budget amendment of $300,000 to OWP 6000700 for FY 2010 for ongoing program operations and marketing. The remaining $175,000 will be added to the FY 2011 budget of OWP 6000700, for a total of $800,000 in additional revenues provided through the agreement with VONS. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – Del Mar.

22. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM ACTIONS (APPROVE)

Chris Kluth, Associate Planner, provided the staff report.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Sessom and second by Supervisor Dianne Jacob (County of San Diego), the Board of Directors adopted Resolution No. 2009-28 to add $9,000 in Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds for the City of Santee Bicycle Master Plan, and adopted Resolution No. 2009-29 providing $68,000 in TDA funds for the SANDAG San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – Del Mar.

23. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, June 12, 2009, at 10 a.m. The next Board Business meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for Friday, June 26, 2009, at 9 a.m.

24. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

DGunn/M/DGU
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cheryl Cox (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Carrie Downey (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Crystal Crawford (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Mark Lewis (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Jerome Stocks, 1st Vice Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>James Wood (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Don Higginson (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego – A</td>
<td>Anthony Young (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Ben Hueso (Primary, Seat B)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jim Desmond (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale (2nd Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Dianne Jacob (Primary, Seat A)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price (Primary, Seat B)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado (1st. Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Bob Campbell (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Victor Carrillo (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>CAPT Robert Fahey (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Unified Port District</td>
<td>Scott Peters (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD County Water Authority</td>
<td>Mark Muir (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California/Mexico</td>
<td>Lydia Antonio (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association</td>
<td>Robert H. Smith (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
_ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The following actions were taken by the Policy Advisory Committees since the last Board of Directors meeting.

BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (May 22, 2009)

The Borders Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Accepted the Tribal Transportation Demand Management Outreach Final Report for distribution to Caltrans.

- Recommended that the Board of Directors delegate authority to the Executive Director to provide letters of support for tribal-specific American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 project applications that are submitted by San Diego tribes and consistent with SANDAG policies and programs.

- Appointed Escondido Councilmember Sam Abed, San Diego County Supervisor Pam Slater-Price, and Santee Councilmember John Minto to serve on an ad hoc joint summit planning task force for a spring 2010 Tribal Summit.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (June 5, 2009)

The Transportation Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Recommended that the Board of Directors approve Resolution Nos. 2009-31 to 2009-34, approving the FY 2010 Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocations, in substantially the same form as attached to the report.

- Recommended that the Board of Directors conduct a first reading of Commission Ordinance No. 09-01, which would amend Commission Ordinance No. 04-01 to align the timeline for the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) audits with the TransNet annual fiscal and compliance audit requirements (“Amendment”). The Transportation Committee further recommended that the Board of Directors approve a one-time extension of time to September 1, 2009, for jurisdictions to submit financial records pertaining to their RTCIP funding programs for review and audit in order to allow sufficient time for the proposed Amendment to be considered.

- Accepted draft goals and policy objectives for use in the Regional Bicycle Plan, and accepted draft project prioritization criteria that will be used to prepare the regional bicycle network phasing plan.
JOINT TRANSPORTATION/REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (June 5, 2009)

The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

• Recommended that the Board of Directors accept and distribute the draft land use scenarios for the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast for public review and use in upcoming public workshops.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (June 5, 2009)

The Regional Planning Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

• Recommended that the Board of Directors accept the Regional Alternative Fuels, Vehicles, and Infrastructure draft report for public distribution and comments.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (June 12, 2009)

The Executive Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

• Recommended that the Board of Directors approve the proposed changes to excerpts of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, pending adoption of proposed Commission Ordinance No. 09-01.

• Approved the continuation of the SANDAG lower level committees and working groups as described in the agenda report.

• Approved the Board agenda for the June 26, 2009, meeting, as amended.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETINGS (June 19, 2009)

The Transportation Committee is scheduled to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2009-35, authorizing the Executive Director to apply for FY 2009 Proposition 1B Transit Security Grant Program funds on behalf of North County Transit District (NCTD).

• Approve Amendment No. 14 to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program with Project NCTD06 (Bus/Rail Support Equipment & Facility) being contingent upon Board approval of the Proposition 1B Transit Security Grant Application on behalf of NCTD.

• Approve the NCTD and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) operating budgets for funding, with final budgets subject to approval by the respective transit district boards.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the use of the TransNet Commercial Paper program for the City of Santee in the amount of $3.95 million; (2) approve an exception to Rule #16 of Board Policy No. 031 to increase the repayment period from five years to ten years for this instance; and (3) authorize the Executive Director to execute the Memorandum of Agreement in substantially the same form as attached to the report.
• Provide recommendations on possible next steps for the Transit Impediments Study for the Board's consideration at its June 26, 2009, meeting.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve: (1) the list of FY 2010 TDA and TransNet bicycle, pedestrian, and neighborhood safety/traffic calming projects for funding; and (2) Resolution No. 2009-30, approving the FY 2010 TDA Article 3 allocation, in substantially the same form as attached to the report.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the transfer of the remaining $686,386 in SANDAG project 1142700 (East County Bus Maintenance Facility (ECBMF) Compressed Natural Gas Station) to SANDAG project 1049600 (ECBMF); and (2) accept the transfer of $501,600 in dedicated funding, including federal grant E2007-BUSP-0062, from MTS Capital Improvement Project 11237 (East County Land Acquisition) to SANDAG project 1049600 (ECBMF).

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING (June 19, 2009)

The Public Safety Committee is scheduled to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2010 Budget and Overall Work Program to accept $669,866 in funding, and authorize the Executive Director to execute the Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and the Southern District of California’s Project Safe Neighborhoods Task Force, in substantially the same form as attached to the agenda report.

Staff will update the Board of Directors if the actual actions taken by the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on June 19, 2009, differ from those described in this report.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
Introduction
Proposition 1B provides funding for the Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP) using the existing State Transit Assistance (STA) distribution formula. Consistent with STA requirements, SANDAG applies for the Proposition 1B funds on behalf of the North County Transit District (NCTD).

Discussion
The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, known as Proposition 1B, authorizes the issuance of approximately $19.9 billion in general obligation bonds for specified purposes, including several of the programs already approved by the Board of Directors such as the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account; the Trade Corridor Improvement Fund; and the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account programs. Proposition 1B funds also will provide grants for transit system safety, security, and disaster response projects through a $1 billion TSGP. The Governor’s Office of Homeland Security (OHS) is responsible for program management of the TSGP, and funds must be appropriated on an annual basis before they may be allocated.

The FY 2009 Proposition 1B TSGP appropriation totals $60 million. These funds have been allocated to eligible recipients using the same formula used to distribute STA funds. Fifty percent of the FY 2009 TSGP funds have been allocated to eligible agencies based on population and 50 percent have been allocated to eligible operators using a fare revenue-based formula. As with STA funding, the Metropolitan Transit System is eligible to receive those funds directly under both formula distributions. SANDAG is the sole eligible recipient for the NCTD share, and therefore SANDAG must approve the application to be filed on behalf of NCTD for these funds. Under the funding formulas, NCTD would be eligible to receive $860,494 of these FY 2009 TSGP funds.

Eligible uses of the TSGP funding are summarized in the following list:

A. A capital project that provides increased protection against a security or safety threat, including but not limited to:
   1. Construction or renovation projects that are designed to enhance the security of public transit stations, tunnels, guideways, elevated structures, or other transit facilities and equipment.
2. Explosive device mitigation and remediation equipment.
3. Chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear explosives search, rescue, or response equipment.
4. Interoperable communications equipment.
5. Physical security enhancement equipment.
6. The installation of fencing, barriers, gates, or related security enhancements that are designed to improve the physical security of transit stations, tunnels, guideways, elevated structures, or other transit facilities and equipment.
7. Other security-related projects approved by OHS.

B. A capital project that increases the capacity of transit operators to prepare for disaster-response transportation systems that can move people, goods, emergency personnel, and equipment in the aftermath of a disaster.

NCTD wishes to use the $860,494 for two separate projects to enhance safety and security: (1) Planning and Design for Positive Train Control in the amount of $594,200, and (2) SPRINTER Network Back-Up (Redundancy) Capabilities in the amount of $266,294.

**Positive Train Control (PTC)**

PTC is a predictive collision avoidance technology that can stop a train before it collides with another train or a misaligned switch. PTC is designed to keep a train within authorized limits on a track and under its maximum speed limit. To accomplish this, sophisticated technology and braking algorithms will automatically bring PTC-equipped trains to a safe stop. This will help prevent train-to-train collisions, over-speed derailments, and casualties or injuries to passengers, the public, and railway workers. The Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008, passed by Congress and signed by the President in October 2008, mandates implementation of PTC nationwide by December 2015. This mandate applies to the NCTD coastal rail system due to mixed passenger and freight operations.

Because of the level of technological sophistication of PTC systems, including the absolute need for seamless interoperability between freight and passenger trains and among multiple operators nationwide, implementation requires extensive planning and design. In order to meet the December 2015 deadline, NCTD must initiate planning and design activities now. Toward this end, NCTD has been and will continue to coordinate PTC project development activities with the multiple operators and owners of the rail right-of-way along the LOSSAN corridor to ensure this project is effectively and efficiently planned, designed, and implemented. NCTD also will be coordinating with SANDAG to ensure that this project receives the proper visibility and financial commitment necessary for its successful implementation. Future allocations under this program will be used to help fund the purchase of the requisite hardware, software, and integration required to implement PTC.

**SPRINTER Network Back-Up (Redundancy) Capabilities**

The SPRINTER network currently relies upon a single network card at the SONET node at each station. SONET, or Synchronous Optical NETworking, is a type of networking protocol designed for large volumes of data like video. SONET rings, known as “self-healing rings,” use two or more transmission paths between network nodes. The intent in the implementation of this technology is that if there is a break in one line, the other may still be available. For the best security against
failure, when possible, different physical routes are used for the two lines. If these cards fail, the station equipment is not accessible through the central security console. A new card must be configured and installed before the system capabilities are once again operational. These cards are a critical element of the SPRINTER security system. Since these cards have demonstrated a higher failure rate than originally anticipated, and significantly higher than any other component in the SPRINTER network, staff is proposing to install redundant cards at each station to provide failover capability so that there is a back-up if there is a loss of a card. Staff considers this project to be a critical security component since it is directly related to the security team’s ability to access cameras, public announcement systems, and electronic call boxes at the SPRINTER stations.

In order to receive funding each recipient agency is required to submit an Investment Justification (IJ) that identifies the project(s) proposed to be funded with the grant. NCTD submitted the required Investment Justification by the required timeline of June 5, 2009, on behalf of SANDAG, subject to approval of the SANDAG and NCTD Boards. OHS has agreed to process this request based on the Investment Justification while awaiting final approval of the resolutions, which are due by June 30, 2009.

The NCTD Board approved this action at its meeting on June 18, 2009. Also, this project (NCTD06) was included with the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Amendment No. 14, approved by the Transportation Committee (June 19, 2009) but contingent upon the approval of the Board for this item.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Resolution No. 2009-35

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, ski@sandag.org

No Budget Impact
RESOLUTION
NO. 2009-35

APPROVING A FUNDING APPLICATION ON BEHALF OF THE NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT FOR THE TRANSIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM-CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND FY 2009 PROPOSITION 1B-6161-0002

WHEREAS, The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, approved by the voters as Proposition 1B at the November 7, 2006, general election, authorizes the issuance of approximately $19.9 billion in general obligation bonds for specified purposes, including grants for transit system safety, security, and disaster response projects; and

WHEREAS, $1 billion of said bond proceeds are to be made available in the Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account, which for FY 2009 will provide $60 million for the Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP); and

WHEREAS, funds under the TSGP must be allocated utilizing the distribution formulas of the State Transit Assistance program;

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the SANDAG Board of Directors does hereby:

1. Approve the allocation of TSGP funding to NCTD set forth below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Code No.</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8879.58(a)(2)</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>$616,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8879.58(a)(3)</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>$243,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$860,494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Authorize the Executive Director or designee to take any actions necessary for the purpose of securing Transit Security Grant Funding for NCTD as noted above.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of June, 2009.

________________________________________   ATTEST: ______________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

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

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association, and Mexico.
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
JUNE 26, 2009

FY 2010 BUDGET AND OVERALL WORK PROGRAM
AMENDMENT: SANDAG ASSUMING ROLE AS THE
FISCAL AGENT FOR THE U.S. ATTORNEY’S OFFICE
PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS

Introduction
Since 2003, a national federal effort has been coordinated through the local U.S. Attorney’s Office to target gun- and gang-related violence. This effort, called Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN), has involved a comprehensive strategy that includes coordinated regional response by law enforcement, the involvement of community partners, a media campaign, as well as the analysis of gun-crime statistics. The SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division has been involved in this effort locally since its inception, currently serving as the research partner. The U.S. Attorney’s Office has approached SANDAG to assume the role of the fiscal agent beginning in FY 2010, per Department of Justice requirements for a local government agency to fulfill these contracting and reporting tasks. At its June 19, 2009, meeting, the Public Safety Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve this item.

Discussion
In May 2009, SANDAG was approached by the U.S. Attorney’s Office to serve as the PSN fiscal agent beginning July 1, 2009. SANDAG was recommended to serve in this capacity given the agency’s involvement in the project since 2003 and the agency’s experience in receiving, managing, and distributing federal funding. As the PSN fiscal agent, SANDAG would be responsible for participating on the PSN Task Force, entering into contracts with entities selected by the PSN Executive Committee, carrying out portions of the PSN Task Force strategy, preparing required federal reports, drawing down federal funds as needed, making payments to contractors, and working with federal monitors or auditors as needed. In exchange for completing these tasks, SANDAG would be compensated for all costs incurred up to 10 percent of all grant funds that are awarded. Currently allocated grant funds ($669,866) could be available through June 30, 2012, with the possibility of new funding being distributed in FY 2010 if allocated by the new administration.

The Office of General Counsel has reviewed the Draft Memorandum of Understanding provided as Attachment 1 and staff from the Criminal Justice Research Division, Finance Department, and Contracts and Procurement have determined they will be able to complete the required tasks with current staffing and with the fiscal resources that are available.
If the Board of Directors approves SANDAG entering into this agreement with the Southern District of California’s Project Safe Neighborhoods Task Force, a Memorandum of Understanding in substantially the same form as Attachment 1 would be completed to formalize this arrangement.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Draft Memorandum of Understanding

Key Staff Contact: Cynthia Burke, (619) 699-1910, cbu@sandag.org
June 2, 2009

Cynthia Burke, Ph.D.
Director, Criminal Justice Research Division
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101-4231

Re: Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) Fiscal Agent Responsibilities and Memorandum of Understanding

Dear Dr. Burke:

On behalf of the Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) Task Force in the Southern District of California I am writing to thank SANDAG for considering accepting designation as the PSN Fiscal Agent. It is an important endeavor, and we thank you for bringing it to the attention of your Board of Directors. As a Research Partner, SANDAG has been an active member of the Task Force and your input has been instrumental in the formation of strategies to reduce gun crime and gang violence in our District.

As you know, the U.S. Attorney’s Office is responsible for establishing a collaborative PSN Task Force of federal, state, and local law enforcement and other community members to implement PSN initiatives. The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) oversees the grant-making function of PSN in every district in the country. A Fiscal Agent is required to receive the funds and then make sub-awards to, or enter into contracts with, each project or entity that will carry out the strategies. The role of the Fiscal Agent is to: participate on the PSN Task Force; enter into contacts with each entity responsible for executing portions of the strategy; receive the grant funds, oversee any contracts; account for awarded funds; prepare required federal reports; draw down federal funds as needed; make payments to contractors; and work with federal monitors or auditors. For administering funds, the Task Force may allocate up to 10% of the total grant to the fiscal agent. A two page Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is attached for your review.

If you or the Board has any questions or concerns, please contact me or Executive Assistant Linda Frakes at 619-557-5711. We look forward to continuing to work with you.

Very truly yours,

KAREN P. HEWITT
United States Attorney
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AND THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA’S PROJECT
SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS TASK FORCE
REGARDING RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FISCAL AGENT

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is made between the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the Southern District of California’s (SDCA) Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) Task Force.

I PURPOSE

The PSN Executive Committee has requested that SANDAG become the Fiscal Agent on behalf of the PSN Task Force for the SDCA. Upon acceptance of this request to be the Fiscal Agent, the United States Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of California (USAO SDCA) will certify to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs (BJA OJP) that SANDAG is the new Fiscal Agent.

II RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FISCAL AGENT

SANDAG agrees to perform the duties of the Fiscal Agent for the SDCA PSN Task Force. These responsibilities include:

(1) Participate on the PSN Task Force;
(2) Enter into contracts with each entity responsible for carrying out portions of the Task Force Strategy;
(3) Oversee any contracts entered into;
(4) Account for all funds awarded;
(5) Prepare required federal reports;
(6) Draw down federal funds as needed;
(7) Make payments to each contractor;
(8) Work with federal monitors or auditors as needed;
(9) Review the PSN “Tool Box” as it relates to the Fiscal Agent practices; and
(10) Attend an OJP financial training session, if necessary.

III COMPENSATION

In return for SANDAG’s role as the Fiscal Agent, up to ten-percent (10%) of the total grant amount for each grant may be awarded to compensate SANDAG.

IV RE-AWARDING OF ACTIVE PSN GRANTS TO THE NEW FISCAL AGENT

As the current Fiscal Agent has given notice that it wishes to relinquish its role, the PSN grants will have to be closed out and then re-awarded. SANDAG, as the new Fiscal Agent, will reapply for the remaining balance of funds as to each active grant. There are four (4) active grants. BJA will work with
SANDAG to submit a new application for each active award. The United States Attorney for the SDCA will certify SANDAG on each grant.

V LIMITATIONS

The Fiscal Agent is not a voting member on the SDCA PSN’s Executive Committee. It is expected that the Fiscal Agent may participate in discussions on matters that come before the Executive Committee. It is acknowledged that SANDAG is the Research Partner for the SDCA PSN Task Force. As such, the Research Partner is compensated for this role and is a voting member of the Executive Committee. Nothing with respect to the role of SANDAG as the Research Partner shall be altered with the addition of SANDAG as the Fiscal Agent.

VI TERM OF AGREEMENT

SANDAG agrees to act as the Fiscal Agent for the SDCA PSN Task Force starting July 1, 2009. It is understood that the close out of the prior Fiscal Agent and the re-award process to SANDAG as the new Fiscal Agent may take BJA up to three (3) months to complete. SANDAG agrees to provide a ninety (90) day written notice when it wishes to terminate its role as the Fiscal Agent.

VII AUTHORIZATION

This MOU becomes effective upon the signature of all parties.

(Name for SANDAG Representative)  

Date

Karen P. Hewitt  
United States Attorney  
On Behalf of the Southern District of California  
Project Safe Neighborhoods Task Force  

Date
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN SANDAG AND THE CITY OF SANTEE REGARDING TransNet EXTENSION ORDINANCE COMMERCIAL PAPER PROGRAM AND REQUEST FOR AN EXCEPTION TO RULE NO. 16 OF BOARD POLICY NO. 031

Introduction

In accordance with Rule #16 of Board Policy No. 031, “TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules,” local jurisdictions may access the SANDAG Commercial Paper (CP) program to advance local TransNet eligible projects with a repayment period of up to five years. Local jurisdictions must document their understanding of the requirements for using the TransNet CP program in an executed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). The City of Santee has requested access to TransNet CP to cover the shortfall in funding for the Forester Creek Improvement Project (“Project”). The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee and Transportation Committee reviewed this proposal at their May and June meetings, and both have recommended approval.

Discussion

The Forester Creek Improvement project, a congestion relief project, is a regionally significant project that included both TransNet Highway and federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding. This project included construction of the Olive Lane and Mission Gorge Road bridges over the flood control channel and was open to traffic in August 2007. The entire Forester Creek Improvement project qualifies as congestion relief because it prevents flooding and minimizes bridge lengths for the State Route 52 projects and two local streets, Olive Lane and Mission Gorge Road.

At its September 28, 2005, meeting, the Santee City Council approved a resolution awarding the contract for the Forester Creek Improvement project (Attachment 2). A funding shortfall was discussed in the Council Report and it was noted that SANDAG agreed to provide interim funding of $4.5 million through the TransNet CP program, once it was needed. Should there be no alternative funding source available, the City of Santee (City) would then use its TransNet local funds as the permanent funding source.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that Board of Directors (1) approve the use of TransNet Commercial Paper program for the City of Santee; (2) approve an exception to Rule #16 of Board Policy No. 031 to increase the repayment period from five years to ten years; and (3) authorize the Executive Director to execute the Memorandum of Agreement in substantially the same form as attached to the report (Attachment 1).
The City has pursued numerous options to cover the gap funding needs for the Project, originally at $4.5 million. The City was able to identify funding of $550,000 and has temporarily borrowed from various City funds to cover the $3.95 million remainder while continuing to pursue funding options.

At its meeting on April 22, 2009, the Santee City Council approved the request to borrow against its annual TransNet Extension revenue for this purpose (Attachment 3). On May 1, 2009, the Transportation Committee approved Amendment No. 12 to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program contingent upon the Board of Directors approving the CP request.

Rule #16 of Board Policy No. 031, TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules, requires repayment of the principal amount of CP to be completed within five years of the agency's receipt of the proceeds. The City has requested an exception to the five-year repayment period in an effort to continue with other approved local projects. Based on the capacity analysis (Attachment 4), it was determined that a ten-year repayment period would allow the City to meet its annual CP obligations and receive enough TransNet funds to continue with other Local Street Improvement projects.

Rule #16 includes an option to roll the outstanding CP amount into a long-term bond issue during the repayment period. It is the intent of the City to take the option and include any outstanding CP in SANDAG’s next long-term bond issue.

**Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee Review**

At its May 13, 2009, meeting, the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), the independent citizen oversight committee that reviews TransNet-funded projects, was presented with the above information and recommended delay of action until staff followed up on five points and reported back to ITOC at its next meeting. At its May 15, 2009, meeting, the Transportation Committee was presented with the above information and agreed to delay action until staff followed up on five points as requested by the ITOC. Staff responses to the five points were presented to ITOC at its June 10, 2009, meeting, and ITOC recommended support of the proposal to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors.

The five points and staff responses are as follows:

1. Include in the agenda report the fiscal advantage of this action;

   **Response** – General advantages of the CP program include accelerating the delivery of TransNet-funded local street and road improvement projects, a historically significantly lower cost of capital than fixed rate bonds, and the flexibility to refinance. In addition, agencies may take advantage of the current low construction bid environment by advancing the construction of the TransNet-funded projects.

   Allowing the City to make repayment over ten years rather than five years provides additional funding capacity for street rehabilitation projects in the early years of the repayment period. A capacity analysis was presented to the ITOC at its June 10, 2009, meeting that showed additional costs of approximately $7.2 million if the 10-year repayment period is not approved. Furthermore, if the Forester Creek Improvement Project had not been completed as scheduled, a 5,248-foot bridge would have been required to span the floodplain resulting in an estimated cost of $67 million.
2. Establish reasonable criteria for repayment, such as limiting the extension for repayment to 10 years;

Response - Board Policy No. 031, Rule #16 currently includes repayment criteria, such as full repayment within five years. In an effort to keep the CP program flexible and advantageous for the recipient agency, there may be special circumstances when the five-year repayment period does not provide the best fiscal advantage for both the recipient agency and its programmed TransNet projects. Therefore, allowing a recipient agency to request an exception to Rule #16 for a longer repayment period appears to be a prudent option.

3. Include the criterion that if a jurisdiction loses eligibility for TransNet funding in any year, that repayment of the borrowed funds would occur in full in the same year;

Response - The attached Draft MOA (Attachment 1) has been revised to include a requirement for repayment of borrowed funds within 30 days from written notice from SANDAG if the City becomes ineligible for TransNet funding.

4. Include an analysis of all other potential funding sources or lack thereof;

Response - Other funding sources of the City that were deemed unavailable for the funding gap are: (1) the General Fund, which currently has a fiscal year operating deficit in excess of $1.2 million, and the deficit is expected to increase next year; (2) redevelopment funds, which are expected to have an undesignated fund balance next year below $2 million with declining property tax revenues; (3) Drainage Development Impact Fees currently have a shortfall for the Mission Gorge Road Drainage Improvement project and Corrugated Metal Pipe Replacement project; and (4) Traffic Mitigation Development Impact Fees, which currently have a shortfall for the Olive Lane Widening project. The City also has pursued numerous federal and state grants since late 2005 with no success.

5. Clearly state that the capacity calculation is from the congestion relief portion of TransNet Local Street and Road funds.

Response - Attachment 4 includes footnotes in addition to those provided at the May 15, 2009, Transportation Committee meeting. The analysis assumes 100 percent of the estimated TransNet revenues during the repayment periods are Congestion Relief since the City has no future projects programmed in the Maintenance category.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Draft MOA between SANDAG and the City of Santee
   2. Santee City Council Agenda Item No. 6A
   3. Santee City Council Agenda Item No. 2B
   4. City of Santee Capacity Analysis

Key Staff Contact: Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, (619) 699-1942, lko@sandag.org
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS, ACTING AS
THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
AND THE CITY OF Santee
REGARDING DEBT FINANCING THROUGH THE TRANSNET PROGRAM

This Memorandum of Agreement ("MOA") is made and entered into effective as of this _____ day of _____________, 2009, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments, acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission ("SANDAG") and City of Santee (City).

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Agreement:

WHEREAS, SANDAG serves as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, and in that role is responsible for the administration of programs under the TransNet Extension Ordinance (Proposition A, November 2004), which sets forth permitted uses for revenues from a one-half cent transactions and use tax in San Diego County (TransNet Extension Program); and

WHEREAS, in order to accelerate the implementation of TransNet tax-funded projects, SANDAG has established a commercial paper program for short-term debt financing program to provide advanced funding for eligible projects under the TransNet Extension program; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule No.16 requires that an agency receiving proceeds from the TransNet Commercial Paper program shall be responsible for its proportionate share of the ongoing interest and related administrative costs from the date the proceeds are received until the principal amount of the loan is fully repaid; and

WHEREAS, the City wishes to borrow three million, nine hundred-fifty thousand dollars ($3,950,000) from the TransNet Extension program for the Forester Creek project; and

WHEREAS, the parties wish to memorialize their agreement in this MOA 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 lend City three million, nine hundred-fifty thousand dollars ($3,950,000) through debt financing for the Forester Creek project from the TransNet Extension Program subject to certain conditions set forth below and SANDAG Board Policies concerning TransNet Extension Program loans.
2. SANDAG will transfer the funds to the City within thirty (30) days following execution of this MOA.

THE CITY AGREES:

1. The governing body of the City at its April 22, 2009, meeting approved the request to borrow three million, nine hundred-fifty thousand dollars ($3,950,000) through debt financing using the SANDAG commercial paper program for Forester Creek project.

2. The City agrees to use the funding provided under this MOA solely for the Forester Creek project.

3. The City will pay its proportionate share of the annual interest and administrative costs from the date the proceeds are received until the principal amount of the loan is fully repaid.

4. Repayment of the principal amount shall commence within three (3) years of the receipt of the proceeds and shall be completed within ten (10) years. Repayment of the proceeds will be accomplished by rolling the outstanding amount into a long-term bond issued during the ten (10) year repayment period if the opportunity for the conversion exists and is agreed to by SANDAG. In such case, the City would be responsible for its proportionate share of the bond issuance costs and annual debt service costs.

5. The repayment of debt, in all cases, is the first priority on the use of the City's annual TransNet revenues. The City agrees not to subordinate the SANDAG lien on the TransNet revenues to any other claim upon these funds. The amounts to be deducted and the terms of repayment (if appropriate) are estimated and set forth in the Repayment Schedule, which is Attachment A hereto.

6. In the event City becomes ineligible for TransNet funding in any year in which repayment is due to SANDAG under this Agreement, City shall pay the full amount owed SANDAG for borrowed funds for that year within thirty (30) days of receiving written notice from SANDAG.

7. The City agrees to 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 projects financed through funding provided under this MOA.

THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE:

1. That all obligations of SANDAG under the terms of this MOA are subject to the appropriation of the required resources by SANDAG and the approval of the SANDAG Board of Directors.

2. Any notice required or permitted under this MOA 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  For the City of Santee
   401 B Street, Suite 800  10601 Magnolia Ave.
   San Diego, CA 92101  Santee, CA 92071
   Attn: Director of Finance  Attn: Tim McDermott
3. That unless it is amended by the parties in writing, this MOA shall terminate on June 30, 2019, or on such earlier or later date as the parties may agree to in writing.

4. The indemnification provisions of this MOA shall survive termination of the MOA.

5. This MOA 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 MOA, 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 MOA, 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 MOA 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 MOA is intended to create duties or obligations to or rights in third parties to this MOA or affect the legal liability of the parties to this MOA to third parties.

10. This MOA 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.

11. This MOA may be executed and delivered by facsimile signature, and a facsimile signature shall be treated as an original.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this MOA effective on the day and year first above written.

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  CITY OF SANTEE

________________________________________  __________________________________________
GARY L. GALLEGOS  KEITH TILL
Executive Director  City Manager

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________________________  __________________________________________
Office of General Counsel  Legal Counsel
MEETING DATE  September 28, 2005  AGENDA ITEM NO. 6A

ITEM TITLE  RESOLUTION AWARDING THE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT, AUTHORIZING STAFF TO APPROVE CONSTRUCTION CHANGE ORDERS, APPROVING A CONSULTANT CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT AND TESTING, AND APPROVING A CHANGE TO THE DESIGN CONTRACT FOR FORESTER CREEK IMPROVEMENTS, CIP 2002-21, AND AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

DIRECTOR/DEPARTMENT  Douglas Williford, Development Services

SUMMARY  This item is to award the construction contract for the Forester Creek Improvement Project. The project includes improving a one-mile stretch of the creek from the Mission Gorge Bridge upstream to Prospect Avenue. This portion of the creek can currently only handle less than a 10-year flood and has experienced a number of storms that have flooded and damaged nearby properties.

Past flooding from Forester Creek has also closed major thoroughfares such as Mission Gorge Road, Carlton Hills Boulevard, Olive Lane, and Via Zapador, inhibiting the safe travel of regular and emergency vehicles. The proposed project will achieve 100-year flood protection in Forester Creek, protect transportation facilities, minimize risk to public health and safety, reduce damage to private property, protect and enhance natural resources, and significantly improve water quality. Additionally it will encourage redevelopment that is consistent with the City’s General Plan and Redevelopment Plan, as well as improve traffic circulation.

A critical related project that necessitates the need for moving forward with the Forester Creek improvements is the extension of State Route (SR) 52 through Santee. The State of California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) is currently preparing design of this portion of the highway, which is planned to cross the city eastward from the SR 125/SR 52 interchange to Cuyamaca Street and then eastward to SR 67. Without the Forester Creek project, SR 52 would not be able to proceed.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT RECOMMENDATION  See budget exhibits attached and staff report.

Adopt the attached Resolution approving the following actions:
1. Awarding the construction contract to Archer Western for a total of $23,190,000;
2. Authorizing staff to approve change orders totaling $1,000,000;
3. Approving a change order to the pre-construction services contract with PBS&J in the amount of $55,000;
4. Approving a contract to PBS&J for Construction Management in an amount not to exceed $1,781,000, and changes to the contract not to exceed $200,000;
5. Authoring purchase of office equipment for the project in an amount not to exceed $20,000;
6. Approving a change order to the designer, Earth Tech, for additional design services in an amount not to exceed $140,000;
7. Approving a contract with Earth Tech for construction support in the amount of $175,000, and changes to the contract not to exceed $50,000;
8. Authorizing payments to Caltrans not to exceed $4.15 Million for right of way costs.

ATTACHMENTS
Resolution  Bid Summary  Project Budget and Estimated Costs
B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

At its June 25, 2003 meeting, Council certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Forester Creek Improvements, CIP 2002-21. Final plans and bidding, right of way takes, resident and business relocations, and structure demolition have now been completed.

The proposed project widens and revegetates a one-mile stretch of Forester Creek, between Mission Gorge Road and Prospect Avenue, to contain the 100-year flood within the channel banks. The current channel is between 85 feet and 110 feet in width. The proposed project consists of an earthen channel varying in width from 180 feet to 380 feet, which will maximize infiltration to improve water quality. The downstream portion of the channel is to be protected from erosion with use of a soil stabilization material and lining under the Mission Gorge Bridge. A trash collection and energy dissipation structure will be placed at the upstream end of the channel to reduce water velocity and further improve water quality. Enhancement of the channel with the planting of fresh water marsh and southern willow scrub is provided.

Additionally, lengthening of the Mission Gorge Bridge by 123 feet is required to pass the 100-year flow under the bridge. The project includes an eight-foot wide paved bikeway on the south-side of the channel from Prospect Avenue to Mission Gorge Road. A landscaped “mini-park” bike rest area is provided near Prospect and will include picnic tables and interpretative signage with information on the native flora and fauna.

Also included is the demolition of the undersized Via Zapador bridge and replacement with a new bridge at Olive Lane, in accordance with the City’s new Circulation Element and in conjunction with the SR 52 project (which will eliminate the link between Via Zapador and Atlas View Drive). The new bridge extends Olive Lane southward to a signalized intersection at Prospect Avenue and Argent Street. This will improve traffic circulation by providing a more efficient link between Mission Gorge Road and Prospect Avenue to serve as an alternate to Cuyamaca Street.

This project will protect over 40 single family residences, 130 mobile home units, 96 apartment units and several businesses from the floodway and/or floodplain, including the RollerskateLand complex, Goodyear Tire, Al’s Sport Shop, and the former Southland Envelope site.

Construction Contract

Eleven Contractors were pre-qualified to bid on the project. The project was advertised for a January 2005 bid; however, all prospective bidders dropped out just days prior to the bid citing concerns regarding unknown risks associated with possible additional requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board as well as the relocation of other agencies’ utilities. Staff met with contractors and made revisions to plans to address these concerns. The plans were re-advertised in May 2005.

On July 14, 2005, four bids were received and opened, with a low of $23,190,000 and a high of $24,172,883. The low bid was submitted by Archer Western and was 24.1% higher than the most recent Engineer's estimate of $18,677,783. The difference between the high and low bid was only 4.2%. An in depth analysis of the bids revealed that the bid price was higher than the Engineer's estimate due mostly to increased prices for steel and concrete related bid items. Other agencies have recently experienced similar bid cost increases which have been reported to be a result of increased material costs for items such as steel, concrete and fuel. Given the bids varied by a maximum of 4.2%, it is staff’s opinion that the bids received are competitive and reflect the actual costs to perform the work and that re-bidding would not result in a lower cost.
Staff and the City Attorney have reviewed the bid submitted by Archer Western and have concluded that it is complete and accurate and meets all standards for acceptance. Staff recommends award of the contract to Archer Western in the amount of $23,190,000.

Staff requests authorization to approve contingency construction change orders up to $1,000,000, which is 4.3% of the total project cost. Given the cost of the project, this additional authorization is requested to ensure that delays do not occur in processing and approving change orders, if needed. If the cumulative total of change orders exceeds $1,000,000, staff will return to City Council for further approval.

**Construction Administration/Support**

Given the size, length and complexity of the project, it is necessary to hire a Construction Administration firm to provide full time testing, inspection and management of the construction. Early this year, the City published a request for qualifications for construction administration firms and received six responses. Four firms were selected as the most qualified and were asked to provide proposals. The four firms were interviewed by a panel consisting of representatives from the City, Caltrans and the design engineer's staff. PBS&J was selected as the most qualified firm due to their extensive experience managing similar projects. After selection, Council authorized a contract with PBS&J for $98,985 to perform pre-construction services for the project, plus $6598 in staff authorized change orders. Additional services in the amount of $55,000 are required of PBS&J as a result of the re-advertisement of the bid, to assist with utility relocations, and to prepare documents for the Caltrans pre-award audit. Staff requests authorization for a change to the PBS&J pre-construction services contract in the amount of $55,000.

PBS&J's performance on the pre-construction services contract has been excellent. As part of the review of their work, Caltrans conducted a pre-award audit of PBS&J's accounting procedures and hourly rates, as required by Federal Aid regulations. For the construction management of the entire project, Staff has negotiated a scope of services with a fee not to exceed $1,781,000. Staff requests Council authorization for a consultant contract with PBS&J for an amount not to exceed $1,781,000. Staff additionally requests authorization to approve changes to the consultant contract not to exceed $200,000 for additional work that may be required to manage construction.

PBS&J will have four staff members dedicated to the project and various additional specialists involved as needed. At least one staff member will be located primarily in City offices. The balance of PBS&J's staff will work from a construction trailer furnished by the contractor. Staff requests authorization to purchase computers, software, telephones, fax machines, service connections and related equipment for staff dedicated to the project. All software and equipment would remain City property for use by City staff after completion of construction. It is estimated that the cost of required items will not exceed $20,000.

**Design Contract Change Order**

Additional services in the amount of $140,000 are needed from the project engineering designer, Earth Tech, including costs to re-bid the project, coordinate relocation of utilities, and prepare floodplain mapping. Additionally, support from the designer will be required during construction which may include clarification or changes of design, review of contractor work, shoring and pre-stressing plans, and review of contractor proposed material substitutions. Staff has negotiated a scope of services for construction support for a fee not to exceed $175,000. Staff requests approval of a change to the existing design contract with Earth Tech in the amount of $140,000, and a new contract for construction services in the amount of $175,000. Additionally, staff requests authorization to approve changes to the construction support contract in an amount not to exceed $50,000, on an as-needed basis.
Right of Way Costs
On December 17, 2003, Council approved an amendment to the Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans for right of way takes which added six parcels to the Agreement increasing the City’s obligation to $3.693 Million. The City’s share of costs has increased to $4.034 Million as a result of increases in the cost of relocation assistance and associated costs. Additional costs may be incurred as court cases are settled. Staff requests authorization to amend the City’s share of right of way costs to not to exceed $4.15 Million.

Additionally, Caltrans and utility owners are obligated to pay certain portions of utility relocation costs. At its June 9, 2004 and November 10, 2004 meetings, Council approved Agreements with Caltrans, Padre Dam, the City of El Cajon, the County of San Diego and SDG&E to share costs of utility relocations. The City will pay for relocations of utilities which are within easements and are required for the Forester Creek project. Caltrans will pay for relocation required for the SR 52 project. Utility owners, the City of El Cajon, County of San Diego, and Padre Dam will pay for relocation of utilities not within easements and betterments to their facilities. These agencies are responsible for an estimated $2.38 Million of the construction cost, as established in executed relocation Agreements. Approximately $471,000 of cost responsibilities of the City of El Cajon are being disputed and will require further action to resolve.

Additional Funding
Due to the bids being higher than expected, there is an approximate $4.5 million shortfall in current funding for the project. It is critical to both Santee and the region that this project goes forward at this time. Delaying the project would result in direct delays to the completion of State Route 52, which is a regionally significant freeway and would also likely result in higher construction costs for Forester Creek itself.

Recognizing this, SANDAG has agreed to provide interim funding for the additional $4.5 million, once it is needed. Given the projected timing of construction, it is expected these funds will not actually be needed for 12 to 15 months (i.e. – late 2006 \ early 2007). From the point of receipt of these funds, the City will pay low interest only payments to SANDAG until the next Transnet bond issuance is completed in 2008. At that point, the City’s portion of annual Transnet payments will go up from our current level of $817,000, to approximately $1.4 million. From this amount we would be obligated to pay back to SANDAG approximately $350,000 per year, based on a 20-year payment schedule, to fully pay back the $4.5 million.

However, before this occurs, the City will be seeking any and all available alternative funding sources to permanently fund the $4.5 million deficit, including Federal and State grants and bond monies for freeway, flood protection and clean water purposes. If the City can achieve these additional funding sources in the next three years, it would alleviate all additional financial obligations to the City.

Documents related to the interim funding to be provided by Sandag will be brought forward to the City Council at a subsequent meeting.
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF Santee, California Awarding the Construction Contract, Authorizing Staff to Approve Construction Change Orders, Approving a Consultant Contract for Construction Management and Testing, and Approving a Change to the Design Contract for Forester Creek Improvements, CIP 2002-21, and Authorizing the Advance and Appropriation of Funds

WHEREAS, the City Clerk, on the 14th day of July, 2005, publicly opened and examined sealed bids for the Forester Creek Improvements, CIP 2002-21; and

WHEREAS, Archer Western was found to be the lowest responsible bidder with their bid amount of $23,190,000; and

WHEREAS, staff requests authorization to approve change orders totaling $1,000,000 which is 4.3% of the total contract amount; and

WHEREAS, additional services in the amount of $55,000 are required for pre-construction services by PBS&J; and

WHEREAS, staff has selected PBS&J as the most qualified construction administration and testing firm and has negotiated a fee in the amount of $1,781,000 and staff requests authorization to approve change orders up to $200,000; and

WHEREAS, staff requests authorization to purchase office equipment and software as need for PBS&J staff dedicated to the project for an amount not to exceed $20,000; and

WHEREAS, additional services in the amount of $140,000 are needed from the designer, Earth Tech; and

WHEREAS, construction support in the amount of $175,000 is needed from the designer, Earth Tech and staff requests authorization to approve change orders up to $50,000; and

WHEREAS, the City's share of right of way costs for properties acquired by Caltrans have increased to $4.034 Million and staff requests authorization to make payments to Caltrans not to exceed $4.15 Million; and

WHEREAS, additional funding in the amount of $4.5 Million is needed to complete the project.
NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Santee, California, that the construction contract for the Forester Creek Improvements, CIP 2002-21, be awarded to Archer Western for the amount of $23,190,000 and the City Manager is authorized to execute the contract on behalf of the City; and

1. That staff has authorization to approve change orders totaling $1,000,000; and

2. That a contract with a PBS&J for construction administration and testing in the amount of $1,781,000 be approved and the Deputy City Manager is authorized to execute the contract on behalf of the City and approve change orders not to exceed $200,000; and

3. That a change to the pre-construction services contract with PBS&J in the amount of $55,000 be approved; and

4. That staff has authorization to purchase office equipment and software as need for the project for an amount not to exceed $20,000; and

5. That a change to the design contract with Earth Tech in the amount of $140,000 be approved for costs to re-bid the project, coordinate utility relocation and provide floodplain mapping; and

6. That a contract with Earth Tech for construction support in the amount of $175,000 be approved and the Deputy City Manager is authorized to execute the contract on behalf of the City and approve change orders not to exceed $50,000; and

7. That payments to Caltrans for joint right of way acquisitions be increased up to $4.15 Million; and
ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Santee, California, at a regular meeting thereof held this 28th day of September 2005, by the following roll call vote to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

APPROVED:

RANDY VOEPEL, MAYOR

ATTEST:

LINDA A. TROYAN, CITY CLERK
City of Santee

COUNCIL AGENDA STATEMENT

MEETING DATE April 22, 2009

ITEM TITLE RESOLUTIONS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTEE REQUESTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2008 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR TRANSNET LOCAL STREET IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS FOR THE CITY OF SANTEE FOR FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013 AND REQUESTING SANDAG, ACTING AS THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION TO PROVIDE ADVANCED FUNDING THROUGH DEBT FINANCING FOR THE FORESTER CREEK IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT (CIP 2002-21)

DIRECTOR/DEPARTMENT Jim O'Grady, Interim Director of Development Services
Tim K. McDermott, Director of Finance

SUMMARY

This item requests that the City Council adopt the attached resolutions to 1) amend the City’s list of projects to be completed through TransNet funding for Fiscal Years 2009 through 2013 as the result of the swap of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (“ARRA”) federal stimulus funds for additional TransNet funds, and 2) authorize an advance of TransNet funding in an amount not to exceed $3,950,000 for the Forester Creek Improvements Project.

(see attached staff report)

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

$918,000 in additional TransNet funding will be received in exchange for the federal stimulus (ARRA) funds. The repayment of TransNet funds advanced to the City through the commercial paper borrowing program will be made from a portion of the City’s annual TransNet revenues. Repayment will ultimately be accomplished by rolling the outstanding amount into a long-term bond issued by SANDAG.

CITY ATTORNEY REVIEW □ N/A ☑ Completed

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct and close the public hearing. Adopt the attached resolutions approving an amendment to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program for TransNet local street improvement projects for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 and requesting SANDAG to provide advanced funding through debt financing for the Forester Creek Improvements project.

ATTACHMENTS

Staff Report
Resolutions (with attachments)

A. Amendment to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 included funds for local agency transportation projects. At its March 27, 2009 meeting, the SANDAG Board approved a plan to replace ARRA funds allocated to Cities with TransNet funding. The TransNet funding has fewer restrictions and administrative requirements.

The City of Santee’s allocation of funding is $918,000. Staff recommends that the following project be added to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program for TransNet projects for Fiscal Years 2009-2013:

SNT12 – Major Street Rehabilitation and Improvements

The proposed project includes major pavement rehabilitation on Mission Gorge Rd. from Fanita Dr. to the Post Office, and on Magnolia Ave. from Mast Blvd. to Second St. Should additional funding become available, staff recommends additional pavement rehabilitation be conducted on Magnolia Ave. from Mast Blvd. to El Nopal and on Mission Gorge Rd from Big Rock Rd. and West Hills Pkwy.

B. TransNet Funding Advance – Forester Creek Improvements Project

On September 28, 2005 the City Council approved a resolution awarding the construction contract for the Forester Creek Improvements project. The State Route 52 extension project, a critical and regionally significant freeway project necessitated the need for moving forward with the Forester Creek Improvements project. Without the Forester Creek project being completed the SR 52 extension would not have been able to proceed. At the time of the award of the Forester Creek Improvements contract a $4.5 million funding shortfall was identified. The City planned to seek any and all available alternative funding sources to permanently fund this shortfall, including a variety of federal and state grants for freeway, flood protection and clean water purposes. SANDAG agreed to provide interim funding of $4.5 million through its TransNet commercial paper program as needed. Should insufficient alternative funding sources be obtained the City could then use our TransNet funds as the permanent funding source through a long-term bond issue by SANDAG.

The City has pursued numerous options to cover this gap, which as the result of project cost savings is now down to $3.95 million. The City has temporarily borrowed from
various City funds to cover this shortfall while pursuing numerous funding alternatives. Staff now recommends that the City Council authorize the use of the SANDAG commercial paper program to borrow against future TransNet revenues to eliminate this shortfall.

In accordance with SANDAG board policy the repayment of the principal amount of commercial paper borrowing is to be completed within five years of an agency's receipt of the proceeds. We have requested (with approval from SANDAG staff) an exception to the five-year repayment period in order to receive sufficient TransNet revenues (after debt-service obligations) to enable the City to continue to invest in other local street projects such as the ongoing Street Repair and Rehabilitation program. Based upon a capacity analysis (Attachment A) it was determined that a ten-year repayment period would allow the City to meet its debt obligations and receive enough annual TransNet funds to continue with such local street improvement projects. Under a ten-year repayment period the total debt service payment for each of the next three years would be approximately $177,750, leaving more than $1 million in available TransNet revenues for other projects each of the next three years.

The City has an option to roll the outstanding commercial paper balance into a long-term bond issue during the repayment period. Staff recommends that the City utilize this option and roll the outstanding amount into the next SANDAG long-term bond issue, which is currently estimated to occur in 2011.
RESOLUTION NO. 008 – 2009

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF Santee Requesting SANDAG, acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, to provide advanced funding through debt financing for the Forester Creek Improvements Project (CIP 2002-21)

WHEREAS, SANDAG, acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation commission, is responsible for the administration of programs under the TransNet Extension Ordinance (Proposition A, November 2004), which sets forth permitted uses for revenues from the ½ cent transactions and use tax in San Diego County (TransNet Extension Program); and

WHEREAS, to accelerate the implementation of TransNet tax funded projects, SANDAG has established a commercial paper program to provide advanced funding for eligible projects under the TransNet Extension program; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG Board Policy No. 31, Rule #16 requires that an agency receiving proceeds from the TransNet commercial paper program shall be responsible for its proportionate share of the ongoing interest and related administrative costs from the date the proceeds are received until the principal amount of the loan is fully repaid; and

WHEREAS, the following project(s) being implemented by the City of Santee have been approved by SANDAG through the TransNet Extension Program of Projects included in the 2008 Regional Transportation improvement Program and would benefit from the availability of funding:

FORESTER CREEK IMPROVEMENTS which requires an amount of three million, nine hundred-fifty thousand dollars ($3,950,000) in debt financing.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Santee, California as follows:

1. That the City Manager is hereby authorized to request advance funding from SANDAG through the commercial paper program in an amount not to exceed three million, nine hundred-fifty thousand ($3,950,000) dollars.

2. That the City Manager is hereby authorized to execute any necessary documents relating to the receipt of said funds from SANDAG, including but not limited to a Memorandum of Agreement in substantially the same form as attached to this Resolution (Attachment 1).

3. That the City of Santee will be responsible for paying its proportionate share of the annual interest and administrative costs of the commercial paper program based on the ratio of the amount of financing provided to the City of Santee compared to the total commercial paper outstanding for each fiscal year.
RESOLUTION NO. 008 – 2009

4. That SANDAG will deduct said interest and administrative costs from the monthly TransNet tax allocations for the City of Santee prior to remitting any remaining TransNet tax proceeds for projects of the City of Santee.

5. That the City of Santee will repay to SANDAG the principle amount borrowed according to the Payment Schedule that will be attached to the proposed MOA.

6. That the first priority use of the City of Santee annual allocation of TransNet revenues shall be payment of the principle amount borrowed according to the Payment Schedule and any administrative costs and interest due. The City of Santee agrees not to subordinate SANDAG's lien on the TransNet revenues to any other claim upon these funds.

7. That the City of Santee agrees to 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 projects financed through funding provided under this MOA.

ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Santee, California, at a Regular Meeting thereof held this 22nd day of April 2009, by the following roll call vote to wit:

AYES: JONES, MINTO, RYAN

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: DALE, VOEPLE

APPROVED:

[Signature]

BRIAN W. JONES, VICE MAYOR

ATTEST:

[Signature]
PATSY BELL, CMC, CITY CLERK

Attachment: Attachment 1 – Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with SANDAG
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS, ACTING AS THE SAN
DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
AND THE CITY OF Santee
REGARDING DEBT FINANCING THROUGH THE TRANSNET PROGRAM

This Memorandum of Agreement ("MOA") is made and entered into effective as of this _____ day
of _____________, 2009, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments, acting as the San
Diego County Regional Transportation Commission ("SANDAG") and City of Santee (City).

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Agreement:

WHEREAS, SANDAG serves as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission,
and in that role is responsible for the administration of programs under the TransNet Extension Ordinance
(Proposition A, November 2004), which sets forth permitted uses for revenues from a ¼ cent transactions
and use tax in San Diego County (TransNet Extension Program); and

WHEREAS, in order to accelerate the implementation of TransNet tax funded projects, SANDAG
has established a commercial paper program for short term debt financing program to provide advanced
funding for eligible projects under the TransNet Extension program; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG Board Policy No. 31, Rule #16 requires that an agency receiving proceeds
from the TransNet commercial paper program shall be responsible for its proportionate share of the
ongoing interest and related administrative costs from the date the proceeds are received until the
principal amount of the loan is fully repaid; and

WHEREAS, the City wishes to borrow three million, nine hundred-fifty thousand dollars
($3,950,000) from the TransNet Extension program for the Forester Creek project; and

WHEREAS, the parties wish to memorialize their agreement in this MOA 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 lend City three million, nine hundred-fifty thousand dollars ($3,950,000) through debt financing
   for the Forester Creek project from the TransNet Extension Program subject to certain conditions
   set forth below and SANDAG Board Policies concerning TransNet Extension Program loans.
2. SANDAG will transfer the funds to the City within 30 days following execution of this MOA.

THE CITY AGREES:

1. The governing body of City at its April 22, 2009, meeting approved the request to borrow three million, nine hundred-fifty thousand dollars ($3,950,000) through debt financing using SANDAG’s commercial paper program for Forester Creek project.

2. The City agrees to use the funding provided under this MOA solely for the Forester Creek project.

3. The City will pay its proportionate share of the annual interest and administrative costs from the date the proceeds are received until the principal amount of the loan is fully repaid.

4. Repayment of the principal amount shall commence within three years of the receipt of the proceeds and shall be completed within ten years. Repayment of the proceeds will be accomplished by rolling the outstanding amount into a long-term bond issued during the ten year repayment period if the opportunity for the conversion exists and is agreed to by SANDAG. In such case, the City would be responsible for its proportionate share of the bond issuance costs and annual debt service costs.

5. The repayment of debt, in all cases, is the first priority on the use of the City’s annual TransNet revenues. The City agrees not to subordinate SANDAG’s lien on the TransNet revenues to any other claim upon these funds. The amounts to be deducted and the terms of repayment (if appropriate) are estimated and set forth in the Repayment Schedule, which is Attachment A hereto.

6. The City agrees to 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 projects financed through funding provided under this MOA.

THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE:

1. That all obligations of SANDAG under the terms of this MOA are subject to the appropriation of the required resources by SANDAG and the approval of the SANDAG Board of Directors.

2. Any notice required or permitted under this MOA 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        For the City of Santee
   401 B Street, Suite 800      10601 Magnolia Ave.
   San Diego, CA 92101           Santee, CA 92071
   Attn: Director of Finance     Attn: Director of Finance

3. That unless it is amended by the parties in writing, this MOA shall terminate on June 30, 2019 or on such earlier or later date as the parties may agree to in writing.

4. The indemnification provisions of this MOA shall survive termination of the MOA.
5. This MOA 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 MOA, 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 MOA, 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 MOA 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 MOA is intended to create duties or obligations to or rights in third parties to this MOA or affect the legal liability of the parties to this MOA to third parties.

10. This MOA 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.

11. This MOA may be executed and delivered by facsimile signature, and a facsimile signature shall be treated as an original.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this MOA effective on the day and year first above written.

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

CITY OF Santee

GARY L. GALLEGOS KEITH TILL
Executive Director City Manager

APPROVED AS TO FORM: APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Office of General Counsel City Attorney
## Santee $3.95M Commercial Paper Capacity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance (est)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Allocations</strong></td>
<td>$1,204,479</td>
<td>1,245,463</td>
<td>1,287,879</td>
<td>1,355,647</td>
<td>1,426,415</td>
<td>1,426,415</td>
<td>1,426,415</td>
<td>1,426,415</td>
<td>1,426,415</td>
<td>1,426,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP Proceeds</strong></td>
<td>3,950,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP Principal Repayment</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP Interest/Other Fees</strong></td>
<td>(177,750)</td>
<td>(177,750)</td>
<td>(177,750)</td>
<td>(166,112)</td>
<td>(140,719)</td>
<td>(115,326)</td>
<td>(89,933)</td>
<td>(64,540)</td>
<td>(39,147)</td>
<td>(13,754)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTIP programmed projects</strong></td>
<td>(1,026,729)</td>
<td>(1,067,713)</td>
<td>(1,110,128)</td>
<td>(625,250)</td>
<td>(721,410)</td>
<td>(746,804)</td>
<td>(772,196)</td>
<td>(797,588)</td>
<td>(822,982)</td>
<td>(848,375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Balance</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Assumes other project expenditures from the TransNet Extension program will fully utilize available balance after D/S obligation.

2. Estimated revenues based on January 2009 projections for the next 5 years, updated on an annual basis.

3. Years 6 through 10 (FY15 through FY19) are not part of the 5 year projection, therefore Estimated Allocations for year 5 (FY13) are used.
### Ten-Year Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance (estimated)</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Allocations</strong></td>
<td>1,180,049</td>
<td>1,220,000</td>
<td>1,262,000</td>
<td>1,328,000</td>
<td>1,397,000</td>
<td>1,397,000</td>
<td>1,397,000</td>
<td>1,397,000</td>
<td>1,397,000</td>
<td>1,397,000</td>
<td>13,372,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP Proceeds</strong></td>
<td>3,950,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP Principal Repayment</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(564,286)</td>
<td>(564,286)</td>
<td>(564,286)</td>
<td>(564,286)</td>
<td>(564,286)</td>
<td>(564,286)</td>
<td>(564,286)</td>
<td>(3,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP Interest/Other Fees</strong></td>
<td>(177,750)</td>
<td>(177,750)</td>
<td>(177,750)</td>
<td>(166,112)</td>
<td>(140,719)</td>
<td>(115,326)</td>
<td>(89,933)</td>
<td>(64,540)</td>
<td>(39,147)</td>
<td>(13,754)</td>
<td>(1,162,781)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP Disbursement</strong></td>
<td>(3,950,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTIP programmed projects</strong></td>
<td>(1,002,299)</td>
<td>(1,042,250)</td>
<td>(1,084,250)</td>
<td>(597,602)</td>
<td>(691,995)</td>
<td>(717,388)</td>
<td>(742,781)</td>
<td>(768,174)</td>
<td>(793,567)</td>
<td>(818,962)</td>
<td>(8,259,268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Balance</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Estimated revenues based on May 2009 projections for the next five years, updated on an annual basis. Assumes 100% of estimated revenues are programmed for Congestion Relief projects. The City has no projects programmed for Maintenance.

2. Years six through ten (FY15 through FY19) are included in the five year projection, therefore Estimated Allocations for year five (FY14) are used.

3. The City repayment of CP principal to begin 3 years after the initial borrowing, which is an option per Rule #16 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031.

4. The ten-year repayment analysis results in an estimated cost of $1,162,781.

5. Interest repayments are calculated at 4.5% for the capacity analysis, but are paid based on actual costs. This includes interest costs and the City’s proportionate share of CP program fees.

6. Assumes other project expenditures from the TransNet Extension program will fully utilize available balance after debt service obligation.
SUPPORT FOR TRIBAL-RELATED FEDERAL AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT PROPOSALS

Introduction

Tribal Nations across the country are competing for tribal-specific funding available through the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). The Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association (SCTCA) has requested that SANDAG provide letters of support for project proposals submitted by San Diego tribes that are consistent with SANDAG policies and programs.

Discussion

As governments across the country are responding to a multitude of opportunities for ARRA funding in various programs, so too are tribal governments. There is an assortment of programs with ARRA funding that are specific to tribal governments. In many cases, establishing that a given tribal government has a working relationship with local and regional planning agencies increases its scoring in the selection process.

The Borders Committee meeting on May 22, 2009, was dedicated to tribal issues. At that meeting, the SCTCA requested that SANDAG consider providing letters of support for project proposals submitted by San Diego tribal governments. Following a discussion, the Borders Committee recommended that the Board of Directors delegate authority to the Executive Director to provide letters of support for tribal-specific ARRA project applications that are submitted by San Diego tribes and consistent with SANDAG policies and programs.

Recommendation

The Borders Committee recommends that the Board of Directors is asked to delegate authority to the Executive Director to provide letters of support for tribal-specific ARRA project applications that are submitted by San Diego tribes, and consistent with SANDAG policies and programs, as well as local agency general plans.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909, jcl@sandag.org
EAST COUNTY BUS MAINTENANCE FACILITY
BUDGET CONSOLIDATION

File Number 1049600

Introduction

Transportation Committee recommended approval of budget changes and grant transfers for various East County Bus Maintenance Facility (ECBMF) projects. These changes include the consolidation of two separate SANDAG Capital Improvement Projects (CIPs) and the transfer of a federal Section 5309 earmark from the existing Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) CIP (11237) into the new, consolidated, SANDAG CIP (1049600). These funding transfers would facilitate the construction of site improvements at ECBMF in the near term. The MTS Board of Directors has approved these budget changes and grant transfers (see attached MTS Agenda Item No. 6).

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that Board of Directors (1) approve the transfer of the remaining $686,386 in SANDAG project 1142700 (ECBMF CNG Station) to SANDAG project 1049600 (ECBMF); and (2) accept the transfer of $501,600 in dedicated funding, including federal grant E2007-BUSP-0062, from MTS CIP 11237 (East County Land Acquisition) to SANDAG project 1049600 (ECBMF).

Discussion

MTS has identified the need for additional parking capacity for full-size heavy duty buses at the ECBMF. Site improvements to achieve this objective within the existing five-acre site are currently in the design development stage. The scope of work includes demolition of the building at 544 Vernon Way, asphalt and concrete paving, installation of required storm water pollution prevention drainage systems, and public right-of-way improvements related to Johnson Avenue, Vernon Way, and Pioneer Way. The planning level estimate to complete the administration, design, and construction is $2 million. This project is being administered under SANDAG CIP 1049600 (ECBMF). Funds are being transferred from other ECBMF projects to facilitate construction, because this project currently does not have $2 million available to complete the construction work. These funds are not being used in the near term under their current project numbers due to the circumstances outlined below.

SANDAG Project 1142700, ECBMF CNG Station

MTS and SANDAG have conducted some initial studies regarding the feasibility of a compressed natural gas (CNG) fuel station. While the project is feasible, the delivery of alternative fuel buses is not expected for several years. A new CNG fuel station will be evaluated as part of a future analysis of bus fuel types when the East County fleet is ready for replacement. The environmental process
for ECBMF is ongoing and will be able to accommodate CNG fuel, gasoline, or other alternative fuels considered to power new buses for the East County fleet. At this time, staff is proposing to transfer the remaining $686,386 in this project to the ECBMF construction effort under SANDAG project 1049600. The federal funding in project 1142700 dates back as far as 2002, so it is prudent to use the available grant funding and related local match for current construction needs. Continued funding is subject to the annual capital programming process and will likely be available in future years following a decision on alternative fuels for East County buses. Special discretionary grants may even be available depending on fuel type and timing of new bus deliveries.

MTS CIP 11237, East County Land Acquisition

Staff is proposing to transfer $501,600 ($401,280 of federal earmark funds (E2007-BUSP-0062) plus $100,320 of local match) from ECBMF Land Acquisition under MTS project 11237 to the ECBMF construction effort under SANDAG project 1049600. The ECBMF earmark was appropriated under the Federal Transit Administration Section 5309 program in 2007. The right-of-way acquisition timing is beyond the available time period to utilize the proposed transferred grant. These funds are not required for land acquisition in the near term and may expire if not utilized.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. MTS Agenda Item No. 6, May 28, 2009

Key Staff Contact: John Dorow, (619) 699-1915, jdo@sandag.org
Agenda

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

May 28, 2009

SUBJECT:

MTS: EAST COUNTY BUS MAINTENANCE FACILITY BUDGET CHANGES

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Directors approve budget changes and grant transfers for East County Bus Maintenance Facility (ECBMF) projects.

Budget Impact

1. Transfer $686,386 from ECBMF Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Capital Improvement Project (CIP) 1142700 to ECBMF CIP 1049600; and

2. Transfer $501,600 in dedicated funding, including federal grant E2007-BUSP-0062, with federal funds in the amount of $401,280 plus a local match of $100,320 from CIP 11237 (MTS East County Land Acquisition) to CIP 1049600 (ECBMF).

DISCUSSION:

MTS has received a few federal grants for the ECBMF expansion over the past few years. The funding was initially programmed for right-of-way acquisition. However, the dedicated funding has time constraints; the right-of-way acquisition timing is beyond the available time period to utilize these grants. MTS and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are in need of construction funding for improvements on the existing ECBMF and can take advantage of those existing grants within the next year. There is $501,600 in grant funds to be transferred, which requires Board action.
There is an additional $326,563 (federal grant E2009-BUSP-080 in the amount of $261,250 and local match in the amount of $65,313) available that has been added and programmed through SANDAG within ECBMF CIP 1049600.

MTS and SANDAG have conducted some initial studies regarding the feasibility of a CNG fuel station at the ECBMF as part of East County CNG Station CIP 1142700. The project does appear feasible, and a new CNG fuel station will be evaluated as part of a future analysis of bus fuel types when the East County fleet is ready for replacement in the next several years. The environmental process for ECBMF is ongoing and will be able to accommodate CNG fuel, gasoline, or other alternative fuels considered to power new buses for the East County fleet. The $686,386 in project funding in the ECBMF CNG Station CIP is not currently needed and can be used now for more urgent projects at the East County site. The grants funding this project were from FY 2002 through FY 2006.

MTS wants to transfer these funds to the current upcoming ECBMF construction project and utilize the older grant funds now. Additional funds would be available in the future after a final decision is made on alternative fuels for the East County bus fleet. Therefore, the Board action includes a recommendation to support the transfer of the remaining funds in CIP 1142700 to the ECBMF construction CIP 1049600. Both capital projects were established as construction projects and are within the SANDAG budget. This action would set the stage for SANDAG to move the funds with MTS’s endorsement.

The planned construction at the East County Bus Maintenance Facility is currently being designed. The work proposed is at the existing five-acre site. Work proposed includes: demolition of the old and not-needed 544 Vernon Way building; asphalt and concrete paving and site work on all of the existing site, enabling full-size, heavy-duty buses to be parked anywhere on the site; and installation of required storm water pollution prevention drainage systems to meet environmental requirements. MTS will also be working with the City of El Cajon staff regarding city requirements for the public right-of-way improvements related to Johnson Avenue, Vernon Way, and Pioneer Way that may be included within this construction project.

Paul C. Jablonski
Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff Contact: Elliot Hurwitz, 619.595.7031, elliott.hurwitz@sdmits.com

MAY28-09.6.ECBMF BUDGET CHGS.EHURWITZ.doc
ANNUAL REPORT ON COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS

Introduction

In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 004, an informational report is provided to the Board of Directors on an annual basis concerning the status of all standing and ad hoc committees and working groups. In accordance with Board Policy No. 001, the Executive Committee is responsible for annually reviewing a list of all SANDAG lower-level committees and working groups to determine the need to maintain the committee or working group and to approve any revisions in functions or membership. On June 12, 2009, the Executive Committee conducted its required review and approved the 24 groups that are described in this report.

Discussion

Obtaining meaningful public and technical input is important to all of our functional areas and is consistent with adopted SANDAG policy for public participation/involvement. Equally important is the need for focused policy direction, which is vested either in the Board of Directors or has been delegated by the Board to one of the five Policy Advisory Committees (PAC).

SANDAG supports 24 different committees and working groups that advise the PACs on a variety of projects and issues related to our Overall Work Program and Capital Program. With the exception of the Executive Committee, each PAC (Transportation, Regional Planning, Borders, and Public Safety) has a number of different committees and working groups that report to it. Attachment 1 depicts the relationship between each of the PACs and their related working groups. Attachment 2 lists the membership, responsibilities, year established, frequency of meetings, and status for each of these groups.

Standing Groups

Many of our committees and working groups have met for years (even decades). These standing groups generally assist in ongoing planning, programming, and project development activities. Some examples of these include the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (planning directors), Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (public works directors), the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (stakeholders from the San Diego region and Mexico), and the Chiefs'/Sheriff’s Management Committee (chiefs of police, sheriff, or public safety chief executive officers).

Ad Hoc Groups

Other committees and working groups are ad hoc, meaning that they are established to accomplish a specific task or project. These ad hoc groups terminate upon completion of the identified task or...
project. Some examples of ad hoc groups include the recently approved Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group and Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group, and the I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP) Joint Policy Committee (currently assisting with the grant-funded I-15 IRP Phase III project).

**Working Group Changes**

Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group

On May 22, 2009, the Board of Directors approved the establishment of a new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) to provide input on the development of key work elements in the planning process, including the public participation plan and public outreach to help inform and encourage active public participation for the next 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The new SWG will act in an advisory capacity to both the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on the development of the 2050 RTP and its components.

Staff issued the call for SWG membership applications in June 2009. A selection committee will review applications during June/July, and the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees will be asked to recommend the SWG slate to the Board of Directors at their July meetings.

Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group

On May 22, 2009, the Board of Directors also approved the establishment of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group (PWG) and its charter. The PWG will provide input to the Transportation Committee and SANDAG staff on the development of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and its components. The PWG will meet through the completion of the draft environmental document anticipated in August 2010.

Staff issued the call for PWG membership applications on May 26, 2009. Applications will be reviewed by a selection committee in June 2009. Staff will present the selection committee’s PWG participant recommendations to the Transportation Committee and the Board or Directors at their July meetings.

Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines Ad Hoc Working Group

The Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines Ad Hoc Working Group was formed in 2006 to provide input on the development of urban design guidelines for the San Diego region. The group held its last meeting in January 2009 and will be removed from the next annual status report. Action by the Regional Planning Committee and Board of Directors on the final design guidelines is scheduled for June 2009.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Policy Advisory Committees and Related Working Groups Diagram
2. List of Committees and Working Groups

Key Staff Contact: Victoria Stackwick, (619) 699-6926, vst@sandag.org
Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group
Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee
Regional Transit Planning Working Group
San Diego Region Conformity Working Group
San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council
Social Services Transportation Advisory Council

Bayshore Bikeway Working Group

Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group
Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee
Regional Transit Planning Working Group

Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group
Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group

Board of Directors
Transportation Committee

Bold = new working group
Board of Directors

Borders Committee

Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities

Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues

I-15 Interregional Partnership Joint Policy Committee
Board of Directors

Public Safety Committee

Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee

ARJIS

Business Working Group
Crime Analysis Working Group
Enterprise Core Working Group
Technical Working Group
## LIST OF COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS

### TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE OR WORKING GROUP NAME</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
<th>YEAR ESTABL.</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bayshore Bikeway Working Group</strong></td>
<td>County Supervisor Cox (Chair), Chula Vista Councilmember Bensoussan, Coronado Councilmember Woiwode, Imperial Beach Mayor Janney, National City Councilmember Zarate, City of San Diego Councilmember Faulconer, and advisory representatives from Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), Port of San Diego, and the bicycling community</td>
<td>Reviews and supports improvements to the Bayshore Bikeway</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Will terminate upon project completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Lead: Stephan Vance</td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Periodically No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group</strong></td>
<td>Staff from local jurisdictions, Caltrans, MTS, North County Transit District (NCTD), Port of San Diego, representatives from bicycle and pedestrian advocacy groups</td>
<td>Makes bicycle and pedestrian funding recommendations and reviews non-motorized transportation issues</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Lead: Chris Kluth</td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Monthly No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)</strong></td>
<td>Public works directors from local jurisdictions and staff from Caltrans, MTS, and NCTD</td>
<td>Makes recommendations regarding transportation-related policies and issues that affect local street and road projects and programs</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Lead: Dan Martin</td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Monthly No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE OR WORKING GROUP NAME</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
<th>YEAR ESTABL.</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Regional Transit Planning Working Group</td>
<td>NCTD, MTS, other transit operator planning staffs, and Full Access &amp; Coordinated Transportation (FACT) staff</td>
<td>Assists in developing annual Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP) and Productivity Improvement Program; fulfills TDA requirement for a productivity improvement committee</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lead: Daniel Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Quarterly No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 San Diego Region Conformity Working Group</td>
<td>Staff from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), California Air Resources Board (ARB), Caltrans, and San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD)</td>
<td>Reviews and comments on Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/ Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) transport conformity and State Implementation Plan development or updates; fulfills federal and state requirements for interagency consultation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lead: Rachel Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Monthly No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council (SANTEC)</td>
<td>Traffic engineers from local jurisdictions, Caltrans, and staff from MTS and NCTD</td>
<td>Makes recommendations regarding traffic engineering issues associated with the region’s roadway network</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lead: Alex Estrella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Monthly No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised June 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE OR WORKING GROUP NAME</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
<th>YEAR ESTABL.</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)</td>
<td>Representatives of transit users who are 60 years or older; representatives of transit users who are persons with a disability; staff from social service providers serving seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons of limited means; representatives from the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (FACT); representatives from each of the transit operators.</td>
<td>Designated as the Local Review Committee for the FTA Section 5310 grant applications, holds required unmet needs hearings, and advises on regional issues of accessible transportation provided by the public and private sector; fulfills state Public Utilities Code requirement; fulfills SAFETEA-LU Coordinated Plan requirement; also reviews and advises on transit capital improvement projects for ADA compliance</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bimonthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group</td>
<td>22 members distributed over several membership categories, including access advocate, business community, community representatives, community services, employers, environmental, retail, student representative, taxpayers advocate, transportation advocate, transit rider representative, and at-large members</td>
<td>Provide a forum to update key stakeholders and the public on Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project information and project review processes, present technical information for review during the scoping period, to reach consensus in support of a Locally Preferred Alternative, and review the draft environmental documents and provide comments</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ad Hoc – will terminate upon completion of draft environmental document (August 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE OR WORKING GROUP NAME</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITIES</td>
<td>YEAR ESTABL.</td>
<td>CURRENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)</td>
<td>Up to 25 members, including 16 to 18 “at-large” citizen members selected based on their individual qualifications, and 5 to 7 individuals representing community-based networks</td>
<td>Provide ongoing public input into key activities associated with developing the 2050 RTP and its key components, including its goals and objectives and a Sustainable Communities Strategy required by Senate Bill 375 (2008)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ad Hoc – will terminate upon completion of 2050 RTP (summer 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lead: Jane Clough-Riquelme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE OR WORKING GROUP NAME</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITIES</td>
<td>YEAR ESTABL.</td>
<td>CURRENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Shoreline Preservation Working Group</td>
<td>San Diego County Supervisor Slater-Price (Chair), Solana Beach Councilmember Kellejian (Vice Chair), Coronado Mayor Pro Tem Downey, Del Mar Councilmember Filanc, Imperial Beach Mayor Janney, Oceanside Councilmember Sanchez, City of San Diego Councilmember Faulconer, Encinitas Councilmember Bond, Carlsbad Mayor Pro Tem Kulchin, representatives from resource agencies; U.S. Department of Defense (DOD); Port of San Diego; Surfrider Foundation; Sierra Club; California Coastal Coalition; Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association; California Lobster and Trap Fisherman Association; and economic development, business, and other community organizations</td>
<td>Advises on the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy adopted by SANDAG in 1993</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lead: Shelby Tucker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Regional Housing Working Group</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Councilmember Selby (Co-Chair); Duane Roth, CONNECT (Co-Chair); housing staff representatives from the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, North County Coastal, North County Inland, East County, and South County; and housing authority staff, housing industry representatives, and housing advocates</td>
<td>Serves as a forum for discussion of regional housing issues</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lead: Susan Baldwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Regional Energy Working Group</td>
<td>Coronado Councilmember Downey (Chair), San Marcos Councilmember Jones (North County Inland), San Diego Councilmember Frye, Solana Beach Councilmember Heebner (North County Coastal), Vacant (East County), Vacant (County of San Diego); and representatives from San Diego Gas &amp; Electric, Port of San Diego, California Center for Sustainable Energy, Energy Policy Initiatives Center at USD, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, North County Economic Development Council, San Diego Regional Clean Fuels Coalition, Environmental Health Coalition, Sierra Club, regional universities and regional transit agencies</td>
<td>Advises on the implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy adopted by SANDAG in 2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lead: Susan Freedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised June 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE OR WORKING GROUP NAME</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
<th>YEAR ESTABL.</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) Working Group</td>
<td>Coronado Councilmember Carrie Downey (Chair); County of San Diego staff Tom Oberbauer (Vice Chair) and staff representatives from City of San Diego, North County Coastal, North County Inland, East County, and South County; representatives from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Game, California Wildlife Conservation Board, Caltrans, The Nature Conservancy, Conservation Resource Network, U.S. Geological Survey, Endangered Habitats League, Building Industry Association, San Diego Foundation, California Coastal Conservancy, and Alliance for Habitat Conservation</td>
<td>Advises on issues related to the coordination and implementation of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Will continue through duration of implementation of TransNet EMP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                 | Staff Lead: Keith Greer                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                  |              | **Meeting Schedule:** Monthly  
|                                 |                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                  |              | **No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009:** 8 |
| 14 Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) | Planning directors from local jurisdictions and staff from other agencies, including Port of San Diego, MTS, NCTD, San Diego County Water Authority (CWA), and Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) | Advises on the development and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) | 1990         | Standing  
|                                 | Staff Lead: Carolina Gregor                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                  |              | **Meeting Schedule:** Monthly  
<p>|                                 |                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                  |              | <strong>No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009:</strong> 14 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE OR WORKING GROUP NAME</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
<th>YEAR ESTABL.</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines Ad Hoc Working Group</td>
<td>Two members each from the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee, Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, and Regional Planning Technical Working Group</td>
<td>Provide input on the development of urban design guidelines for the San Diego region, including preparation of scope of work, consultant selection, and periodic feedback as the guidelines are developed</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Held last meeting in January 2009 – will be removed from next annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 SPRINTER Smart Growth Working Group</td>
<td>Staff from jurisdictions located along the SPRINTER line, including the cities of Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido, and the County of San Diego, and NCTD; other public and private stakeholders serve as advisory members</td>
<td>Provides assistance to local jurisdictions along the SPRINTER line and other stakeholders to implement smart growth in the areas around the 15 SPRINTER stations</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)</td>
<td>Up to 25 members, including 16 to 18 “at-large” citizen members selected based on their individual qualifications, and 5 to 7 individuals representing community-based networks</td>
<td>Provide ongoing public input into key activities associated with developing the 2050 RTP and its key components, including its goals and objectives and a Sustainable Communities Strategy required by Senate Bill 375 (2008)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ad Hoc – will terminate upon completion of 2050 RTP (summer 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE OR WORKING GROUP NAME</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITIES</td>
<td>YEAR ESTABL.</td>
<td>CURRENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO)</td>
<td>Stakeholders from both sides of the United States/Mexico border, including representatives from local jurisdictions, businesses, and academia</td>
<td>Advises on binational -related planning and project development issues</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues</td>
<td>Representatives from each of the federally recognized tribal governments and California tribes in San Diego County</td>
<td>Discuss and coordinate transportation issues of mutual concern with the various public planning agencies in the region, including SANDAG, Caltrans, the County of San Diego, and the transit operators</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP) Joint Policy Committee</td>
<td>Elected officials from the San Diego region (members of SANDAG Borders Committee) and from the Southwestern Riverside County region (members of Western Riverside Council of Governments, Riverside County Transportation Commission, and the Riverside Transit Agency)</td>
<td>Review and provide policy-level feedback on I-15 IRP Phase III Study</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Will terminate upon completion of I-15 IRP Phase III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE OR WORKING GROUP NAME</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITIES</td>
<td>YEAR ESTABL.</td>
<td>CURRENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Chiefs’ / Sheriff’s Management Committee</td>
<td>Sheriff and police chiefs from around the region</td>
<td>Reviews, evaluates, and oversees the SANDAG Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) and Criminal Justice work programs and budgets; oversees the ARJIS Business, Technical, Crime Analysis, and Enterprise Core Working Groups; and evaluates and recommends regional public safety initiatives</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lead: Pam Scanlon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Monthly No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 ARJIS Business Working Group</td>
<td>Appointed staff members from each agency represented on the Chiefs’ / Sheriff’s Management Committee</td>
<td>Provides advice to the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee on ARJIS matters relating to information sharing, business practices, and budget</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lead: Audrey Radi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Bimonthly as needed No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 ARJIS Crime Analysis Working Group (CASS)</td>
<td>Appointed staff members from each agency represented on the Chiefs’ / Sheriff’s Management Committee</td>
<td>Provides advice to the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee on matters relating to the verification, validation, and analysis of regional public safety information and mandated federal reporting requirements</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lead: Audrey Radi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Bimonthly as needed No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE OR WORKING GROUP NAME</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
<th>YEAR ESTABL.</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 ARJIS Enterprise Core Working Group</td>
<td>Appointed staff members from each agency represented on the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee</td>
<td>Provides advice to the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee on matters relating to the development of the new ARJIS Enterprise System</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Lead: Pam Scanlon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Bimonthly as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 ARJIS Technical Working Group</td>
<td>Appointed staff members from each agency represented on the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee</td>
<td>Provides advice to the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee on ARJIS matters relating to state-of-the-art information technology that enhances both officer and public safety</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Lead: Joe Vaughn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Schedule: Bimonthly as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Mtgs. in FY 2009: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

File Number 8000100

Introduction

Board Policy Nos. 003, 017, and 024 require the Executive Director to report certain actions to the Board of Directors on a monthly basis.

Discussion

Board Policy No. 003

Board Policy No. 003, “Investment Policy,” requires the submittal of a monthly report of investment transactions to the Board. Attachment 1 contains the reportable investment transactions for April 2009.

Board Policy No. 017

Board Policy No. 017, “Delegation of Authority,” requires the Executive Director to report to the Board certain actions taken at the next regular meeting.

Section 4.1 of the policy authorizes the Executive Director to enter into agreements not currently incorporated in the budget and make other modifications to the budget in an amount up to $100,000 per transaction so long as the overall budget remains in balance. Attachment 2 contains the reportable actions since the report made at the last meeting.

Board Policy No. 024

Board Policy No. 024, “Procurement and Contracting-Construction,” requires the Executive Director to report to the Board the granting of (1) Relief from Maintenance and Responsibility, and (2) Acceptance of Work for construction contracts. There are no delegated actions to report.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Reportable Investment Transactions for April 2009
2. Budget Transfers and Amendments

Key Staff Contact: Lauren Warrem, (619) 699-6931, lwa@sandag.org
MONTHLY ACTIVITY FOR INVESTMENT SECURITIES TRANSACTIONS FOR APRIL 1 THROUGH APRIL 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction Date</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Security Description</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Amount on Cost</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP GLOBAL REFERENCE NOTES</td>
<td>$4,300,000.00</td>
<td>$4,464,131.00</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2009</td>
<td>07/12/2010</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN GLOBAL NOTES</td>
<td>4,330,000.00</td>
<td>4,438,812.90</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2009</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP NOTES (FLOAT)</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2009</td>
<td>03/09/2011</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP NOTES</td>
<td>4,500,000.00</td>
<td>4,514,310.00</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2009</td>
<td>04/26/2011</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP NOTES</td>
<td>4,500,000.00</td>
<td>4,496,088.60</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2009</td>
<td>09/16/2011</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN BKS GLOBAL BONDS</td>
<td>4,300,000.00</td>
<td>4,472,695.00</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2009</td>
<td>01/09/2012</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN NOTES GLOBAL NOTES</td>
<td>4,450,000.00</td>
<td>4,487,647.00</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2009</td>
<td>04/13/2012</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN BKS GLOBAL NOTES</td>
<td>4,450,000.00</td>
<td>4,470,778.52</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/2009</td>
<td>03/15/2012</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15/2009</td>
<td>04/15/2011</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN NOTES (CALLABLE)</td>
<td>$865,000.00</td>
<td>864,567.50</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/2009</td>
<td>04/21/2014</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP NOTES</td>
<td>$4,450,000.00</td>
<td>$4,502,821.50</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL BOUGHT: $49,665,000.00 $50,229,030.52 1.50%

SOLD           |               | FEDERAL HOME LN BKS GLOBAL NOTES | $4,450,000.00 | $4,502,821.50 | 1.50% |
| 04/14/2009       | 04/13/2012    | FEDERAL HOME LN BKS GLOBAL NOTES | $4,450,000.00 | $4,502,821.50 | 1.50% |

TOTAL SOLD: $4,450,000.00 $4,502,821.50 1.50%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>CURRENT BUDGET (in 000s)</th>
<th>NEW BUDGET (in 000s)</th>
<th>CHANGE (in 000s)</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7500000</td>
<td>Service Bureau - Main Project</td>
<td>$48.2</td>
<td>$181.0</td>
<td>$132.8</td>
<td>Transferred funds of $8,500 from the Main Service Bureau project (#7500000) to establish a new project (#7508100). Additionally, transferred funds of $141,300 into the Main Service Bureau project (#7500000) from the cancellation of the Port of San Diego project (#7508000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7508000</td>
<td>Port of San Diego Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis</td>
<td>$141.3</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>($141.3)</td>
<td>This change is to cancel project (#7508000) to reflect the cancellation of the project due to insufficient funding. The Service Bureau Main project (#7500000) was increased by $141,300.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7508100</td>
<td>Oceanside Transportation Model Alternatives</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
<td>This change is to establish a new Service Bureau project (#7508100) for Oceanside Transportation Model Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG

Since the last Board of Directors meeting, Board members participated in the following meetings and events on behalf of SANDAG. Key topics of discussion also are summarized.

May 19–20, 2009: Urban Land Institute Sustainability Workshop
San Diego, CA

• Imperial Beach Mayor and Regional Planning Committee Chair Jim Janney attended this meeting on behalf of SANDAG. He indicated that it was very productive and provided valuable tools and strategies for local public officials to learn how they can leverage more sustainable development practices in their communities.

June 1–3, 2009: National Association of Regional Councils (NARC) Annual Conference
Denver, CO

• Second Vice Chair Jack Dale and National City Mayor Ron Morrison attended this conference on behalf of SANDAG. Attendees had the opportunity to share best practices, attend informative sessions on program, legislative, and regulatory issues, as well as avail themselves of training and technical services. Speakers included experts from the public and private sector, congressional and state lawmakers, and individuals from universities and nonprofit organizations.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
FIRST READING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
TransNet ORDINANCE 04-01 REGARDING AUDIT REPORTING
FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance (Commission Ordinance CO-04-01) includes language requiring that all local jurisdictions have their Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) financial records available for audit by July 1 of each calendar year. The timing of this deadline creates complications and inefficiencies, because it is not aligned with the annual fiscal audit process. Therefore, it is proposed that the audit requirements for the RTCIP be aligned with the annual fiscal and compliance audit requirements for the TransNet program.

Discussion

The existing TransNet Extension Ordinance (CO-04-01) includes the language in Section G(2) of its attachment entitled “TransNet Extension Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program” that currently provides that each jurisdiction is required to provide the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) with its RTCIP Funding Program documents by July 1 of each year beginning July 1, 2009. Section G(5) goes on to require that SANDAG report to the Board on the RTCIP and the annual audit statements in November of each year beginning in November 2009.

Should jurisdictions be required to meet the reporting dates of July 1 for submittal of their RTCIP Funding Program documents and financial records for review and audit by the ITOC, it would not be coordinated with the fiscal audit process that also is required for all jurisdictions. That process calls for financial records to be ready for review and audit between September 1 and December 1 of each year and that a report to the Board of Directors on the final fiscal audit to be made in June of each year. Furthermore, the requirement to provide financial records by July 1 for audit for a fiscal year ending on June 30 does not provide sufficient time for the jurisdictions to comply.

Recommendation

As recommended by the Transportation Committee and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee, the Board of Directors is asked to conduct the first reading of the CO-09-01, which would amend CO-04-01 to align the timeline for the RTCIP audits with the TransNet annual fiscal and compliance audit requirements (“Amendment” [Attachment 1]). The Board of Directors is further asked to approve a one-time extension of time to September 1, 2009, for jurisdictions to submit financial records pertaining to their RTCIP Funding Programs for review and audit in order to allow sufficient time for the proposed Amendment to be considered.
The TransNet Extension Ordinance also includes the following language regarding the intent of ITOC as a functional partner to SANDAG:

“Cost-efficient—it is the intent that the ITOC will not add cost burden to the SANDAG implementation of the TransNet program and projects. Rather, through a cooperative and productive working relationship between ITOC and the SANDAG implementation team, it is the objective that costs will be saved.”

By linking the RTCIP and fiscal audit processes, there are clear efficiencies that can be gained in overall audit costs. The auditors can visit and report on jurisdictions only one time, rather than multiple times throughout the year. The financial staff at all of the jurisdictions would gain efficiencies as well by only having to prepare for the audit process one time per year.

The proposed Amendment would accomplish two changes to deadlines. The first, in Section G(2) of the TransNet Extension RTCIP, would change the deadline for jurisdictions to provide documentation regarding their Funding Programs to the ITOC from July 1 to December 1 of each year. Amendments to SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, “TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules,” also are proposed that would include additional preliminary deadlines for the jurisdictions to provide RTCIP information to SANDAG. A draft of the proposed changes to Section I of Rule #17 of Board Policy No. 031 regarding audit timing and the RTCIP is provided as Attachment 2 to this report as additional information. (On June 12, 2009, the Executive Committee recommended approval of proposed amendments to Board Policy No. 031, including the proposed change to Section I of Rule #17.)

The second deadline change proposed in the Amendment is in Section G(5). This change would move the deadline for the ITOC to issue an annual audit statement on each jurisdiction’s compliance with RTCIP requirements from October 1 of each year to June 1 of each year. If the Amendment is approved, the first ITOC annual audit statement for RTCIP Funding Programs would be issued by June 1, 2010 (instead of October 1, 2009). These new dates would give sufficient time for the ITOC to review and process the audit of the RTCIP Funding Programs at the same time the annual fiscal audit process occurs. Additionally, the current deadline for staff to report to the Board of Directors on the RTCIP would be shifted annually from November to June (with the first report occurring in June 2010, rather than November 2009).

The proposed Amendment was presented to the Transportation Committee at its June 5, 2009, meeting and to the ITOC at its June 10, 2009, meeting. Both the Transportation Committee and ITOC recommended approval of the Amendment. During review of the proposed amendments in Commission Ordinance CO-09-01 staff noticed some inaccurate verbiage in CO-04-01. Corrections to these typographical errors are also shown in Attachment 1.

Both the Transportation Committee and the ITOC also recommend approval of a one-time extension of the deadline for the RTCIP financial records to September 1, 2009, in order to align the audit process for the current year and allow sufficient time for the Board of Directors to consider the Amendment discussed in this report. The one-time deadline extension and the Amendment are consistent with the intent of the TransNet Ordinance to promote cost efficiency and will not interfere with RTCIP funding or substantive compliance with the terms of the TransNet Ordinance concerning the RTCIP.
Next Steps

Pending Board of Directors action on the first reading of the Amendment, the second reading and approval of the Amendment, along with approval of related changes to Board Policy No. 031, would be scheduled for the July 24, 2009, Board of Directors meeting.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Draft of Commission Ordinance No. CO-09-01 (Amendment)
2. Draft of Proposed Amendments to Section I of Rule #17 of Board Policy No. 031

Key Staff Contact: Charles “Muggs” Stoll, (619) 699-6945; mst@sandag.org
COMMISSION ORDINANCE NO. CO-09-01

AN ORDINANCE OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AMENDING COMMISSION ORDINANCE CO-04-01 TO REVISE THE FINANCIAL REPORTING PROCEDURES FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTCIP)

The SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ordains as follows:

Section 1. That Section G(2) and G(5) of the attachment to Commission Ordinance CO-04-01 entitled, “TransNet EXTENSION REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM,” is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section G(2): Each jurisdiction shall determine its own schedule for collecting and/or contributing private sector exactions to its Funding Program. This schedule shall be kept up-to-date and provided to SANDAG and the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee each year at the time of the annual review and audit. Each jurisdiction must submit its Funding Program documents, including an expenditure plan and financial records pertaining to its Funding Program, to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for a review and audit by December 1 of each year beginning December 1, 2009. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee shall review each jurisdiction’s Funding Program consistent with its auditing role as described in Section 11 of the Ordinance and the Statement of Understanding referenced in that Section. (Change underlined)

Section G(5): The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee identified in Section 11 of the Ordinance shall be responsible for issuing an annual audit statement on each jurisdiction’s compliance with requirements of Section 9 of the TransNet Ordinance by June 1 of each year beginning June 1, 2010. SANDAG will report to the Board on the RTCIP with the annual fiscal audit statement in June of each year beginning in June 2010. (Change underlined)

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, State of California, on July 10, 2009, by the following vote:

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

Chairperson
San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission

Attest:

(Signature)

Executive Director
TransNet ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN RULES (excerpt only)

The following rules have been adopted and amended by the SANDAG Board of Directors in its role as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). The purpose of these rules is to implement the provisions of the original TransNet Ordinance (87-1) and the TransNet Extension Ordinance (04-01).

Rule #17: Fiscal and Compliance Audits

Adoption Date: November 18, 2005

Amendment: Amended at September 26, 2008, Board Meeting.

Text: I. Fiscal and Compliance Audit Procedures

The fiscal and compliance audit is an essential tool to determine that TransNet funds are being used for the intended purposes. The Commission has the fiduciary responsibility to ensure that the public funds are used in accordance with the TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plans (87-01 and 04-01).

Pursuant to the TransNet Extension Ordinance (04-01), the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) is responsible for the conduct of an annual fiscal audit and compliance audit of all TransNet-funded activities beginning with the FY 2009 audit. In order to complete the audits in a timely manner, the following estimated audit schedule is set forth:

A. July/August: ITOC designee and appropriate SANDAG staff meet and coordinate with the auditors to review the audits required for the year and provide all necessary documentation/information for the auditors to begin work.

A. September to November: Auditors schedule and perform site visits. Recipient agencies must be ready and available to meet with the auditors and provide requested financial schedules and other information necessary for the completion of the audit.

B. November/December: Auditors issue preliminary draft reports to both SANDAG and the recipient agencies no later than December 31. The Recipient agencies must be available to review and comment on the draft report in a timely manner. All outstanding issues should be resolved within four weeks of preliminary draft report issuance.

C. February: Auditors issue the draft audits to ITOC.

D. March: Auditors issue a report of compliance audit results, final draft reports, and present the annual report to ITOC at its March meeting.

E. April: ITOC presents initial finding(s) of the audit and its recommendations to the Transportation Committee.
E. May: ITOC issues all compliance reports and adopts the annual report.

F. June: ITOC presents an ITOC annual report, which includes results of the annual audit and its process, is presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors. Board with the results of the annual audit and its process.

ITOC Responsibility: In accordance with the ITOC Responsibilities Section of the attachment to Commission Ordinance CO-04-01 entitled “STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE FOR THE TRANSNET PROGRAM”, ITOC will conduct an annual fiscal and compliance audit of all TransNet-funded activities using the services of an independent fiscal auditor to assure compliance with the voter-approved Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, and will prepare an annual report for presentation to the SANDAG Board of Directors that includes the results of the annual audit process.

SANDAG Responsibility: SANDAG will provide all information necessary to complete the audit.

Agency Responsibility: All agencies must be ready for the site visit, provide requested information, and review and comment on the draft reports in a timely manner.

If the auditor is unable to complete the audit because an agency was not ready or did not provide the required information or reviews in a timely manner, then the agency will be deemed in noncompliance of the Ordinance. SANDAG will withhold future TransNet payments (except for required debt service payments) until the audit draft is completed.
FY 2010 TDA/TransNet BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY/TRAFFIC CALMING FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Each year, the SANDAG Board of Directors allocates Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 and TransNet funds to support nonmotorized transportation projects in the San Diego region as part of the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program. For FY 2010, approximately $7.8 million is available for allocation from these two programs.

On April 3, 2009, the Transportation Committee approved the evaluation criteria and program guidelines (Attachments 1 thru 5) and authorized the FY 2010 call for projects. SANDAG received 38 applications requesting $9.9 million. A total of 26 applications were submitted for capital projects requesting $8.5 million, and 12 applications were submitted for bicycle master plans, pedestrian master plans, bicycle parking, and bicycle support programs requesting $1.4 million. Program applicants presented their projects to the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG) on May 20, 2009. Project applications also were posted on the SANDAG Web site for public review. On May 21, 2009, a Review Panel was assembled to review project eligibility and the accuracy of the evaluation scoring as measured by the adopted program guidelines.1

The BPWG met on May 27, 2009, and recommended a list of projects for funding, which is shown in Attachment 6. On June 10, 2009, the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) reviewed the projects to verify eligibility and compliance with the TransNet ordinance.

Discussion

FY 2010 Funding Availability

The Board of Directors is able to approve programming of approximately $3 million in TDA funding and $4.8 million in TransNet funding for FY 2010 for a total of $7.8 million. The breakdown of this year’s funding availability is outlined in Attachment 8. It is recommended that a modest reserve of approximately $27,000 be maintained to account for potential increases in project costs and to allow some buffer for potential reductions in TDA or TransNet allocations.

Recommended FY 2010 Funding Allocations

During the review and evaluation process the Review Panel determined that five of the original 26 project applications were ineligible. One project for routine maintenance was not an eligible expense under the program guidelines. Four project applications were deemed incomplete.

1 Participation on the Review Panel is voluntary and is open to any member of the BPWG.
Bicycle Plans, Pedestrian Plans, Bicycle Parking, and Support Programs

The Program guidelines encourage and fund bicycle plans, pedestrian plans, bicycle parking, and support programs. Consistent with the adopted program guidelines, these projects are not part of the competitive process and can be funded up to the amounts set in the guidelines. The projects that are proposed for funding total $1,154,378 and are shown in Attachment 6. The recommended projects include seven bicycle or pedestrian master plans, three bicycle parking projects, a bicycle and pedestrian safety program for elementary and middle-school students, and support for printing and distribution of the regional bicycle map produced by SANDAG.

In accordance with the program guidelines, it is recommended that two projects in this category be funded at less than the requested amount. In the first case, the program guidelines require all bicycle parking facilities be accessible to the public. The City of Escondido Bike Lockers and Racks project proposed bike racks that would be available to the public and bike lockers that would be for use by City employees only. It is recommended that funding be provided only for the publicly accessible bike racks in the amount of $14,378, down from the original $42,034 request. In the second case, the program guidelines also identify a maximum funding amount of $150,000 for planning studies. It is therefore recommended that the City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan Environmental Documentation and Feasibility Study be funded at $150,000, down from the $350,000 request.

Capital Projects

There were 26 applications for capital projects. The project applications were evaluated according to the program guidelines and criteria adopted by the Transportation Committee. After funding for the plans, bicycle parking, and support programs is deducted from the overall FY 2010 funding allocation, there is approximately $6.5 million in funding available for capital projects. Funding is recommended for the top 18 scoring projects as shown in Attachment 6. It is recommended that the top 18 projects receive the full amount applied for. The total amount of recommended funding for capital projects is $6,587,430.

Next Steps

Upon approval of funding allocations for the FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program by the Board of Directors, SANDAG staff will establish grant agreements with each grant recipient to specify a scope and expected outcomes for each of the projects.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Claim Guidelines
  2. FY 2010 Annual Grant Application
  3. FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Application Checklist
  4. FY 2010 Bicycle Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix
  5. FY 2010 Pedestrian Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix
  6. FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Project Scores and Rankings
  7. Draft Resolution No. 2009-30
  8. Proposed FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program

Key Staff Contacts: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, ckl@sandag.org
                   Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, ski@sandag.org
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CLAIM GUIDELINES

Introduction

The following describes the claim process for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects and TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety Projects.

TDA Project Eligibility

The law specifies that funds should be allocated according to the regulations adopted by SANDAG as the regional transportation planning agency. It also identifies certain categories of eligible projects. These specific project types represent neither an exhaustive list nor are they listed as priorities (Public Utilities Code [PUC] Sections 99233.3 and 99234). They are summarized below for reference. Project evaluation criteria, established by SANDAG Board policy, are discussed later.

- Construction, including related engineering expenses, of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Maintenance of bicycle trails provided they are closed to motorized traffic.
- Projects serving the needs of commuting bicyclists, including but not limited to, new paths serving major transportation corridors, secure bicycle parking at employment centers, park-and-ride lots, and transit centers where other funds are not available.
- A comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian facilities plan (no more than once every five years), with an emphasis on bicycle projects intended to primarily accommodate non-recreational bicycle trips.
- Up to 20 percent of the cost to restripe Class II bicycle lanes.
- Up to 5 percent of the amount available to a city or the county may be expended in conjunction with other funds to support bicycle safety education programs, so long as the funds are not used to fully fund the salary of any one person.

TransNet Project Eligibility

TransNet bicycle, pedestrian, and neighborhood safety funds may be expended for all purposes necessary and convenient to the design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of facilities intended for use by bicyclists, pedestrians, and neighborhood safety/traffic calming projects. These funds also may be used for programs that help to encourage bicycling and walking, such as secure parking facilities, bicycle/pedestrian promotion programs, and safety programs.

Certain costs at times associated with bicycle and pedestrian projects are not eligible when the benefit provided is not the exclusive use of bicyclists or pedestrians. These instances are listed below.
• Curb and gutter are part of the roadway drainage system. As such, newly installed curb and gutter cannot be considered an improvement exclusively for the benefit of the sidewalk or bike lane and are not an eligible expense.

• Driveway ramps installed across sidewalks are not for the benefit of pedestrians, and in fact, degrade the pedestrian environment. Claimants may not include the cost of driveway ramps in applications for sidewalk projects. However, the distance across the driveway may be included when computing the per-square-foot cost of the sidewalk.

• Where roadway design standards require a roadway shoulder width at least as wide as would be required for a standard bike lane, the cost of the shoulder construction will not be eligible. Appropriate bikeway signage is eligible.

Under some circumstances, it may be necessary to remove and replace curb and gutter, driveway ramps, drainage facilities, and other existing improvements in order to construct a bikeway or sidewalk. In such cases the cost of this work is most likely eligible, but claimants should carefully document why this is so in the claim submittal.

**SANDAG Claim Requirements**

SANDAG has the authority to establish criteria applicable to analyzing and evaluating claims for non-motorized transportation facilities (PUC Section 99401). To be considered for funding, a claim must be consistent with the SANDAG-adopted non-motorized plans and meet the requirements for community support and geometric design standards, as described in Categories 1 and 2 of the Project Evaluation Criteria. In addition, the following requirements must be met, if applicable:

• If the project abuts other jurisdictions, it must be shown on the adopted plans of the adjacent jurisdictions, or a letter must be submitted from the abutting jurisdiction showing that cooperative efforts are underway.

• Other sources of funding for cooperative projects must be identified. Please attach supporting documentation that shows matching funds have been secured. Matching funds that have not been secured will not be considered in the matching funds section of the project scoring matrix.

• Projects which are a required element of a larger capital improvement project are not eligible for funding.

• No single agency may submit an application, or applications, that are greater than the total available allocation for that fiscal year.

**Application Process**

Applications for TDA and TransNet non-motorized claims must be received by SANDAG by May 6, 2009. To be considered for funding, the Annual Grant Application must be fully completed. In addition, please consider the following, if applicable:

• All claims, including those supporting educational or promotional programs and claims for planning projects, must include a project budget, work program, and project schedule.
• No later than May 20, 2009, include a certified copy of a resolution or minute order in which
the planning group, planning commission, or governing body of the claimant authorizes the
claim.

• Review Panel. A review panel of six to eight working group members will conduct a full
preliminary review of the project applications to identify significant issues and request
clarification from the project applicants, if necessary. Participation on the review panel is
open to any active working group member. Applicants must submit multiple hard copies of
their applications for distribution to the review panel.

• Completed applications will be made available online. Applicants must submit their
application in PDF format as well as hard copy. Electronic version of the applications will be
posted to the internet to give any working group member the opportunity to review the
applications.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation process for TDA bicycle and pedestrian projects and TransNet bicycle, pedestrian,
and neighborhood safety projects is consistent with the way SANDAG evaluates and prioritizes
other components of the transportation system, such as arterial, highway, and transit projects.
Transportation project priorities are established in planning documents like the Regional
Transportation Plan (RTP). Priorities also are used for funding decisions that are programmed in the
Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). In addition, the evaluation criteria supports
the overall goals and objectives SANDAG has for improving the regional transportation system and
promoting smart growth in the region by giving priority to projects that enhance the existing
transportation network as a whole. The criteria to be used in the evaluation process are specified in
the Project Evaluation Criteria matrix.

Claimants for TDA bicycle and pedestrian projects and TransNet bicycle, pedestrian, and
neighborhood safety projects will be responsible for accurately filling out the Annual Grant
Application and the accompanying Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix. SANDAG will be responsible
for performing the Geographic Information System (GIS) Analysis in Category 6 and the Cost Benefit
Analysis in Category 11 of the Project Evaluation Criteria based on the process outlined below.
SANDAG will compile the results from the Grant Applications and produce a prioritized list of
projects that will be reviewed by the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG). The committee
then will recommend a final priority list of projects to the Transportation Committee, which will
then be approved by the Board of Directors.

• Regional Housing Needs Incentive. To qualify for funding from this program the applicant
must meet the eligibility criteria prescribed in Section 4 of “Implementation Guidelines for
SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Memorandum” from Board Policy No. 033.
Points will be awarded based on the “Description of How to Calculate the Board Policy No.
033 Incentive Points” detailed in Attachment 5 of the Policy.

• The GIS Analysis will be based on the following five factors: total population, total
employment, population density, employment density, and number of activity centers. Using
the project limits provided by the claimant, SANDAG will perform the GIS Analysis using data
for population and employment forecasts for 2015. A buffer will be created around each
project area. Pedestrian projects will be given a half-mile buffer and bicycle projects will be given a one-mile buffer. The buffered areas will be used along with the population and employment data to generate population and employment densities. The number of Activity Centers, as identified by the SANDAG data warehouse, will be identified and tallied. Each factor will be scored from one to four points, for a possible total of 20 points for the GIS Analysis category. Projects will be scored in each category relative to each other by taking the raw scores and distributing them from highest to lowest. The highest 25 percent will receive four points, the second highest quartile will receive three points, the third highest quartile will receive two points, and the lowest quartile will receive one point.

- The Cost Benefit Analysis will be computed by taking the subtotal score from Categories 1 through 8 on the Project Evaluation Criteria matrix and dividing that subtotal by the grant application amount. Projects will be scored relative to each other by taking the raw scores and distributing them from highest to lowest, with the project with the highest cost benefit ratio receiving 15 points and the project with the lowest cost benefit ratio receiving one point.
FY 2010 Annual Grant Application
Transportation Development Act/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Applicant (Agency): ________________________________

Project Name: ________________________________

Application Amount: ________________________________

Project Type: ________________________________

Project Limits: ________________________________

Project Description: ________________________________

Summary of Cost Estimates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA/TransNet Claim Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment 2
Person Authorized to Submit Application:
I certify that I have reviewed the Bicycle and Pedestrian Claims Guidelines and the
information submitted in this application is accurate and in accordance with these
guidelines.

__________________________________________________________________________
Name                       Title

__________________________________________________________________________
Signature                     Date
**Project Funding:**

**Total Estimated Project Cost** (Please attach a detailed project estimate based on best available engineering) $_______________

Project Cost Estimates – On a separate sheet provide an itemized cost estimate for all eligible expenses. Be as accurate as possible to avoid future cost overruns. Projects with cost overruns have three options for moving the project forward depending on what percentage over the original grant amount the revised project cost will be. Applicants may ask for a recommendation from the BPWG to amend original allocation for up to five percent of the original cost estimate (up to the amount available in the reserve). Projects that require more than five percent additional funding can resubmit the project in a subsequent funding cycle with the adjusted project amount. Lastly, the applicant can choose to complete the project with their own funding.

Matching Funds (Category 9 of Project Evaluation Criteria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TDA/TransNet** (Application Amount as shown in Category 10 of Project Evaluation Criteria) $______________

**Total Revenues** $______________

**Scope of Work**

In the section below, state the project deliverables (including specific quantities and locations of improvements) and anticipated completion dates. Please note that if this project is funded, this scope of work will be added to the grant agreement and the grantee will be held to this scope of work for the purpose of project oversight.

*Example:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design for intersection reconfiguration to better accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue construction contract</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete construction of intersection improvements</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting Materials

A. Community Support/Consistency with Community Plan (Category 1) – The council or governing board of the applicant must authorize this grant application. Please attach a copy of the resolution or minute order documenting that action. Or, if the project is part of an approved Bicycle Plan, please attach a copy of the section that includes the project.

B. Minimum Design Standards (Category 2) – Projects applying for construction funds must provide actual drawings or cross-sections from the project itself, not generic standard drawings. If the applicant is seeking funding for the design and construction of a project, proposed cross-sections may be used in lieu of the actual plan drawings. If any part of a project is substandard, clearly illustrate that (provide photographs, if applicable) and provide an explanation as to why the minimum design standard is not being met.

C. Connect to Regional Transportation Corridor or Transit Linkage or Regional Bikeway Map (Category 3) – Provide a map which clearly illustrates the projects relationship to existing facilities. Show the project’s direct linkages to any regional bikeway (for bicycle projects) or direct continuous link to a local bus stop or direct link to an LRT/regional transit station. A direct link for a bicycle project is defined as connecting immediately to a regional bikeway with no gaps. A direct link between a pedestrian project and a transit facility is defined as one in which some part of the facility comes within 600 feet of a local bus stop or LRT/regional transit station.

D. Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Bicycle/Pedestrian Network (Category 4) – List and briefly describe the linkages or connections to existing bicycle or pedestrian network. Provide a map which clearly illustrates the projects relationship to existing facilities.

E. Project Readiness (Category 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document/Certification</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise for Construction</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Construction</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Geographic Factors/GIS Analysis (Category 6) – SANDAG will perform a GIS analysis as described in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Claims Guidelines based upon a project map provided by the applicant. Briefly describe project limits and provide a location map clearly showing the project alignment. In addition, clearly show and label the following elements:
a. major traffic generators within the project area (within \( \frac{1}{2} \)-mile for pedestrian projects and within 1-mile for bicycle projects)
b. linkage or connections to existing bicycle or pedestrian facilities
c. linkage to any regional bikeway or public transit stop

G. **Geographic Factors/GIS Analysis (Category 6)** - List and briefly describe major traffic generators served by the project.

H. **Safety Improvements (Category 7)** - Describe the safety issues addressed by the project. Please attach support documentation for safety and accident history. If collision data is provided, it must be specific in pointing out which collisions are applicable to the project and why it is relevant.

I. **Innovation and Design (Category 8)** - Describe any design innovations for bicycle/pedestrian priority measures that are included within the project limits.

Is this project in your agency’s adopted capital improvement program (Y/N) ____

If the project is part of a larger capital improvement project, briefly discuss how the bicycle or pedestrian project costs were identified and a description of the other sources of funds for the overall project.

Briefly describe any other aspects of the project that is relevant to its evaluation.
**Bicycle Master Plans, Pedestrian Master Plans, Education/Safety Programs and Bicycle Parking**

Bicycle Master Plans, Education/Safety Programs and Bicycle Parking projects will each be considered in a separate category. These types of projects are encouraged and will be evaluated by SANDAG staff.

**Basic Guidelines**

Bicycle Master Plans – Cities with population up to 75,000 will be eligible for a maximum of $75,000. Cities with population greater than 75,000 will be eligible for a maximum of $150,000. Beginning with the 2010 project application cycle, all cities will need to have a SANDAG-approved Bicycle Plan to be eligible for TDA/TransNet funds for individual projects.

Pedestrian Master Plans – An agency may submit an application for a pedestrian master plan no more frequently than once every five years. Jurisdictions with a population over 150,000 may submit applications for up to $150,000, and jurisdictions with a population under 150,000 may submit applications up to $100,000. In either case, the amount of the application must be substantiated by providing a scope of work and project budget to SANDAG.

Education/Safety Programs – An agency must submit a scope of work and a proposed schedule to be evaluated by SANDAG staff.

Bicycle Parking – Projects that conform to SANDAG’s Bicycle Parking Guidelines and have a projected cost up to $50,000 will be eligible.

All claims, including those supporting educational or promotional programs and claims for planning projects, must include a project budget, work program, and project schedule.
FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Application Checklist

Eligibility

☐ Community Support Documentation

☐ Meets Minimum Design Standards

☐ Regional Housing Needs Incentives
   ☐ Adopted Housing Element
   ☐ Submitted housing production information

Project Summary Sheet

☐ Project name

☐ Project type

☐ Project description

☐ Project location

☐ Summary of cost estimate and funding

☐ Project location map

☐ Contact information

☐ Approval signatures

☐ Detailed Funding Sheet

☐ Matching Fund Documentation

☐ Community Support Documentation
Capital Projects

☐ Routine Accommodation - Project is not part of a larger project which requires this type of bicycle or pedestrian facility improvement

☐ Meets Minimum Design Standards

☐ Project Readiness (Schedule)

☐ Scope of Work with deliverables

☐ GIS/Traffic Generators

☐ Map - Network Linkages/Connections

☐ Safety Improvements/Crash Data

☐ Innovation in Design

☐ Map - Regional Transit Linkage or Regional Bike Network Linkage

Plans, Studies, and Safety and Education Programs

☐ Scope of Work with deliverables

☐ Budget

☐ Schedule
### FY 2010 Bicycle Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Potential Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community Support/Consistency with Community Plan</td>
<td>Must have at least one of the following to qualify: Please attach supporting documentation. 1. Resolution or minutes from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, local planning group, or Planning Commission. Or 2. Project is part of a Bicycle Plan that has been approved within the last five years.</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Must meet the minimum geometric standards set forth in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. Design exceptions may be presented for consideration by the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group with the understanding that initial project proposals also must include a design that meets minimum standards.</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connect to Regional Transportation Corridor or Transit Linkage or Regional Bikeway Map - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Project is a part of, or connects to, a regional bikeway corridor as identified in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Project provides a direct connection to local transit stop. Project provides a direct connection to regional transit station (light rail transit, transit center).</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Bicycle Network - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Provides segment of an identified and approved bicycle facility. Completes connection in existing network or upgrades existing facility.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Project Readiness * 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Projects are eligible for points following completion of each phase.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Geographic Factors/GIS Analysis - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Factors contributing to score are proximity to population and employment, population and employment densities, and activity centers.</td>
<td>0 to 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safety Improvements - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety or accident history. A. One to two correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years B. Three to four correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years C. Five or more correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Innovation and Design - 10 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Bicycle priority measures. Dedicated bicycle signal heads, queue jumpers, bike box, colored lanes, cul-de-sac connector, bike boulevard, and bike station.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Regional Housing Needs Incentive - 50 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Score is based on the formula provided in the currently adopted Policy No. 033.</td>
<td>0 to 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Matching Funds - 25 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Matching funds can be from any of the following sources: 1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval. 2. Approved match grant. 3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation.</td>
<td>(Matching Funds) / (Project Cost) x 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cost Benefit - 15 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Subtotal Score / Grant Application Amount</td>
<td>0 to 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Previous project milestones must be met before qualifying for subsequent funding. ** Preliminary Engineering and Final Designs will be subject to design review by SANDAG.
## FY 2010 Pedestrian Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Potential Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Community Support/Consistency with Community Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must have at least one of the following to qualify. Please attach supporting documentation.</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Resolution or minutes from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, local planning group, or Planning Commission. Or 2. Project is part of a Non-Motorized Plan that has been approved within the last five years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must meet the minimum geometric standards set forth in the SANDAG Planning and Designing for Pedestrians manual and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Design exceptions may be presented for consideration by the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group with the understanding that initial project proposals also must include a design that meets minimum standards.</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Connect to Regional Transportation Corridor/Transit Linkage - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop or regional transit station.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is within 600 feet of, and provides a direct continuous connection to local transit stop.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is within 600 feet of, and provides a direct continuous connection to regional transit station.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completes or improves connection in existing pedestrian network</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Project Readiness * 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects are eligible for points following completion of each phase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering **</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Design **</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographic Factors/GIS Analysis - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factors contributing to score are proximity to population and employment, population and employment densities, and activity centers.</td>
<td>0 to 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Safety Improvements - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety or accident history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. One to two correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Three to four correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Five to six correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Innovation and Design - 10 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian priority measures such as pedestrian-controlled signals, bulb-outs, raised crosswalks, signal lead time, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Animated eye indicators, countdown pedestrian signal, accessible push-button signal, flashing crosswalk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Early pedestrian release interval, passive pedestrian detection, audible pedestrian signal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Raised crosswalk, speed table, raised intersection, pedestrian refuge island</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Pedestrian bulb-out, cul-de-sac connector</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Regional Housing Needs Incentive - 50 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score is based on the formula provided in the currently adopted Board Policy No. 033.</td>
<td>0 to 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Matching Funds 25 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matching funds can be from any of the following sources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Approved match grant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cost Benefit 15 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal Score / Grant Application Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Previous project milestones must be met before qualifying for subsequent funding.
### PROPOSED FUNDING - FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT AND TransNet BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

#### Recommended Plans, Bicycle Parking, and Support Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Application Amount</th>
<th>Recommended Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Bikeway Master Plan Update</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Bike Lockers and Racks</td>
<td>Escondido City Hall and Downtown Specific Planning Area</td>
<td>$42,934</td>
<td>$14,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Bicycle Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental Documentation and Feasibility Study for Bike Master Plan Update</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Program</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Pedestrian Master Plan Phase 4</td>
<td>San Ysidro, Midway, Old Town, Ocean Beach, College, Pacific Beach, and Kensington</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>UC San Diego Bicycle / Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>UC San Diego campus, SDS, and Hillcrest Medical Center</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG/UCSD</td>
<td>Bike Locker Wireless communication</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG/MTS</td>
<td>Bike Locker Retrofits and Upgrades</td>
<td>Sante Fe Depot/Imperial Ave/Pacific Fleet Station/8th Street/E Street/Palomar Street</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bicycle Map Printing and Distribution</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,154,378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommended Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Recommended Allocation</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Spring St Trolley Station Pedestrian Access Improvements</td>
<td>Intersection of Spring St and High St across from trolley station</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>138.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path</td>
<td>Escondido Transit Center Bridge over Creek Channel to Center City Pkwy</td>
<td>$524,100</td>
<td>134.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Ash Street Undercrossing</td>
<td>Ash Street (SR 76)</td>
<td>$457,357</td>
<td>134.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path Lighting and Restriping</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path from Broadway to Ash St</td>
<td>$157,500</td>
<td>130.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>La Mesa Blvd/EI Cajon Blvd Intersection Improvements and Pedestrian Infrastructure</td>
<td>La Mesa Blvd and El Cajon Blvd intersection</td>
<td>$361,000</td>
<td>125.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Inland Rail Trail Phase III B - Right of Way Engineering</td>
<td>Buena Creek SPRINTER Station to Meilrose Ave Station</td>
<td>$506,000</td>
<td>124.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Bicycle Detection at Signalized Intersections</td>
<td>20 locations in the City of San Diego</td>
<td>$73,500</td>
<td>123.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Safe Pedestrian Crossing at Longhor Dr</td>
<td>Longhor Dr at Promontory Ridge Way</td>
<td>$80,649</td>
<td>120.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Barham Dr Urban Trail Improvement Project</td>
<td>Twin Oaks Valley Rd to CSUSM SPRINTER Station</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>113.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Sidewalk Saftey Program - I Street Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>N. side of I Street from Hilltop Dr to First Ave</td>
<td>$116,220</td>
<td>111.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Sweetwater River Bike Path Gap Closure - Plaza Bonita Rd</td>
<td>Plaza Bonita Rd NW from Bonita Mesa Rd</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>111.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Installation of audible pedestrian signals and count-down pedestrian signals</td>
<td>21 intersections in Carlsbad</td>
<td>$150,860</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Kelton Rd Midblock Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Kelton Rd between Zircon St and Luber St</td>
<td>$248,400</td>
<td>107.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Boys and Girls Club Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>W. California Ave from Avenida de Bonita Juarez to 100 ft west of Calle Chapultepec</td>
<td>$146,844</td>
<td>104.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG/Chula Vista</td>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway Segments 7 and 8</td>
<td>Stella St to H St in Chula Vista</td>
<td>$1,078,000</td>
<td>101.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido/San Diego</td>
<td>West Bernardo Bike Path and Cantilever</td>
<td>Rancho Bernardo Community Park Dr to Lake Hodges Ped Bridge</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
<td>101.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,587,430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-Recommended Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Application Amount</th>
<th>Reason for Ineligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>San Luis Rey River Trail</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Inland Rail Trail Phase III A</td>
<td>$123,420</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Prospect Ave Sidewalks</td>
<td>$481,752</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Recommended Capital Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,215,172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ineligible Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Application Amount</th>
<th>Reason for Ineligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Kearny Villa Rd Bicycle Lane Improvements</td>
<td>$337,500</td>
<td>Routine Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Balboa Ave West</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>Incomplete Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Balboa Ave East Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Study</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>Incomplete Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>SR-56 Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Incomplete Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego River Bike Path Study</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>Incomplete Application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ineligibility Involves

- **Recommended Plans, Bicycle Parking, and Support Programs:** Projects that do not meet the criteria for funding.
- **Recommended Capital Projects:** Projects that are recommended for funding but do not meet the criteria for funding.
- **Non-Recommended Capital Projects:** Projects that are not recommended for funding.
- **Ineligible Projects:** Projects that are not eligible for funding due to various reasons.

---

**Attachment 6**
RESOLUTION
NO. 2009-30

APPROVING THE ALLOCATION OF
FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims listed below were submitted for the 2010 TDA funds pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 3, Section 99234 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 29532 of the California Government Code (CGC), SANDAG has analyzed these claims and determined that it conforms substantially to the provisions of the Transportation Development Act of 1971, as amended; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG finds this claim for FY 2010 to be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the SANDAG Board of Directors as follows:

1. That the Board, pursuant to CGC 29532 and PUC 99234, does hereby approve the allocation of TDA funds for the following project in the amounts specified below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10011000</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>$150,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011001</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011002</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011003</td>
<td>Escondido (W. Bernardo)</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011004</td>
<td>Escondido (Bike Racks)</td>
<td>$14,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011005</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011006</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011007</td>
<td>San Diego (Kelton Road)</td>
<td>$248,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011008</td>
<td>San Diego (Environ. Doc for Master Plan)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011009</td>
<td>San Diego (Safety Education)</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011010</td>
<td>San Diego (Pedestrian Master Ph. 4)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011011</td>
<td>San Diego/UCSD (Bike-Ped Master Plan)</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011012</td>
<td>SANDAG (Bike Locker Wireless)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011013</td>
<td>SANDAG (Bike Locker Retrofit)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011014</td>
<td>SANDAG (Bike Map)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,978,438</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. That the Board does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit allocation instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for payment of these claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of June 2009.

______________________________  ________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   ATTEST:

______________________________  ________________________________
SECRETARY                     SECRETARY

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.
ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and Mexico.
## Proposed FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA - Article 3</th>
<th>FY 2010 Apportionment</th>
<th>2,174,095</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDA Reserves</td>
<td>812,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TDA Funding Available for FY 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,986,423</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>FY 2010 Apportionment</td>
<td>4,686,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TransNet Reserves</td>
<td>96,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TransNet Funding Available for FY 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,782,850</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FY 2010 Funds Available to Allocate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7,769,273</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Finance Department
FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ALLOCATIONS

Introduction

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides one-quarter percent of the state sales tax for operating and capital support of public transportation systems and non-motorized transportation projects. SANDAG, as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), is responsible for the allocation of TDA funds to the region’s cities, the County of San Diego, and transit operators.

At its February 27, 2009, meeting, the Board of Directors adopted the San Diego County Auditor’s estimate of $112,662,000 for the region’s FY 2010 TDA apportionment. This report presents the allocation requests for Article 4, Article 4.5, Article 8, and Planning and Administration claims. The Article 3 claim is included in Agenda Item No. 13A, “FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Funding Recommendations.”

The TDA allocations are authorized under four separate articles of the law. Article 3 funds are designated for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Article 4 funds are used to provide general public transit services. Article 4.5 funds are designated for community transit services, and pursuant to SANDAG Board Policy No. 027, “Transportation Development Act,” are allocated within the San Diego region to support paratransit services required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Article 8 funds support specialized services such as express bus and ferry services. Claims under each category are discussed below. A summary of the FY 2010 claims by the different articles and Planning and Administration is shown in Attachment 1.

Discussion

Article 3: Non-motorized Claims (Bicycle and Pedestrian)

A separate report of this claim is included in Agenda Item No. 13A.

Recommendations for Productivity Improvements of Operators

Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code (CPUC) Section 99244, an operator can be allocated no more in the upcoming fiscal year (FY 2010) than it was allocated in the current fiscal year (FY 2009) unless SANDAG determines that the operator made a reasonable effort to implement the
productivity improvement recommendations adopted by the Board of Directors for the current fiscal year (FY 2009). At the May 22, 2009, meeting, (Agenda Item No. 5) the Board of Directors made a determination that both the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvements outlined for FY 2009 and approved continuation of the same program for FY 2010, thus fulfilling the requirements under this provision.

Transit Claims

Article 4: General Public (Fixed Transit Route)

The Article 4 claims of MTS and NCTD comprise the largest portion of the TDA claim. These funds provide support for fixed route and help augment Paratransit services. The combined MTS and NCTD Article 4 claims total $105,453,664 and include transfers to SANDAG for capital, planning, and administrative purposes.

MTS Service Area ($71,278,791)

The total MTS Article 4.0 claim for operators in its service area includes $50,835,683 in operating support for rail, fixed route bus, and Paratransit services; and $17,585,883 in capital support. Added to these amounts are fund transfers to SANDAG for local match to federally funded capital projects that SANDAG will implement on behalf of MTS ($762,703) and for administrative and planning purposes ($2,094,522).

Based on MTS projections, the MTS area operators (San Diego Trolley, Inc., San Diego Transit Corporation, and MTS Contract Services, including both fixed route and rail services) anticipate a slight increase in ridership and a reduction in revenue miles. They are projected to carry approximately 91.6 million passengers over 26.7 million annual miles in FY 2010, an increase of 0.2 percent in passengers and a decrease of 2.2 percent in miles from FY 2009 estimates.

The MTS overall budget for fixed route and rail services reflects a 1.3 percent reduction in cost (from FY 2009 estimates), mainly due to anticipated reduction in cost for fuel and materials.

NCTD Service Area ($34,174,873)

The total NCTD Article 4.0 claim includes $32,484,850 in operating support for bus, rail, and Paratransit services; and $1,194,953 in capital support. Added to these amounts are fund transfers to SANDAG for administrative and planning purposes ($495,070).

The fixed route and rail services are projected to carry nearly 12.4 million passengers over 6.4 million revenue miles, both of which are a slight reduction from estimated FY 2009 figures (-0.8 percent and -1.8 percent, respectively). NCTD plans to initiate a Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) for the entire system that will help identify strategies for more efficient operation overall.

The NCTD operating budget reflects a 3 percent increase in costs (from FY 2009 estimates), due to anticipated increases in fuel costs. MTS and NCTD use different assumptions regarding future fuel costs. The NCTD analysis includes the review of its contract for Compressed Natural Gas (CNG), which expires in November, and based on available data, the cost is expected to rise. Additionally, NCTD conducted an analysis of future costs of fuel based on the Energy Information
Administration data and budgeted a conservative estimate of per gallon cost from $2.30 per gallon to $3.00 per gallon. However, given the volatility in fuel cost, either a slight decrease in cost (as in the case of MTS) or increase (as in the case of NCTD) seem reasonable for budgeting purposes.

**Article 4.5: Community Transit Service (Accessible Service for the Disabled)**

Article 4.5 funds are allocated in the San Diego region to support demand response transit services required by the ADA. Board Policy No. 027 requires that funds be distributed between the two transit agencies in the region based upon service area population, after allocating 2 percent of these funds to the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA). ADA operations for MTS and NCTD also are supported by 2.5 percent of the annual transit revenues in the TransNet program.

**MTS Service Area ($3,696,972)**

This claim provides operating support for the accessible Paratransit services in the MTS service area, including Access and ADA Suburban services. Other operating support comes from passenger fares and the TransNet program. Since ADA-mandated complementary Paratransit service is limited to those who cannot use regular fixed route service, customers must be certified as eligible users of this service. The ridership for this service is expected to decline 11.0 percent to 661,497 total passengers for the year, while miles served is expected to increase slightly by 0.3 percent to 3.8 million miles from the FY 2009 estimates. The reduction in passengers is due mainly to the reduction of service of the Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection. Meanwhile, the revenue miles remain steady as these are based on the anticipated passengers using the demand response service.

**NCTD Service Area ($1,525,136)**

This claim includes $1,512,034 for operating support, with an additional $13,102 for capital support. NCTD anticipates carrying 124,691 passengers on 1.2 million revenue miles, a 32.5 percent increase in ridership and a 7.0 percent increase in revenue miles from FY 2009 estimates. NCTD eliminated FAST, the general service dial-a-ride, which led to double digit increases in requests for LIFT, the ADA-required service. Since NCTD has a zero denial policy, both ridership and miles increased significantly, and this increase is projected to continue into next fiscal year. It is anticipated that the COA would provide strategies to reign in the cost and achieve efficiencies for this service.

**CTSA ($106,574)**

The CTSA is eligible for up to 2 percent of the region’s Article 4.5 funds. The CTSA was created under state law that allows for the formation of a regional agency to coordinate social service agency transportation programs. In the San Diego Region, FACT (Full Access for Coordinated Transportation) serves as the CTSA. The FACT mission is to expand the availability and economic utilization of specialized transportation services for seniors and disabled individuals. In its capacity as the CTSA, FACT serves as a conduit of information and assists the nonprofit sector with the coordination of specialized transportation programs and improving the management of these programs by providing free training and technical assistance.

State law allows for the formation of CTSA to improve transportation service required by social service recipients by promoting consolidation of social service transportation incorporating such benefits as centralized dispatching, combined purchasing of necessary equipment and supplies, centralized maintenance, centralized administration to eliminate duplicative administrative tasks,
and consolidation of existing sources of funding. This consolidation is intended to result in more efficient and effective use of vehicles throughout the region. The FY 2010 FACT CTSA Work Plan is included in Attachment 2.

**Article 8: Special Provisions (Express Bus and Ferry)**

**MTS ($366,758)**

This claim provides operating support for express bus ($214,747) and ferry services ($152,011). The express bus service has undergone significant changes, including service reductions and elimination of one route. Premium express commuter service includes: Interstate 15 (I-15) to downtown San Diego from the Cities of Poway and Escondido and from the communities of Rancho Bernardo/Carmel Mountain Ranch and Rancho Peñasquitos (Routes 810, 820, 850, and 860); and Mira Mesa and Sorrento Valley from the communities of 4S Ranch and Rancho Bernardo (Route 880). The City of Coronado operates passenger ferry service by subsidizing trips to and from downtown San Diego to Coronado and North Island.

**Administration and Planning**

**SANDAG ($3,685,758)**

The TDA law (CPUC 99233.2) also allows SANDAG, as the RTPA, up to 3 percent of annual revenues to conduct regional transportation planning ($3,362,002) to carry out the efforts identified in the FY 2010 Overall Work Program (budget approved by the Board of Directors at its May 22, 2009, meeting). Of this amount, SANDAG is setting aside $228,509 in reserve. As a result, the total claim for planning is $3,133,492. Additionally, a claim of $552,266 will be made for the administration of the TDA program (CPUC 99233.1). This year the administrative cost will, among other things, fund the required triennial performance audit of the transit agencies and SANDAG.

**County of San Diego Auditor Office ($43,000)**

The TDA law (CPUC 99233.1) allows the County Auditor to charge for costs related to the administration of the TDA program. The County Auditor is claiming $43,000 in FY 2010.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Transportation Development Act FY 2010 Claims Summary  
2. FACT CTSA Work Plan for FY 2009–2010  
3. Resolution Nos. 2009-31 to 2009-34

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909; ski@sandag.org

No Budget Impact
## TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT
### FY 2010 CLAIMS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan Transit System</th>
<th>North County Transit District</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>Consolidated Transportation Services Agency</th>
<th>Bicycle and Pedestrian*</th>
<th>County Auditor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010 Apportionment</td>
<td>$75,342,521</td>
<td>$31,081,543</td>
<td>$3,914,267</td>
<td>$106,574</td>
<td>$2,174,095</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$112,662,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Carryover</td>
<td>4,618,466</td>
<td>3,240,008</td>
<td>13,588</td>
<td>7,872,062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available to Claim</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,342,521</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,700,009</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,154,275</strong></td>
<td><strong>120,162</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,174,095</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>120,534,062</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FY 2010 Claims

### Article 3 - Non-Motorized (Bicycle and Pedestrian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan Transit System</th>
<th>North County Transit District</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>Consolidated Transportation Services Agency</th>
<th>Bicycle and Pedestrian*</th>
<th>County Auditor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>(50,835,683)</td>
<td>(32,484,850)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>(17,585,883)</td>
<td>(1,194,953)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Transfer to SANDAG</td>
<td>(762,703)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Planning Transfer to SANDAG</td>
<td>(2,094,522)</td>
<td>(495,070)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Article 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>(71,278,791)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(34,174,873)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Article 4.5 - Community Transit Service (accessible service for the disabled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan Transit System</th>
<th>North County Transit District</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>Consolidated Transportation Services Agency</th>
<th>Bicycle and Pedestrian*</th>
<th>County Auditor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3,696,972)</td>
<td>(1,525,136)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Article 8 - Special Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan Transit System</th>
<th>North County Transit District</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>Consolidated Transportation Services Agency</th>
<th>Bicycle and Pedestrian*</th>
<th>County Auditor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Express Bus</td>
<td>(214,747)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Service</td>
<td>(152,011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Article 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>(366,758)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning/Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan Transit System</th>
<th>North County Transit District</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>Consolidated Transportation Services Agency</th>
<th>Bicycle and Pedestrian*</th>
<th>County Auditor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>(552,266)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG Regional Planning</td>
<td>(3,133,492)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Planning/Administration</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3,685,758)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan Transit System</th>
<th>North County Transit District</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>Consolidated Transportation Services Agency</th>
<th>Bicycle and Pedestrian*</th>
<th>County Auditor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,468,517</td>
<td>$13,588</td>
<td>$2,174,095</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,656,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Allocation recommendation for the bike program is included as part of Agenda Item No. 13A.*
As defined in the Social Services Transportation Improvement Act (Assembly Bill 120), the Consolidated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA) is a public entity responsible for improving transportation services required by social service recipients by promoting the consolidation and coordination of social service transportation services. The benefits of CTSA activities include being the regional broker of social service transportation information, centralized administration and dispatching, identification and consolidation of funding sources, coordinated and consolidated training programs, and combined purchasing of vehicles, supplies, and equipment. The CTSA works to create dedicated transportation services for people with disabilities, senior citizens, social service agencies, health care providers, various organizations, and individuals within that particular service area. The CTSA also is the planning representative of the social service transportation community and works with the region to develop updates to the Coordinated Plan.

Areas of Focus

STRIDE and Full Access & Coordinated Transportation, Inc. (FACT) Web site

- Utilizing funds from the New Freedom program:
  - Update content of the STRIDE Web site to ensure accurate data entry;
  - Add agencies to STRIDE that are identified;
  - Add agencies to STRIDE identified during the Coordinated Plan update in 2009/2010;
  - Update agency information on the STRIDE Web site;
  - Upgrade and update the FACT Web site as a marketing tool that also promotes STRIDE; and
  - Create consistency between the Web sites to promote understanding of FACT being the CTSA.

- Respond to all requests from the public for information on transportation for seniors, people with disabilities, and other transportation disadvantaged individuals utilizing the STRIDE Web site and other available resources.

Council on Access and Mobility

- Conduct Council on Access and Mobility (CAM) meetings quarterly.

- Coordinate training and workshop opportunities for human service transportation providers in such areas as federal and state funding requirements (e.g. 5310), driver training, vehicle inspection, insurance, Regional Emergency Preparedness Requirements, state and federal regulations, safety, funding opportunities, coordination, vehicle acquisition, and other CTSA-related topics, quarterly.

- Initiate coordinated programs in areas of training (e.g. insurance, maintenance, vehicle inspections) that are pertinent based on interest/commitments of involvement from CAM members.

- Represent CAM during level three or higher emergencies in the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and coordinate disaster response as needed.
• Coordinate information provision and involvement of CAM members with the County EOC to ensure effective preparedness planning and to compliance with new state and federal requirements.

CTSA

• Work with SANDAG and the community to develop the locally developed Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan.

• Provide ongoing technical assistance and support to human service transportation providers and all other interested parties to find solutions to overcome identified barriers to coordination, consolidation, and collaboration.

• Coordinate and conduct surveys, and assessments, both formal and informal, to determine stakeholder transportation needs vehicle and other relevant resources and barriers to coordination.

• Provide education and technical assistance to community organizations for federal, state, and local funding opportunities.

• Maintain library of best practices and other documents related to coordination and consolidation of human service transportation.

• Disseminate quarterly CTSA FACT Newsletter to ensure ongoing awareness of current related events.

• Participate in Triennial FTA and TDA Audits.

• Make presentations to stakeholder groups.

• Evaluate programs to regionwide to implement New Freedom and Senior Mini-Grant Programs (i.e. Modular pilot development that can merge long term into an aggregated coordinated mobility management program).

Coordination and Consolidation (New Freedom 2007 and 2008 Implementation)

• Develop and document a 5-year business and recovery plan for FACT covering the following areas: governance, integration of current CTSA work activities, technical assistance and coordination planning, information and marketing initiatives, service contracting and operations programs, policy development and advocacy, trip demand estimation and utilization projections, and funding and financial projections:
  o Allow SANDAG to comment on the draft plan prior to submitting the final version; and
  o This Business and Recovery Plan becomes the Operational Road Map for FACT implementation of New Freedom 2007, 2008, and Senior Mini-Grant Programs.

• Develop a coordinated system of transportation service options for the disabled community:
  o Implement a regional mobility management call center for transportation information and ride scheduling; and
  o Serve as liaison between public transportation providers and human service agencies.

• Build a base of cooperation and coordination between constituencies, including public transportation providers, human service agencies, and other community-based organizations and agencies:
• Provide technical assistance, information, and education programs to transportation providers; and

• Develop a regional training program for human service agencies and clients and consumers in partnership with public transit operators.

• Expand FACT staff capacity to support coordination transportation programs:

  o Potentially, recruit, hire, train five (5) new positions: administrative/financial support, technical/planning support, marketing information and intergovernmental support, IT support and service operations support;
  
  o Hire eight (8) contractors to conduct business plan development, operations/contract support, IT support, financial consultant, grant writing services, marketing, governmental liaison, and ride scheduling; and
  
  o Form a Community Implementation Work Group and/or other advisory groups, consisting of representatives from community organizations that either provide transportation and/or subsidize transportation, and transportation consumers.

• Create a program to reimburse transportation providers with excess capacity for providing rides for FACT clients:

  o Create a prequalified pool of private operators that can be used to provide specialized trips; and
  
  o Increase number of signed Community Partnership Agreements that include an operating component.

• Market Regional Mobility Management Center through press releases, pamphlets, brochures, e-mail, newsletters, special informational pieces, newspaper articles, special events, workshops, and community training sessions.

• Participate in regional disaster preparedness planning.

Administration

• Coordinate Annual Strategic Planning for FACT/CTSA.

• Maintain an inventory of resources in San Diego County.

• Maintain the CTSA Mailing List.

• Complete all required reports.

• Maintain memberships in state and national organizations committed to coordinated transportation and nonprofit corporation development:

  o Community Transportation Association of America (CTAA);
  
  o California Association for Coordinated Transportation (Cal-Act); and
  
  o Non Profit Management Solutions (NPMS).

All TDA 4.5 funding for the FY 2010 will be used as matching funds for the FACT New Freedom grant funding for core CTSA activities. All activities of the CTSA will be included in the development of the Regional Mobility Management Center.
RESOLUTION NO. 2009-31

APPROVING THE ALLOCATION OF
FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
ARTICLE 4 FIXED ROUTE GENERAL PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claimants listed below have submitted claims for FY 2010 TDA funds pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 4, of the California Public Utilities Code (CPUC); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 29532 of the California Government Code (CGC), the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has analyzed the claims and determined that the claims conform substantially to the provisions of the Transportation Development Act of 1971, as amended; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to CPUC Section 99244, SANDAG is required to annually identify, analyze, and recommend potential productivity improvements for the transit operators; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG finds these claims for FY 2010 to be in conformance with the Regional Transportation Plan; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the SANDAG Board of Directors as follows:

1. That the Board of Directors, pursuant to CPUC Section 99244, finds that the claimants listed below have made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvement recommendations for FY 2009;

2. That the Board of Directors adopted the FY 2010 Productivity Improvement Goals set forth in Agenda Report No. 5 at the May 22, 2009, meeting;

3. That the Board of Directors, pursuant to CGC 29532, does hereby approve the allocation of TDA funds to the following claimants for purposes listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10031000</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$50,835,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$17,585,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$68,421,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10041000</td>
<td>North County Transit District (NCTD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$32,484,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,194,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$33,679,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Capital Transfer from MTS</td>
<td>$762,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10031004</td>
<td>Admin/Planning Transfer from MTS</td>
<td>$2,094,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10041002</td>
<td>Admin/Planning Transfer from NCTD</td>
<td>$495,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,352,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. That the Board of Directors does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit allocation instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for payment of these claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of June 2009.
RESOLUTION NO. 2009-32

APPROVING THE ALLOCATION OF
FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
ARTICLE 4.5 COMMUNITY TRANSIT SERVICE

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claimants listed below have submitted claims for FY 2010 TDA funds pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 4.5, of the California Public Utilities Code (CPUC); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 29532 of the California Government Code (CGC), the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has analyzed the claims and determined that the claims conform substantially to the provisions of the Transportation Development Act of 1971, as amended, including the provision of CPUC 99275.5; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG finds these claims for FY 2010 to be in conformance with the Regional Transportation Plan; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the SANDAG Board of Directors as follows:

1. That the Board of Directors, pursuant to CGC 29532, does hereby approve the allocation of TDA funds to the following claimants for purposes listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10031001</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>Total $3,696,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10041001</td>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>$1,512,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$13,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Total $1,525,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10061000</td>
<td>Consolidated Transportation Services Agency</td>
<td>Total $106,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. That the Board of Directors does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit allocation instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for payment of these claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of June 2009.
RESOLUTION NO. 2009-33

APPROVING THE ALLOCATION OF
FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
ARTICLE 8 SPECIAL PROVISIONS

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claimant listed below has submitted claims for FY 2010 TDA funds pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 8, of the California Public Utilities Code (CPUC); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 29532 of the California Government Code (CGC), the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has analyzed the claims and determined that the claims conform substantially to the provisions of the Transportation Development Act of 1971, as amended; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG finds these claims for FY 2010 to be in conformance with the Regional Transportation Plan; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the SANDAG Board of Directors as follows:

1. That the Board of Directors, pursuant to CGC 29532, does hereby approve the allocation of TDA funds for costs associated with the operation of express bus services (CPUC 99400.6), and the operation of commuter ferry service (CPUC 99400.7) as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10031002</td>
<td>Operating for Express Bus Service</td>
<td>$214,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10031003</td>
<td>Operating for Ferry Service</td>
<td>$152,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$366,758</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. That MTS is directed to pass-through to the Coronado Ferry its appropriate share of TDA funding; and

3. That the Board of Directors does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit allocation instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for payment of these claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of June 2009.

________________________________________           ATTEST: ________________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

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

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and Mexico.
RESOLUTION NO. 2009-34

APPROVING THE ALLOCATION OF
FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claimants listed below have submitted claims for FY 2010 TDA funds pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 3, of the California Public Utilities Code (CPUC); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 29532 of the California Government Code (CGC), the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has determined that the claims are eligible pursuant to the provisions of the Transportation Development Act of 1971, as amended;

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the SANDAG Board of Directors as follows:

1. Pursuant to CGC 29532, the Board of Directors does hereby approve the allocation of TDA funds to the following claimants for purposes listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10021000</td>
<td>County Auditor</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10051000</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$552,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10051001</td>
<td>Regional Planning</td>
<td>$3,133,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,685,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. That the Board of Directors does further approve the retention in the Local Transportation Fund of $3,468,516 for future SANDAG regional planning purposes pursuant to Section 6655.1 of Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations; and

3. That the Board of Directors does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit allocation instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for payment of these claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of June 2009.

________________________  ________________________
CHAIRPERSON               ATTEST:    SECRETARY

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

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and Mexico.
TRANSIT IMPEDIMENTS STUDY

Introduction

In November 2007, the Board of Directors certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and approved the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Shortly thereafter, SANDAG and several interested parties entered into a settlement agreement that identified studies to be completed by SANDAG in preparation for the 2050 RTP (Settlement Agreement). A study regarding impediments to public transit is one element of the settlement agreement.

At its April 24, 2009, meeting, the Board of Directors was given an overview of the Transit Impediments Study. The Board accepted the study for public distribution and referred it to the Transportation Committee for review of the alternatives identified in the report. The Transportation Committee discussed the alternatives at its June 19, 2009, meeting. Input from the Transportation Committee, along with any public comments received, will be discussed at the Board meeting.

Discussion

Background

As stipulated in the Settlement Agreement, the Transit Impediments Study includes a discussion of: (1) all known and reasonably foreseeable financial impediments to maintaining long-term transit service levels throughout San Diego County; (2) all known and reasonably foreseeable impediments to maintaining long-term public transit ridership throughout San Diego County; and (3) all known and reasonably foreseeable recurring sources (i.e., not one-time sources) that provide, or can provide, funding to cover for operational expenses for public transit throughout San Diego County. As set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the discussion of each transit impediment included in the report should be considered as a set of possible alternatives that SANDAG could implement in order to overcome impediments identified in the report, increase and maintain service levels, and increase and maintain funding for operational expenses to the fullest extent possible. The Settlement Agreement calls for the Board to consider implementation of the alternatives in the study within 60 days after issuance of the final report.
Study Alternatives

The key elements of the draft Transit Impediments Study report (Attachment 1) were highlighted at the April 24, 2009, Board of Directors meeting. Since then, staff has provided additional information on the possible new funding sources at the regional and local level that are outlined in Section 5 of the report. Attachment 2 provides further details on these alternatives relative to potential funds generated, implementation authority, approval requirements, geographic applicability, and ease of administration. Attachment 2 is intended to provide a preliminary outline of possible funding sources rather than an exhaustive analysis of the limitations and implementation steps associated with each funding type. Should the Board express an interest in pursuing one or more of the funding opportunities, staff could utilize in-house and external resources to conduct more extensive research. Staff could then return to the Board with additional, more detailed information.

Further study of these alternatives also will be made as part of the proposed Quality of Life initiative and development of the 2050 RTP.

Public Comments

Staff will update the Board of Directors on any comments received.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Draft Transit Impediments Study Report
2. Summary of Potential Regional and Local Revenue Sources for Transit Operations

Key Staff Contacts: Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906, dsc@sandag.org
José Nuncio, (619) 699-1908, jnu@sandag.org
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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

In November 2007, the SANDAG Board of Directors certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and approved the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Shortly thereafter, SANDAG and several interested parties entered into a settlement agreement that identified studies to be completed by SANDAG in preparation for the 2050 RTP.

Transit Impediments Study Contents

The study regarding impediments to public transit is one element of the 2030 RTP Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement”). The purpose of the study is to identify and analyze:

i. All known and reasonably foreseeable financial impediments to maintaining long-term transit service levels throughout San Diego County

ii. All known and reasonably foreseeable impediments to maintaining long-term public transit ridership throughout San Diego County

iii. All known and reasonably foreseeable recurring sources (i.e., not one-time sources) that provide, or can provide, funding to cover funding for operational expenses for public transit throughout San Diego County

Each of these topics is addressed in the report. The study describes both the financial and ridership factors that inhibit greater use of public transit, and includes alternatives that will be considered by the SANDAG Board of Directors after receiving public input. Alternatives were developed through the analysis of both existing and potential funding sources, while ridership alternatives were developed around opportunities stemming from recent survey data and planning activities associated with the SANDAG Coordinated Plan 2008–2012.

Processing Requirements and Study Review

This report was completed and posted on the SANDAG Web site within 12 months after the execution of the Settlement Agreement, signed by all parties on April 30, 2008. Per the Settlement Agreement, the SANDAG Board of Directors shall consider implementation of the alternatives at a public meeting to be held not more than 60 days after issuance of this report.

Identification of Transit Funding Needs

The determination of transit funding needs for operations and maintenance is an important first step in evaluating the financial impediments to maintaining long-term transit service levels in San Diego County. Significant changes have been made to the region’s transit systems in recent years that have resulted in improved system cost-effectiveness and service levels in the urban core areas that have strong transit-supportive land uses. However, these improvements also have added costs. The 2030 RTP calls for a major investment of $7 billion for the region’s existing transit system,
representing 42 percent of the $17 billion in funds dedicated to transit projects and services in the 2030 RTP. Much of this increase would be invested in existing bus and rail services in key travel corridors in order to provide 15-minute or better all-day service and to provide ongoing transit capital maintenance and rehabilitation needs.

Although funds are set aside for ongoing transit operations and maintenance, there is not enough money to meet the growing need. The region’s voters have approved TransNet, a sales tax measure devoted to transportation, which includes funds for maintenance and operations of the existing transit system, however, these funds alone cannot keep pace with demand. Furthermore, state funds normally used for transit operations and maintenance such as the State Transit Assistance (STA) program recently have been diverted to fund other state programs.
The lack of adequate dedicated and predictable sources of revenue for operations and maintenance is not the only major obstacle to expanding transit ridership; in recent years it has become a significant problem with each annual budget just to maintain existing transit operations. Among the dozens of local, state, and federal programs that target funding for various aspects of transportation, most are set aside for capital, many for only highway capital and operations, and only a few provide funding for transit operations. Compounding this problem are the increased costs and declining revenue now facing the transit agencies.

**Background**

A general overview is provided here of the relationship between transit costs and revenues, while a detailed description of federal, state, and local recurring funding sources is included in the following discussion. The graph in Exhibit 1 below tracks transit fixed-route operating costs (including administration and overhead) for the San Diego region from FY 1998 through FY 2007 and compares those costs to the Transportation Development Act Funds (TDA) and TransNet transit operations funds received in the region during the same period.

**Exhibit 1**

Transit Operating Revenues VS Costs and Service Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Operating Costs</th>
<th>TDA Revenues</th>
<th>TransNet Revenues for Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This exhibit shows that these two sales tax-based revenue sources have failed to keep pace with the costs of transit operations, and largely as a result of external factors (such as fuel and insurance) costs continued to climb even as the service provided, in terms of revenue miles, remained almost unchanged. According to the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) TDA Article 4.0 claims, the cost of operating fixed-route services, including administrative costs, grew by nearly $107 million during the ten-year period from $153.7 million in FY 1998 to $260.4 million in FY 2007. Over this same time period, TDA, the largest single subsidy source for transit operations grew by approximately $59 million, or approximately 89 percent. In June 2003, the SANDAG Board of Directors amended the TransNet Ordinance to increase the allowable share of TransNet transit funds for operations from 20 percent to 40 percent. Exhibit 1 shows the increase in available TransNet funds for operations beginning in FY 2004. During this time period and due in part to the TransNet Ordinance amendment, the TransNet revenues available for operations grew from about $9.6 million in 1998 to about $32.6 million in 2007. However, an annual gap of $16 million remained in the transit operating budgets to be filled by other revenue sources, including fares and diversion of capital funds.

Exhibit 2 shows the cost components of fixed-route operations. The transit agencies have attempted to control costs, but due to external events the agencies have limited control over many cost categories. As would be expected, labor is by far the largest component of those costs, accounting for approximately 48 percent of the operational costs. While it is a significant component of the costs, the relative proportion has decreased from 1998, when it accounted for more than 58 percent of the cost. On the other hand, components such as fuel and other energy, purchased transportation, and liability have increased from approximately 42 percent to 52 percent of the total.
The graphic in Exhibit 3 shows the relative make up of the revenues used for funding the two transit agencies’ operations over the same 10-year period.

Exhibit 3

Regional Fixed Route Operating Revenues
FY98-FY07

In the early years depicted in this graphic, in excess of 45 percent of the costs of operations were paid through the farebox, among the highest in the transit industry. As costs increased over time, the regional farebox recovery ratio could not be sustained, falling to 35 percent in FY 2007. This situation was one of the main reasons MTS conducted a Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) in order to gain more riders and cut non-performing services. NCTD is preparing to undertake a similar operations analysis. In addition, MTS has consolidated transit operators and contracts, which has achieved considerable cost savings. As a result of these efforts, the MTS average farebox recovery increased to 42 percent as of December 2008.

For the most part TDA grew as a percentage of the total budget through FY 2001, but started declining in FY 2002. It became necessary for the transit agencies to assemble funding plans that included, most notably, diverting an increasing amount of federal funds normally used for capital replacement to operations. In 1998 the transit agencies used approximately $12 million (36%) of their $33 million combined federal formula apportionments for operations. In 2007 the transit agencies reported using nearly $37 million in federal funds for operations. Their combined apportionment totaled $63 million, meaning that 52 percent of these federal apportionments were used for operations. This resulted in the deferral of capital replacement. (It should be noted that the federal funds identified above as used for operations could have included minor amounts of discretionary funds from the federal Department of Homeland Security or from the Federal Transit Administration Jobs Access and Reverse Commute programs, which make the total federal contribution in FY 2007 slightly greater than referenced here.)
Exhibit 2 does not fully show how complicated the funding picture is for transit agencies. Year to year, the transit boards come up with new combinations of revenues and constantly monitor system productivity to balance their budgets. More recently, FY 2008 sales tax revenues actually have declined due to the economic downturn. TransNet receipts declined by 1.4 percent and TDA went down 1.42 percent. FY 2009 appears to be even more challenging as TransNet revenues are projected to decline 4 percent for the year, and TDA apportionments have been reduced 4.96 percent. These declines are coming in a period of serious economic decline for most segments of the economy throughout the country, and so transit is experiencing effects similar to other industries.

MTS and NCTD have both taken proactive steps during the FY 1998–FY 2007 period to enhance productivity. NCTD completed its “Fast Forward” effort that looked at the system in place and revamped it to provide greater quality and more cost-effective service. More recently, MTS undertook its COA with an eye on the same goals. Both of these agencies believed that they had achieved systems that could be sustained with known revenues at that time. The recent trends described above continue to raise the concern of potentially deferring capital replacement needs in the future, which could affect operating costs as the agencies deal with more equipment and vehicle needs.

Recurring Funding Sources

The analysis of recurring funding sources includes all known and reasonably foreseeable sources that provide or can provide funding to cover operational expenses for public transit throughout San Diego County. This includes local, state, and federal sources of recurring funding:

- TransNet
- State Transit Assistance (STA)
- Transportation Development Act (TDA)
- FTA Section 5307 Urban Area Formula Funds
- FTA Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization
- FTA Section 5310 Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities
- FTA Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Formula Funds
- FTA Section 5316 Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC)
- FTA Section 5317 New Freedom

TransNet

Since 1988, TransNet, the half-cent sales tax for local transportation projects, has been instrumental in expanding the transportation system, reducing traffic congestion, and advancing critical transit projects. In November 2004, 67 percent of the county’s voters approved a 40-year extension of TransNet, which is expected to generate an additional $14 billion for public transit, highway, and local street and road improvements.
After off-the-top deduction of commitments for certain oversight, administration, and bicycle/pedestrian programs, 16.5 percent of the annual TransNet revenues are to be used for transit purposes, either capital or operating, with 94.25 percent of the 16.5 percent allocated by population to the transit operators. Also, 2.5 percent of the 16.5 percent goes to the transit agencies to aid in complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and 3.25 percent of the 16.5 percent is reserved for a competitive program to provide transportation services for seniors.

In addition, 8.1 percent of annual TransNet revenues (after off-the-top deductions) are set aside for operating costs of specific new services developed with capital investment from the TransNet Major Corridors program.

Increases in the annual apportionments to the transit agencies are subject to limitations on cost increases in cost per revenue vehicle hour and revenue vehicle mile as compared to the Consumer Price Index for San Diego County. The 8.1 percent is limited to the new services specifically identified in the TransNet Expenditure Plan.

Issues That Impede the Use of These Funds to Sustain Operations

The 2004 TransNet Extension measure attempts to help resolve the problem with finding monies to operate expanded transit service. The difficulty lies in projecting the costs over a 40-year period. It is necessary that growth of the TransNet sales tax keep up with inflation to ensure that the new service is operated through the end of the measure. Moreover, since many of the new services are still being developed, the funds will be spent on an as-needed basis, leading to unspent balances until the new services go into operation.

State Transit Assistance

In February 2009, the State Transit Assistance (STA) program (Senate Bill [SB] 620, as amended) was suspended through FY 2013 by the state. Previously, this program was the only ongoing source of state funding for day-to-day transit operations. For MTS and NCTD, this means the elimination of more than $20 million in funding for transit operations in the most recent budget year. In the past, the STA program was derived from the Public Transportation Account (PTA) and provided a source of operating and capital funding for transit operators. The PTA was funded primarily from sales tax on gasoline and diesel.

Beginning with FY 2008–2009, SB 717 (Chapter 733, Statutes of 2007) continuously authorized the transfers of sales tax revenue derived from the sale of motor vehicle fuels to the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF) to be distributed as follows: 20 percent to the Public Transportation Account, 40 percent to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and 40 percent to cities and counties for road maintenance and construction. This codified the Proposition 42 funding formula into law.

Within STA, 25 percent is allocated for transit capital (also part of the STIP) projects, 37.5 percent is allocated to regional transit entities according to a population formula, and the remaining 37.5 percent is allocated to regional entities to be allocated in turn to individual operators proportionately based on a revenue formula. STA funds may be used for operations provided that the transit agency’s costs do not increase at a greater rate than the Consumer Price Index (with exceptions for extraordinary costs such as fuel and liability insurance).
The State Controller is required to issue estimates of STA funds to be allocated to each regional entity by January 10 of each year. As the successor agency to the Metropolitan Transit Development Board, MTS retained its predecessor’s status within the TDA as a transportation planning agency and therefore receives its allocation directly from the State without SANDAG approval. However, holding no such legislative designation, NCTD receives its population and revenue formula-based share through SANDAG.

Issues That Impede the Use of These Funds to Sustain Operations

It is unclear whether or not this funding source will reemerge in the future. While it has been completely eliminated for the time being, this funding source was very susceptible to raids by the Legislature and the Governor in the past. Proposition 42 (2002) and Proposition 1A (2008) were both voter-approved initiatives which placed limitations on using these funds to supplement the state general fund. However, neither measure addressed what has been called the Spillover Account, which in simple terms, is the amount of sales tax that is attributable to spikes in fuel prices over and above increases in the prices of other commodities. Beginning with the FY 2008 budget year, the Governor’s budget included the cost of home school transportation and the debt service on previously sold transportation revenue bonds as “mass transportation” costs, and the courts have upheld this interpretation.

Transportation Development Act

The Mills-Alquist-Deddeh Act (SB 325) was enacted by the California Legislature to improve existing public transportation services and encourage regional transportation coordination. Known as the Transportation Development Act of 1971, this law provides funding to be allocated to transit and non-transit related purposes that comply with regional transportation plans. The TDA provides two funding sources including the STA described previously and the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), which is derived from a quarter cent of the general sales tax collected statewide. The State Board of Equalization, based on sales tax collected in each county, returns the general sales tax revenues to each county’s LTF.

TDA comprises the largest source of subsidy for the San Diego region’s transit operators. TDA funds may be used for a wide variety of transportation programs, including planning and program activities, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, community transit services, public transportation, and bus and rail projects. Providing certain conditions are met, counties with a population under 500,000 also may use the LTF for local streets and roads, construction, and maintenance.

Issues That Impede the Use of These Funds to Sustain Operations

TDA funds are sales-tax based and their growth relies totally on the growth of the economy. Short-term projections of sales tax receipts rely on different, more immediate factors than the trend-based long-term revenue projections. SANDAG recently developed a new financial model to better predict short-term sales tax receipts, as these revenues often are subject to fluctuations dependent on short-term economic conditions. Projecting new growth to expand service and increase ridership based on the existing tax would be too unreliable. In order to meet new needs, an increased tax rate would be likely required.
Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program

The Urbanized Area Formula Program makes federal resources available to urbanized areas for transit capital and operating assistance in small urbanized areas and for transportation-related planning. An urbanized area is an incorporated area with a population of 50,000 or more that is designated as such by the Bureau of the Census.

For medium and large urbanized areas such as San Diego County, the Section 5307 program does not provide assistance for operating costs such as operator salaries and overhead, but based on the need to maintain federally funded assets, this program enables transit agencies to use their Section 5307 apportionments to pay the cost of maintaining those assets. The provision, called Preventive Maintenance, allows the transit operators to recover up to 80 percent of their total maintenance costs from this source. This provision is applicable to all modes; however, use of these funds for this purpose is likely to be at the expense of funding ongoing capital needs, such as bus and other equipment replacements.

Two other special provisions under Section 5307 may be employed to direct these capital funds toward operations: the Capital Cost of Contracting and ADA Services provisions. Capital Cost of Contracting allows the transit agencies to use the Section 5307 funds to pay a portion of costs of operating contracts based on the amount of capital being provided by the contractor. The proportions vary based on the type of contract and whether the contractor provides vehicles. The transit agencies may pay up to 80 percent of the ADA operating contracts with Section 5307 funds instead of using those funds for ongoing capital needs.

Congress authorizes a multiyear federal surface transportation measure approximately every six years along with the other surface transportation programs under the Department of Transportation. The most recent authorization entitled, Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) authorized federal programs for FY 2005 through FY 2009. Based on annual levels established in the authorizing legislation, Congress then appropriates funds for FTA programs.

Urbanized Area Formula Program funds appropriated by Congress then are apportioned annually by FTA. Funds apportioned by FTA under the Urbanized Area Formula Program remain available to the recipient for four fiscal years—the year of the apportionment plus three additional years.

SANDAG is the designated recipient of the 5307 funds and apportions these funds to the transit agencies after a small portion, currently about $2.5 million, is set aside for SANDAG planning purposes. SANDAG policy has been to allocate 70 percent of the remaining funds to MTS and 30 percent to the NCTD.

Issues That Impede the Use of These Funds to Sustain Operations

As previously noted, these funds may only be used for Preventive Maintenance and certain operating contracts; however, this is not the limiting factor with regard to their use to offset operational needs. Both agencies could likely use all or nearly all of their respective apportionments toward operations through Preventive Maintenance, Capital Cost of Contracting, and ADA Services provisions. The agencies, while using substantial amounts of the Section 5307 funds for this purpose, have found it necessary to reserve certain amounts to pay the cost of ongoing capital replacement needs. Therefore, the primary obstacle is that these funds are insufficient for their needs.
Also, there is an inherent aspect in the federal formula under Section 5307 that exacerbates the problems of increased costs and reduced passenger revenue miles. The Section 5307 funds are distributed based in part on service provided (passenger revenue miles). The transit agencies annually prepare operating statistics for the National Transit Database. Some of those statistics then are used in the formula for apportionment. The statistics from one year will affect the distribution of funding two years later. As the transit agencies have to cut service to accommodate decline in other funds, their relative share of the national program also could be cut. In recent years, when the region’s agencies have seen cuts in service, the overall federal apportionment has been increased sufficiently to mask the impact these service cuts. Conversely, increases in service in one year can increase the regional share two years later.

Cost-effectiveness as in cost per revenue mile is another part of the formula that could have a negative impact. As costs rise in San Diego disproportionately with other areas in the country, the cost per revenue mile rises and the regional share also is impacted.

Another obstacle to the use of these federal funds for operations/increasing ridership is that the federal funds come with certain restrictions that could affect the costs for which they are used. Very specific bidding and procurement requirements are applied to operations-type contracts. As previously noted, however, the San Diego transit agencies have not let those requirements deter them from using the federal funds for Preventive Maintenance. Preventive Maintenance is limited to just maintenance and not other direct operating costs such as driver salaries, support, and administration.

Regardless, choosing between operations or capital presents a dilemma—more dollars for operating purposes means less for capital. In order to overcome the greatest obstacle, Congress would have to increase the amount authorized for this program. Currently, SAFETEA-LU is set to expire on September 30, 2009, and Congress is expected to begin work on a new authorization in the coming year. Of course, our Congressional leaders also face the obstacle of too little funding as the Federal Highway Trust Fund that includes the Mass Transit Account is virtually depleted of revenues. This is because the federal gas tax that goes into the Trust Fund has not been increased since 1997. The cost of maintaining existing infrastructure has outstripped the growth in revenues. The advent of more fuel-efficient vehicles, while perhaps falling short of the goal, has nonetheless exacerbated the problem with the Trust Fund insufficiency. Congress will be reviewing its options for enhancing or replacing the gas tax as a dedicated funding source for surface transportation programs with the next authorization.

**Federal Transit Administration 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization**

This federal formula program is available to fixed guideway agencies with systems in operation for at least seven years. The term “fixed guideway” refers to any transit service that uses exclusive or controlled rights-of-way or rails, entirely or in part. The term includes heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, trolleybus, aerial tramway, inclined plane, cable car, automated guideway transit, ferryboats, that portion of motor bus service operated on exclusive or controlled rights-of-way, and high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes. Called 5309 Rail Mod, these program funds must be used only for fixed guideway projects including Preventive Maintenance. These funds require a non-federal match of 20 percent to the federal 80 percent contribution.
Like Section 5307 funds, Fixed Guideway Modernization funds are authorized under SAFETEA-LU and are appropriated annually by Congress. FTA apports these funds to the regions based on a complicated tiered formula using factors of revenue miles and route miles, and SANDAG apports these funds directly to MTS (70%) and NCTD (30%).

Issues That Impede the Use of These Funds to Sustain Operations

The obstacles identified with the 5309 Rail Mod funds are almost identical to those related to Section 5307 funds:

- Cuts in service could result in reduced share of the total available at the national level.
- Preventive Maintenance is limited to just maintenance and not other direct operating costs, such as operator salaries, support, and administration.
- Congressional action would be needed to change the use of these funds for other operating costs, but historically, Congress has not favored operating assistance for large urbanized areas.
- Any funds used for Preventive Maintenance would not be available for capital replacement.
- The Rail Mod Program is funded from the Mass Transit Account of the Federal Highway Trust, which is approaching insolvency.

In addition, the application of these funds is more limited. While Section 5307 funds are available for any transit mode, Rail Mod funds only may be used for “fixed-guideway” systems.

Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Formula Funds for Service to Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities

The goal of the Section 5310 program is to improve mobility for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities throughout the country. These funds are included in this discussion as a potential source of operating revenues. The states are the direct recipients of these funds and the state implementing agencies, usually the transportation departments, determine how the funds may be used: capital and/or operations. The State of California has to date used these funds solely for capital, but that decision may be changed.

The states receive these funds on a formula basis, and the State of California through the actions of Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) distributes them on a competitive basis.

The primary recipients of these funds are non-profit agencies that provide transportation for elderly individuals and the developmentally challenged; however, public transit agencies may apply if they can show that no nonprofits are readily available to provide service for which the capital funds are requested. In the past, nonprofit agencies have contracted with MTS and NCTD to provide required ADA services. These agencies successfully applied to the state for the purchase of vehicles using the Section 5310 funding. This then has helped hold down the cost of the contract service. Projects for new ADA services have competed well statewide.
Issues That Impede the Use of These Funds to Sustain Operations

The targeting of these funds to nonprofit agencies is the biggest obstacle for using these funds for public transit operations. The transit agencies cannot be certain, when they procure an operator for ADA services, that the nonprofit agency is the most qualified or most cost-effective choice. Like most FTA programs that are run through the state, this program provides a very small amount of funding, which if used for operations would bring with it the federal procurement and operating requirements. Moreover, like the other federal programs, the Section 5310 program is subject to reauthorization. There are some questions whether these smaller targeted programs will continue under a new authorization measure.

Federal Transit Administration Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Formula Funds

FTA apportions these funds for non-urbanized areas to the states according to a statutory formula based on each state's population in rural and small urban areas (under 50,000 population). In California, Caltrans apportions the Section 5311 funds to counties on a rural population basis. SANDAG in turn also apportions the regional funds to MTS and NCTD based on their relative rural populations according to the most recent decennial census. NCTD receives 59 percent of the funding and MTS receives 41 percent. These funds may be used for operations requiring a dollar-for-dollar match. They may be used for capital at an 80/20 federal to non-federal ratio.

Issues That Impede the Use of These Funds to Sustain Operations

These funds, like the Section 5310 program, make up a very small percentage of the transit budgets. However, their availability has enabled the agencies to provide some rural services that might not otherwise be possible. The funds cannot be used for urban or suburban transit services, so elimination of rural services also would mean the loss of this funding source. Like the other FTA programs, the Section 5311 program is subject to the next authorization measure, and like the other programs, it is unknown if and in what form the program would continue.

Federal Transit Administration Section 5311(f) Intercity Bus Program

A subsidiary program under the Section 5311 program, the Section 5311(f) program was created to help provide an intercity bus transportation system designed to address the intercity bus transportation needs of the entire state by providing financial assistance for operating, capital, and/or planning grants that support three national objectives:

- To support the connection between non-urbanized areas and the larger regional or national system of intercity bus service;
- To support services to meet the intercity travel needs of residents in non-urbanized areas; and
- To support the infrastructure of the intercity bus network through planning and marketing assistance and capital investment in facilities.

This program, while discretionary, is included in this list of recurring sources because the region's two transit agencies have been somewhat successful in obtaining these funds to support rural operations and capital needs.
Federal Transit Administration Section 5316 Jobs Access and Reverse Commute Program

The goal of the Job Access and Reverse Commute program (JARC) is to improve access to transportation services to employment and employment-related activities for welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals and to transport residents of urbanized areas and non-urbanized areas to suburban employment opportunities.

This program provides financial assistance for transportation services planned, designed, and carried out to meet the transportation needs of eligible low-income individuals and of reverse commuters regardless of income. The program requires coordination of federally-assisted programs and services in order to make the most efficient use of federal resources. The formula for JARC funds is based on the number of eligible low-income and welfare recipients in urbanized and rural areas. The region may use up to 10 percent of the JARC funds for planning, administration, and technical assistance.

JARC funding is allocated by formula to states for areas with populations below 200,000 persons, and to designated recipients for areas with populations of 200,000 persons and above. SANDAG serves as the designated recipient for the San Diego region. SANDAG apportions these funds through a competitive basis. Any projects must be included in the 2008-2012 Coordinated Plan, which serves as the federally mandated locally-developed transit and human service transportation plan.

To broaden the applicability of this program, the sources for matching funds are expanded. While most FTA programs must be matched with non-federal funds, the JARC funds may be matched with other federal funds as long as that match does not come from other Department of Transportation sources. This encourages coordination with other programs such as those funded by the Department of Health and Human Services.

The JARC funds may be used for operating at a 50 percent share or for capital at an 80 percent JARC share. While social service agencies are eligible for these funds, MTS and NCTD have been the largest recipients in the region and have used them principally for operations.

Issues That Impede the Use of These Funds to Sustain Operations

Like all of the other FTA sources, there are significant limits on the use of these funds. It remains to be seen if specialized federal programs will remain in the next authorization.

Federal Transit Administration Section 5317 New Freedom Program

The New Freedom Program is authorized in SAFETEA-LU to support new public transportation services and public transportation alternatives beyond those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. Specific eligible projects include:

- Increases or enhancements related to geographic coverage, service quality, and/or service times that impact availability of transportation services for individuals with disabilities as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year;

- Additions or changes to environmental infrastructure (e.g., transportation facilities, sidewalks, etc.), technology, and vehicles that impact availability of transportation services as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year; and
• Actual or estimated number of rides (as measured by one-way trips) provided for individuals with disabilities as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year.

SANDAG, as the designated recipient of these funds, distributes them on a competitive basis. MTS and NCTD may receive these grants, but nonprofit agencies also may compete and receive their funding as subrecipients of SANDAG or the transit agencies. New Freedom Program service is defined as any service or activity that was not operational on August 10, 2005, and did not have an identified funding source as of August 10, 2005, as evidenced by inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) or the STIP. In other words, if not for the New Freedom Program, these projects would not have consideration for funding, and proposed service enhancements would not be available for individuals with disabilities.

Issues That Impede the Use of These Funds to Sustain Operations

These funds have been targeted at expanding a very specialized service. The funds are clearly targeted at increased ridership in a small segment of the population, but they are not available for expanding general purpose transit ridership.

Summary of Recurring Funding Sources

In summary, there are very few funding options for transit operations. Legislators and funding agencies have shown a desire to fund capital improvements, leaving the cost of operations to the local entities. Moreover, the few sources available come with restrictions and/or are targeted toward addressing the needs of certain populations. Only TDA and portions of TransNet transit operating revenues have meaningful flexibility to allow the transit operators to apply them as needed.

SANDAG has worked to inform state and federal legislators of the importance of identifying resources to fund existing and expanded transit ridership. Board members and executive management joined coalitions of regional agencies, our transit agencies, and the California Transit Association to fight the elimination of STA funds. Board members and executive management have testified in Congressional hearings and outreach sessions as to the importance of public transit to the region; however, this effort cannot be achieved without a public consensus on the priority for transit funding.

In addition, when the voters approved the TransNet Extension in 2004, they approved a provision that required that SANDAG pursue an additional sales tax measure to fund long-term habitat conservation plans in the San Diego region. Originally required to be on the ballot by 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved an amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance to extend the deadline two years from 2008 to 2010. The Board also directed staff to explore other “quality of life” areas in need of additional funding, including shoreline preservation, water quality improvements, and public transit improvements. As part of the current FY 2009 work program and proposed FY 2010 work program, SANDAG is continuing to evaluate the timing and viability of a new funding measure, including the need to find a reliable funding source for public transit.
SECTION 3: IMPEDIMENTS TO MAINTAINING LONG-TERM RIDERSHIP

The discussion in this section focuses on understanding the impediments to maintaining long-term ridership, both in terms of factors affecting systems development (design elements of new transit services and facilities) and those affecting systems management (the efficiency and effectiveness of the existing transit system).

Discussion

Three major efforts conducted in recent years are discussed below that highlight impediments affecting transit ridership:

- MTDB TransitWorks market research study done in 2000
- SANDAG Transit Public Opinion Survey conducted in 2008
- SANDAG 2008–2012 Coordinated Plan

In addition, two other SANDAG efforts involving an update to the regional transportation model and development of new transit technologies in the region are highlighted.

Metropolitan Transit Development Board TransitWorks Study

In 2000, the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB, now known as MTS) undertook a market research approach for its TransitWorks\(^1\) Long-Range Strategy. At the core of the MTDB long-range strategic plan effort was the belief that San Diego’s transit system should deliver services that individual travelers desire. Market segmentation was seen as a powerful tool to understand and respond to the needs of transit customers.

The market research identified the attitudinal factors that influence a person’s decision on modal choice—that is, their decision whether to drive or use transit. Two of these factors—sensitivity to one’s personal travel experience and one’s need for flexibility and speed—proved to be the key components in segmenting the San Diego market into six discrete groups of travelers. The results produced useful insights into traveler’s sensitivity to certain variables based on which group they belonged to. The highlights (organized by transit attribute) include:

- **In-Vehicle Travel Time** - This measure was found to be an important factor in the decision on whether to use transit, although riders making a commute trip were found to be more sensitive to this variable than the riders making a non-commute trip. Therefore, long in-vehicle travel times, when compared to a similar auto trip, are seen as a significant ridership impediment for commuters.

---

\(^1\) The complete study can be found at http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1430_9421.pdf.
• **Wait Time for Transit** – Similar to in-vehicle travel time, the wait time for transit was found to be a strong disincentive for commute trips. However, it was no more burdensome than in-vehicle travel time on average non-commute trips.

• **Walk Time** – Walk time reflects the walk times to and from a transit stop. The study found the sensitivity to transit walk times was similar to the sensitivity for walk times between an auto parking location and the work destination.

• **Time Spent Searching for Parking** – The study found that respondents on a commute trip also were found to be more sensitive to time spent searching for parking than respondents on a non-commute trip.

• **Transfer Penalty** – A transit rider’s sensitivity to transferring between transit routes is significantly higher than in-vehicle travel time, suggesting that minimizing the transfers and/or transfer wait time can have a strong impact on ridership.

• **Cost of Travel** – Cost was not seen as a significant variable in the study and sensitivity to fares was not particularly strong within any of the market segments studied. Additionally, the two segments of travelers with the highest average income were those also willing to pay for a higher quality of service if in-vehicle travel times and wait and walk times are competitive with a similar auto trip.

• **Seat Availability** – Seat availability was found to have a minor impact on the attractiveness of transit.

• **Automobile Ownership** – The lack of auto ownership was found to be a significant indicator of higher transit use as would be expected. However, access to an auto was not, in and of itself, a deterrent to transit use. Rather, the decision on whether to use transit is dependent upon the effect from the other factors discussed above as well.

The TransitWorks study process also highlighted the critical role that land use plays in determining transit ridership. Areas with transit-supportive land uses enhance passenger access to transit stations and make transit a more convenient option. Lower density auto-oriented land uses, on the other hand, make it difficult to provide transit in a convenient and cost-effective manner.

Overall, the TransitWorks process showed that the transit market is not one-dimensional in nature, but rather that the different rider types respond differently to the various factors discussed above. Through a solid understanding of the types of riders that may use a particular bus, Trolley, or COASTER service and careful attention to the service design, the ability of that service to attract and retain riders can be enhanced.

**2008 Public Opinion Survey**

The 2008 Public Opinion Survey² undertaken by SANDAG was aimed at better understanding travel preferences of both existing and potential transit riders. The results of the study discuss the factors that influence the likelihood of riding transit, including the degree to which these factors can influence both current ridership and interest in riding in the future (providing a greater level of

---

detail than the previous TransitWorks analysis). These factors also were designed to take into account the specific transit service types in the region including COASTER, Trolley, and bus.

The study identified nine factors that were seen as the most important transit impediments influencing existing ridership and 11 factors influencing someone’s interest in future ridership. While the factors are not ranked and the survey does not assess how difficult the factors are to change, the study does quantify how changing someone’s perceptions of these factors can increase their likelihood to ride transit. For example, it might be easier and less costly to invest in a marketing campaign that persuades potential riders that the Trolley is less stressful than the car than to make operational changes that build more stations so people have more access. While the study identifies important factors, transit experts (planning, operations, and marketing) need to assess the factors in practical terms as well.

Table 1
Factors Influencing Existing Riders - By Transit Service Type

**Bus Predictors**
- Ability to travel to desired locations
- Feeling safe
- Having service available when needed

**Trolley Predictors**
- Attended special events in the past
- Ability to travel to desired locations
- Having service available when needed
- Reducing stress
- Ability to get to destination on time
- Having flexibility to travel when needed
- Avoiding traffic

**COASTER Predictors**
- Ability to travel to desired locations
- Attended special events in the past
- Avoiding traffic

The same analysis was undertaken to determine the important variables in a person’s interest in riding transit in the future. Under this scenario, 11 variables were seen as the most important factors impeding future transit use as shown in the following table.
Table 2
Factors Influencing Interest in Future Riders - By Transit Service Type

**Bus Predictors**
- Avoiding traffic
- Feeling safe
- Having clean and comfortable vehicles

**Trolley Predictors**
- Feeling comfortable with someone else driving
- Considers themselves an environmentalist
- Ability to access multiple destinations
- Ability to get to destination on time
- Avoiding traffic
- Feeling safe
- Having clean and comfortable vehicles
- Reducing stress

**COASTER Predictors**
- Ability to travel to desired locations
- Feeling safe
- Attended special events in the past
- Considers themselves an environmentalist
- Avoiding traffic

**SANDAG Coordinated Plan**

The 2008-2012 Coordinated Plan includes a detailed evaluation of transit and social service operational deficiencies in the region. Two important components regarding ridership impediments are included in the report: operational deficiencies based on transit service statistics (Chapter 4), and service gaps and deficiencies based on a geographic analysis of access to transit (Chapter 7).

The evaluation of transit data stems from the regional performance evaluation program included in the 2008-2012 Coordinated Plan. This program provides a tool to annually assess the overall health of the regional public transit system. Detailed demographic data were collected to assess the transportation needs of multiple groups and the corresponding transit and social service transportation network to meet their daily needs. Additionally, specific demographic sub-groups were evaluated (including low-income persons, seniors, and disabled individuals) since these groups have a greater likelihood of being transit dependent.

---

3 The complete report and appendices can be found at www.sandag.org/coordinatedplan.
To date, the 2008–2012 Coordinated Plan has been utilized to fund several projects proposed to fill the transportation gaps discussed in the plan based on the following identified deficiencies:

- Lack of transit or social service transportation in various areas or neighborhoods of San Diego County (based on empirical mapping techniques)
- Lack of transit or social service transportation in various areas or neighborhoods of San Diego County with associated threshold densities (based on empirical mapping techniques)
- Absence of a centralized ride scheduling and dispatching center
- Lack of service to the rural areas
- Limited coordination among transit and social service agencies
- Minimal weekday or weekend service
- Lack of low-cost non-emergency medical transportation

This Plan is updated on an annual basis to monitor changing passenger needs, evolving demographics, and changes in transit service levels. The Plan provides an important tool in monitoring the performance of the existing system and indicating areas of improvement that could improve system efficiency both in terms of the rider convenience and cost effectiveness.

**Regional Travel Model**

The degree to which the market research and travel behavior survey results discussed above can be incorporated into the SANDAG regional travel demand model can help improve the transit ridership forecasts used in long-range planning studies and plans. SANDAG modeling staff currently is moving towards the next generation of a forecasting model involving an Activity-Based Model approach that will be able to use data from the TransitWorks and Public Opinion Survey to develop a more sophisticated set of variables in forecasting transit ridership, including:

- Perception of the various rail and bus transit modes
- Use of transit for different travel purposes
- Socioeconomic characteristics, such as car ownership, income, household size, worker status, age, gender, and education
- Travel Time
- Transit Fares
- Transit Access to Desired Locations

In the context of planning decisions, the new model also is expected to be capable of better answering policy questions such as: how to optimize the use of congestion pricing; how to optimize use of Managed Lanes; and how to evaluate benefits of transit-oriented development. In addition to being used for travel forecasts for development of the RTP and transportation corridor studies,
the model will be used for transportation modeling requests made to the SANDAG Service Bureau by cities, counties, other governmental bodies, and private sector clients across the region.

**Technology Enhancements**

There is a strong role that technology can play in improving transit operations and rider information. SANDAG completed deployment of the Regional Transit Management System (RTMS) in 2006 which provides the countywide infrastructure needed to track vehicles and deliver customer information. The RTMS is a sophisticated communications system that uses satellites to provide transit system performance, vehicle diagnostics, and life/safety emergency information.

In addition, in the last two months, SANDAG completed installation of the first set of digital message signs at several transit centers in the region as part of a longer-term plan to provide real-time transit information to passengers. The signs use cell phone technology to communicate to the RTMS network and convey real-time information about the arrival/departure status of buses serving a particular stop. This information is based on schedule deviation and the bus’ current location. In the future, SANDAG will explore solutions that enhance the bus arrival prediction to include delays from traffic impacts.

Other technology enhancements include development of transit priority treatments to reduce delays for transit buses, including signal priority measures that can extend green lights if a bus is behind schedule, queue jump lanes, and dedicated transit lanes on both local arterials and freeways. These measures can both reduce transit travel times and improve schedule reliability.

**Conclusions on Impediments to Maintaining Long-Term Ridership**

The discussion above indicates that maintaining long-term ridership for public transit is more complex than simply adding more resources for the regional transit system. Rather, improvements to transit can involve both systems development (how to best allocate new resources to transit) and systems management (how to better manage the existing system in order to maximize its efficiency and effectiveness). Focusing efforts in both arenas are needed to improve the attractiveness of transit to both existing and potential riders.

Systems development improvements involve the use of a variety tools to better design future rail, bus rapid transit/rapid bus, and local bus services. The TransitWorks research and the Public Opinion Survey note the importance in better understanding the transit travel markets that will be served by new services, and designing those services with the specific attributes that will attract those market segments. Those attributes range from service frequency and travel time to the vehicle and station amenities. Improvements being made to the SANDAG regional travel model will assist in this effort by incorporating many of these market research elements to better forecast potential ridership.

Systems management improvements entail the use of various tools to explore ways, on an ongoing basis, for improving the effectiveness of existing resources devoted to public transit. The technology improvements discussed above offer the potential to improve the performance of the existing system and passenger convenience with investment in relatively low-capital cost improvements. Information from the 2008–2012 Coordinated Plan helps identify existing needs that, if overcome, would improve the quality of the system for current riders and lead to increased attractiveness to potential riders. The market research and public opinion survey also provide valuable information that can be used to better tailor existing transit market outreach efforts to reach those market segments that could be attracted to transit.
Finally, it should be recognized that public transit is only one component of a multimodal approach to transportation solutions that are geared toward giving people better choices. We have all seen what happened to use of public transit when fuel prices went up - we now understand better the variety of ways that we pay to drive our automobiles (e.g., vehicle license fee, insurance, maintenance costs, etc.) Behavioral economics needs to be part of this discussion in order to make the overall transportation system function efficiently.
SECTION 4: FINANCIAL IMPEDIMENTS – REALLOCATION OF EXISTING FUNDING SOURCES - TransNet EXTENSION ORDINANCE

In addition to the impediments detailed in Section 3, this section discusses funds that are not typically applied to transit but may be applied depending on their guidelines or bylaws. One such resource is the TransNet Extension Ordinance and the various programs and funding streams associated with it. This section evaluates the flexibility of TransNet funds to cover transit operations expenses where reallocated dollars could be reprogrammed to help maintain existing transit services in TransNet project corridors as an interim step until budgets return to prior FY 2008 levels.

Background

Excluding administrative expenses, oversight, and funds for the bicycle/pedestrian/neighborhood safety program (approximately 3%), the TransNet Extension Ordinance includes a set-aside dollar amount comprising 8.1 percent of revenues collected to operate new transit services developed by the TransNet Major Corridors program. These new services are identified in the TransNet Extension Ordinance and include the Mid-Coast Corridor transit project, the Super Loop, and Interstate 15 Bus Rapid Transit (I-15 BRT), among others.

At this time, the region is conducting an analysis to compare the updated cost estimates to operate all new services identified in the TransNet Extension Ordinance with the anticipated revenues from TransNet and to provide a reassessment of the program's financial ability to operate these new services. If these funds were to be designated to fund existing transit operations, it would put the budget capacity in jeopardy to fund the new transit project operations as envisioned in the program approved by the voters. This also would also impact the potential for federal Full Funding Grant Agreements as evidence of adequate operations funds is a requirement for competition. Any proposal to redirect funding from the 8.1 percent program to transit operations for the existing network would require an amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance with two-thirds approval from the SANDAG Board of Directors, acting in its role as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission.

It should be noted that changes to the scope of work of the TransNet program, including the elimination, addition, or substitution of capital projects also requires an amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance. This amendment also would require approval by a minimum of two-thirds of the SANDAG Board of Directors. It should be noted that the elimination of the Mid-Coast Corridor transit project from the program would require a vote by the people, because it was a remaining project from the original TransNet measure.

At this time, the region has embarked on the development of several new transit services: I-15 BRT, South Bay BRT, Mid-City Rapid Bus, the Super Loop, and the Mid-Coast Corridor project. Another option the SANDAG Board of Directors has is to delay the implementation of these projects and shift the capital funds to operations. While delaying implementation of a project does not require an amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance, diversion of capital funds to operations would require an amendment. And, as with the discussion above, the amendment would require a two-thirds of the board to approve the change (and in the case of the Mid-Coast Corridor transit...
project, a vote of the people). All major transit capital projects are included within the Major Corridors element of the program.

Beyond shifting existing TransNet transit operating or capital dollars, other potential reallocated sources involve highway, local streets and roads, bicycle/pedestrian/neighborhood safety, and Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) funds. All of these sources would require a two-thirds vote of the SANDAG Board of Directors, with the exception of the EMP, which would require a vote of the people. These sources are described in more detail below:

**Highway Funds**

There are few strictly highway program projects in the TransNet Extension Ordinance. Most “highway” projects include elements that provide benefits to transit operations. An example is the I-15 Managed Lanes, which includes Direct Access Ramps to I-15 BRT stations. Nonetheless, if the SANDAG Board of Directors were to eliminate or down-scope a capital project, the requirement would be similar as that for a transit capital project, with a required two-thirds approval from the SANDAG Board of Directors to amend the TransNet Extension Ordinance. The Major Corridors program currently receives 38 percent of the revenues collected. All major highway capital projects are included within the Major Corridors element of the program. It should be noted that, like the Mid-Coast Corridor transit project, completion of the eastern ends of State Route (SR) 52 and SR 76 could not be eliminated without a vote of the people.

**Local Streets and Roads Program**

One part of the TransNet program that could be used for transit operations without an Ordinance change is the Local Streets and Roads program. However, it has not been the practice of the 18 cities and the County of San Diego to apply any of their 29.1 percent of the funds from TransNet to transit operations. Eligible activities include, in addition to street, road, and transportation facility improvements, operating support for local shuttle and circulator routes and other services. Therefore, a shift of these funds to transit operations would not require an amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance.4

**Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety Funds**

The Bicycle, Pedestrian & Neighborhood Safety Program receives an off-the-top 2 percent allocation of the TransNet revenues collected. A change in the amount received by this program would require a two-thirds approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors through an amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance.

**Environmental Mitigation Program**

The Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) included in the TransNet Extension Ordinance provides funding for mitigation needs of the Major Corridors program as well as local street and road projects. The 6.2 percent of the funds collected through TransNet are set-aside for the large scale acquisition and management of critical habitat areas and to create a reliable approach for funding mitigation required for future transportation projects. Amendments to the TransNet Extension Ordinance regarding this program would require a vote of the people.

---

4 Any jurisdiction could decide to spend their funds on transit operations without a TransNet amendment. However, a change in the formula dictating how the 29.1 percent funds are shared amongst the cities would require a TransNet amendment.
Beyond the reallocation of TransNet, several other funding sources were evaluated based on the feasibility of these sources to fund transit operations. These sources would potentially offer new revenue and not allocate existing revenue away from existing programmed projects, as is the case with reallocating TransNet dollars.

**Quality of Life Funding Initiative**

The creation of a Quality of Life funding measure is a potential option to increase available dollars for transit operations. A challenge to implementing this initiative as a tax would be that, contrary to the last approval where it merely was extending an existing tax, this measure would be new tax. Additionally, the current economic crisis may constrain the opportunity to advance an additional measure. Therefore, before the region embarks on asking the voters for an increase, careful assessment of priority issues for the voters should be made.

Among the priorities being evaluated is funding for dedicated transit operations, funding for additional transportation capital improvements, and funding for other quality of life areas, such as open space, habitat acquisition, water quality improvement projects, sand replenishment at local beaches, and others. An increase, however, would provide the region with the greatest amount of flexibility and stability as the revenues would be controlled regionally. A new sales tax also would create a new source of revenue to supplement existing sources. It also should be noted that a Quality of Life measure could be implemented through exercising one or several of the alternatives offered below.

**Increased Transit Fares**

Increasing transit fares is one way to increase revenue for transit operations. Since 2007, SANDAG periodically has increased fares upon request by the transit agencies. In addition, SANDAG has developed a Regional Comprehensive Fare Study with the original goal of achieving a single, simplified, equitable structure for both operators. With the current financial constraints facing MTS and NCTD, this goal has been amended also to include how best to maximize transit revenues.

At the same time, it is recognized that there are clear limitations on raising fares, and there are market forces that need to be carefully considered. It should be emphasized that fare increases are not easily accomplished, and that modification to fare policy will not by itself change the dynamics of the situation facing public transit in this region. The Comprehensive Fare Study will be brought to the SANDAG Board of Directors in spring 2009.

**Potential Local and Regional Public Transit Revenue Sources**

Other solutions to finding new sources of money also were evaluated based on their potential application as regional funding measures. These include the creation of assessment districts, levying fees, or taxes, which have been pursued by other regions or in other jurisdictions at the local level. Consideration of these possible solutions and alternatives generates a number of policy questions;
the answers to some of which may require changes in state and/or federal law. These solutions offer ancillary funding streams or could potentially replace the need for a sales tax initiative.

The process to implement the local revenue mechanisms would be dictated to a large extent by the purpose and administration of the funds. As required by Proposition 218, any tax that is collected for a special purpose (e.g., for transportation infrastructure or transit services), as the proposals in this report would be, is defined as a “special tax” subject to the two-thirds voter supermajority approval. Funding mechanisms based on real property that are structured as “fees” to pay for specific improvements or services could be implemented as a simple local city or county regulation. If a portion of these fees exceeds the reasonable cost of these improvements or services, however, then the “fee” would actually be a “tax” subject to a two-thirds voter supermajority approval.

Other Alternative Funding Mechanisms

A number of other alternative funding mechanisms were evaluated and are highlighted below.

**Benefit Assessment Districts**

Benefit Assessment Districts allow a public agency to construct and maintain improvements, such as traffic signals, parks, and others. Project costs are assessed within the boundaries of the designated benefit area of the county or city. Benefit Assessment Districts have several advantages: they tie financing of specific projects to beneficiaries; they allow different levels of infrastructure and services to vary with different demands for these public goods; and they allow an area that wants better infrastructure the ability to fund desired improvements itself. However, there are certain disadvantages. These include potential fragmentation of infrastructure and services, varying between those areas that want to pay for the improvements, and those that do not.

**Parking Assessment Districts**

Parking Assessment Districts would allow the region to assess fees on certain parking spaces within defined areas. A surcharge or fee on parking spaces through Parking Assessment Districts in congested areas, such as downtown San Diego or other major employment centers, would help raise additional revenue and reduce traffic congestion.

**Development Impact Fees for Transit**

Development Impact Fees (DIF) are fees collected by local agencies to grant development permits that are tied to certain infrastructure improvements. The DIF also could be a vehicle to fund regional transportation mitigation projects. An analysis of these options must include recognition that DIFs may be opposed by the development community, as additional fees would increase their cost of doing business. Public agencies also may find it hard to bond against projected DIF revenue, since the revenues materialize only once the development is implemented. Additionally, a nexus study would be required to justify the fees and their relationship between the cost of the transit services provided and the area served.

**Tax Increment Financing Along Transportation Corridors**

Tax Increment Financing (TIF), in contrast to DIFs, is made up of two components. The first is base revenues, which are the property taxes collected based on existing assessed property values. The
second component is the tax increment, which represents the new revenues in excess of the base revenues that are generated based on the higher assessed value of the new development. TIFs can only be imposed by cities and the County, but may be opposed by local agencies as they limit the amount of revenues that are collected in an area positively impacted by the construction of infrastructure, in this case transportation improvements. A mitigating action in the creation of TIFs is that the local agencies could keep the tax increment upon completion of payment of the financing of the transportation infrastructure.

**Real Estate Transfer Taxes**

Real Estate Transfer Taxes (RETT), also referred as deed recordation taxes, are imposed on the sale or transfer of real property. The fees usually are based on or measured by the consideration paid for or the fair market value of the real estate. Thirty-five states already use RETTs to generate revenue. Some of the uses in other jurisdictions in California and Oregon for revenues derived from RETTs include: affordable housing programs, open space, parkland acquisition and maintenance, and transportation infrastructure. In California, RETTs may be imposed only at the local level by cities and counties. The level of revenues generated depends on the rate, though in the San Diego region the high level of real estate valuations also would influence the amount of revenues. California law allows up to a maximum of $0.55 per $500 of the value of the property being conveyed. There may be some opposition to the imposition of these RETTs precisely because property owner tax bills may be considered high due to these higher property values. RETTs already are collected in San Diego County, and an increase would likely require a two-third supermajority voter approval to take the tax level above existing statutory levels.

**Property Taxes**

Property taxes on land and building values are generally the principal source of revenue for local governments. Portions of local property taxes are authorized widely for use by special districts and authorities, including transit agencies and school districts. Unlike RETTs, property taxes can provide an annual versus one-time funding source for public transit. Traditionally, support for public transportation has been derived from sources other than property tax to avoid competition with other basic public services such as health, education, police, and fire protection. However, with existing sources of transit funding being reduced or eliminated, property tax assessments for transit could provide a valuable tool to reduce the gap between operating costs and revenues.

**Vehicle License Fees**

Another potential funding source is increased revenues through an increase in annual Vehicle Registration Fees. Assembly Bill (AB) 2766 (Richmond, 1990) allows air districts to set a fee of up to $4 for the registration of vehicles within their jurisdictions. The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) currently levies a fee of $2 under AB 2766. Other existing legislation, AB 923 (Firebaugh, 2004), allows the APCD to charge an additional $2 for a total of up to $6. The first $4 of these funds typically is used for projects and programs that reduce emissions, including transit services (the Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection services were funded, in part, by the APCD through FY 2008). The additional $2 cannot be spent on transit projects and is limited to Carl Moyer projects, agricultural sources, lower emission school buses, accelerated vehicle retirement, and repair programs.
Section 44225 of the California Health and Safety Code states that a district may increase the fee by having the APCD governing board approve a resolution approving the fee increase and outlining a corresponding program for expenditure. Section 44325 of the Code provides that, “a district may use these funds to enter into, and implement, agreements with agencies which directly provide carpool, vanpool, or other ridesharing or transit services to provide these services.” The County Board of Supervisors sits as the APCD governing board for San Diego County.

**Commuter Benefits Ordinance**

San Francisco currently has an ordinance, which requires businesses with 20 or more workers to offer a commuter benefits program that allows employees to use pre-tax dollars for their commute expenses. Employers benefit from lower payroll taxes. This type of ordinance has the potential to have a direct ridership benefit for the transit agencies while encouraging mode shift in current non-riders. However, this type of program still requires that transit agencies subsidize trips made by pass holders.

**Transit Payroll Tax for Employers**

A transit payroll tax involves a tax imposed directly on the employer based on its gross payroll regardless of whether the employees use transit or not. The Portland, Oregon payroll tax is levied by the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District (TriMet) and the Lane County Mass Transit District (LTD). A payroll tax in San Diego potentially could generate more revenue than a commuter benefits ordinance since it could be developed to meet existing budget gaps. While the above example of a commuter benefits ordinance has the advantage of encouraging public transit ridership, this type of payroll surcharge has the potential to cover unsubsidized gaps in operating costs and revenues. SANDAG does not currently have the authority to levy transit payroll taxes.

**Parking Structure User Fees at Premium/Rapid Bus and/or Rail Stations**

Parking structures and other facilities located at premium, rapid bus, and rail stations often are filled to capacity. A potential revenue source would be to establish user fees at these facilities. Care must be exercised to develop a fee structure that does not discourage use of the bus or rail service to the point that it significantly reduces ridership. User fees also can help manage the use of this limited resource – parking space availability.

**Rental Car Fees**

Rental car fees, more commonly found in rental agreements that originate at airports, are levied in jurisdictions across the United States. While these fees are sometimes used to pay for facilities directly associated with the airport (parking structures or new terminals, for example) some jurisdictions levy these fees to pay for facilities that are not associated with airport improvements, such as stadium expansions or renovations. An option is to establish rental car fees that provide funding for transit system operations as mitigation for their contribution to congestion on the local street and highway network. These rental car fees could be extended to rental car agreements originating at locations other than airports. SANDAG does not have the authority to impose rental car fees.
Station Naming Rights

Advertising can provide a source of income with minimal associated overhead costs. Revenues from advertising typically flow directly or indirectly to the operating agencies from single or multiyear advertising contracts. Advertising revenue opportunities can include both electronic and print formats, with print ads opportunities on both buses and at transit stations. Revenue from advertising is typically modest, from 0.1 percent to about 3.0 percent of operating revenue. A targeted advertising strategy focused on station naming rights for new transit services, such as the planned BRT/Rapid Bus stations for example, could present the opportunity to help subsidize operations or maintenance costs at these stations. Any new transit advertising strategy would need to be consistent the SANDAG Board Policy No. 034 on Advertising.
SECTION 6: OTHER POTENTIAL FUTURE FEDERAL/STATE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Beyond possible new regional and local funding sources covered in the previous section, this chapter evaluates potential future opportunities to develop new federal or state funding sources. These include possible changes or new programs in the next federal authorization measure, leveraging of new climate change legislation, public/private partnership opportunities, and transit/social service transportation coordination.

Next Federal Surface Transportation Authorization Measure

SAFETEA-LU is set to expire on September 30, 2009, setting the stage for a new transportation authorization. As in previous authorizations, a step increase in the amount of funding is anticipated. However, it should be noted that federal transit formula funds cannot be used directly for operations of transit services. In order for the new authorization to offer meaningful operations assistance to transit agencies, a dedicated revenue source for transit operations through a set-aside or a revised revenue-collection method that benefits transit operations would need to be included. Increased funds to rehabilitate existing infrastructure would also need to be identified to mitigate the transit agencies’ difficult choice to defer preventive maintenance and rehabilitation in favor of operations (preventative maintenance). More money under the existing mechanisms would provide additional funds for capital projects, but additional flexibility in the use of the funds also would be beneficial.

Assembly Bill 32 Scoping Plan – Cap and Trade Options

California is working closely with other states and Canadian provinces in the Western Climate Initiative (WCI) to design a regional cap-and-trade program that can deliver reductions of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions throughout the region. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is expected to develop a cap-and-trade program for California that will link with the programs in the other WCI Partner Jurisdictions to create a regional cap-and-trade program. SANDAG will coordinate with CARB to ensure that transit is made eligible to receive credits/allocations through such a program.

Transit Operations and Protection Plan

For state highways, California has a State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), which sets aside state transportation funds for the ongoing maintenance of the state’s highway system. By state law, these expenditures are given priority over new construction and are funded “off the top” of the State Highway Account before any funding for new construction projects is allocated. A similar program, a local Transit Operation and Protection Program (TOPP), potentially could be created for transit (no such program currently exists).
In order to pursue any of these alternative funding sources, SANDAG would need to commit to the following actions:

- Work with the California Transit Association (CTA), the American Public Transit Association (APTA), and other advocacy groups to ensure that transit operations and maintenance are no longer diverted to other programs and that fund levels are increased over time

- Determine the feasibility of a TOPP to increase the priority for transit operations and maintenance funds

- Based on this feasibility analysis, one option may be to develop a local funding source, in conjunction with MTS and NCTD, as part of the potential Quality of Life initiative that will create a TOPP. Another option would be to work with other transit agencies, regional transportation planning agencies, and other Metropolitan Planning Organizations to create a statewide TOPP.

- Continue to work closely with MTS and NCTD to improve transit cost-effectiveness while increasing service along key corridors.

These four options represent “off-the-top” funding alternatives that can help ensure that adequate transit operating funds are identified, prioritized, and programmed into the annual budget process.

**System Coordination and Public/Private Partnerships**

Beginning with a mandate included in SAFETEA-LU, SANDAG now incorporates overall system coordination in the Coordinated Plan. This entails the evaluation of transportation provided by both public transit and social service transportation providers. With the evaluation of social service transportation now part of the overall planning framework, opportunities have begun to arise regarding potential opportunities for social service and public transit coordination. These opportunities have the potential to reduce costs through use of the most appropriate vehicle to fit the service need and through the pooling of maintenance and insurance. Additionally, the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) for the San Diego region, Full Access and Coordinated Transportation (FACT), has successfully received funding under SAFETEA-LU to develop a coordinated approach to regional mobility management. SANDAG manages the CTSA contract and has committed to update the 2008–2012 Coordinated Plan to take full advantage of regional investments in transportation coordination.

Under the 2008–2012 Coordinated Plan, opportunities also may exist for public/private partnerships within the transit system. One potential example of this is first- and last-mile services that provide access to job sites from regional rail and BRT services. Options should be explored where the nonprofit social service or private sector could make use of existing and under-utilized resources (e.g. existing employer shuttles) to provide first- and last-mile service. Care would need to be exercised so that partnerships would not lead to reduced transit ridership due to service and/or fare changes outside regional control.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Measure</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Potential Annual Funds Generated (SM)</th>
<th>Who Has the Authority at the Local Level?</th>
<th>What are the Requirements to Get It Implemented?</th>
<th>Where Can It Be Applied?</th>
<th>Existing Structure in Place or Requires New Structure to Administer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Transportation Sales Tax (1)</td>
<td>1/4 to 1/2 Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>$117 - $234</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>2/3 Voter-Approval</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Existing Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Center User Fees</td>
<td>$3 Per Parking Space Fee (Range Based on Existing and Planned Spaces at Park and Ride lots)</td>
<td>$1 - $2</td>
<td>SANDAG/ Transit Agencies</td>
<td>SANDAG/ Transit Agency Policy</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Requires New Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Taxes (2)</td>
<td>$50 to $100 Per Parcel</td>
<td>$35 - $70</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>2/3 Voter-Approval</td>
<td>Local/ Regional</td>
<td>Existing Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes (3)</td>
<td>0.34% to 0.66% of all County Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$175 - $340</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>2/3 Voter-Approval</td>
<td>Local/ Regional</td>
<td>Requires New Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Car Fees (5)</td>
<td>1% to 5% Fee on Gross Rental Car Revenue</td>
<td>$2 - $10</td>
<td>None Currently</td>
<td>New State Legislation</td>
<td>Local/ Regional</td>
<td>Requires New Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Assessment Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Nexus Study and Local Agency Approval</td>
<td>Local/ Regional</td>
<td>Requires New Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Assessment Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Nexus Study and Local Agency Approval</td>
<td>Local/ Regional</td>
<td>Requires New Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Impact Fees and Exactions (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None Currently</td>
<td>New State Legislation</td>
<td>Local/ Regional</td>
<td>Requires New Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Districts (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None Currently</td>
<td>New State Legislation</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Requires New Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Increment Finance (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None Currently</td>
<td>New State Legislation</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Requires New Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Transfer Taxes (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>New State Legislation</td>
<td>Local/ Regional</td>
<td>Existing Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charter Cities (11)</td>
<td>2/3 Voter-Approval</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Requires New Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Pursuant to Rev. & Tax Code § 72511.1 the cities and the County are capped at 2% aggregate for all local sales taxes. With the current 8.25% state tax rate, there is a maximum available tax rate for the cities and the County of 10.25%. All of the cities and the County have the capacity to add at least another 1/2% before reaching the maximum. The only area of the state that has exceeded this 2% cap is Los Angeles. This was accomplished via SB 314 (2003), which gave LA County the ability to exclude its transportation sales tax from the 2% limit imposed by § 72511.1.

(2) Based on the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit parcel tax rate of $96 per parcel (recent 2008 measure doubled existing $48 parcel tax for transit services).

(3) Wage and salary information from the California Employment Development Department (EDD). Tax range based on the New York MTA rate of 0.34% and Portland’s Tri-Met rate of 0.66%. However, Portland does not have a transit sales tax measure.

(4) Existing legislation may allow cities to institute a type of tax known as an “occupation” tax, which is a tax on employees rather than employers.

(5) Rental car fees are currently being charged on gross rental car revenues under the California Tourism Marketing Act. These dollars are spent at the state level by the Office of Tourism. Sample rate taken from the New York MTA recent rental car fee at 5% of gross revenues.

(6) These measures would require more research given the wide range of implementation strategies within each jurisdiction; previous estimates prepared for the 2030 RTP are out-of-date given the significant economic changes that have occurred since then.

(7) Development Impact Fees could only be applied to transit capital expenses and not operating expenses. Local jurisdictions have the authority under the Mitigation Fee Act to impose a fee for transit capital, but new legislation would be required to allow the funding to be used for transit operations.

(8) Any city can establish a Community Facilities District (CFD) under the Mello-Roos Law. However, it appears that statutes do not currently allow use of CFDs to fund transit operations.

(9) Tax Increment Financing can only be used to fund capital purchases. Current law allows redevelopment agencies formed by cities and counties to use this type of funding for transit capital projects in highly populated areas. New state legislation would be required to amend the Community Redevelopment Law to authorize funding for transit operations. New state legislation would also be required to amend the Community Redevelopment Law to authorize funding for transit capital in areas with a population under the current thresholds (4 million in the County or 500,000 in a city).

(10) Currently the maximum tax is being assessed ($0.55 per $500, which is split evenly with $0.55 per $1,000 for each city and $.55 per $1,000 for the County). Any additional tax increase for non-charter cities would require new state legislation.

(11) A charter city can forgo its right to half of this tax (known as a “conforming tax”), and subsequently can levy a “nonconforming tax” in its place. There does not appear to be a limit on the amount a charter city can charge for a so-called nonconforming tax. Current examples of this practice vary and are as high as $15 per $1,000 in Berkeley and Oakland to $1.10 per $1,000 in Riverside.
SMART GROWTH DESIGN GUIDELINES

Introduction

The urban form chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) created a framework for smart growth planning and development in the region by focusing on where and how the region could support its growing population in a sustainable way. The plan recognized that good urban design appropriate to its setting would be a critical factor for making more compact, mixed use development successful in the region. However, there are many elements to well-designed communities that could not be adequately addressed in the RCP, so the development of smart growth design guidelines became one of the implementation strategies that emerged from the plan.

Development of the smart growth design guidelines, entitled Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region, has been underway over the past 12 months under the guidance of the Regional Planning Committee (RPC). The RPC established an ad hoc working group that consisted of members from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), and the Stakeholders Working Group from the last Regional Transportation Plan update to assist in this process. The full document has been reviewed by the TWG and the transportation-related chapters have been reviewed by CTAC and the San Diego Traffic Engineers Council. In addition, the document was made available for public comment this spring. The final draft, discussed in more detail below, is the result of this process.

Discussion

Development of the Guidelines

Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region is one component of the SANDAG smart growth toolkit. It is intended to be a resource for local agencies, planning and design professionals, and interested citizens to help in the development of local plans and design requirements. With an audience this broad, the challenge in writing the document was to provide enough detail to be truly informative while keeping the document brief and user-friendly. The objective is to provide useful guidance without being overly prescriptive that is relevant to the San Diego region’s unique environment.

The ad hoc working group met over the course of nine months to review draft materials and to provide feedback. In addition, two public workshops, one in Encinitas and one in the City of
San Diego, were held to provide an opportunity for broad public input. More than 130 people attended the two workshops and provided a significant amount of feedback. The feedback received at the workshops confirmed that the document as proposed would respond to the needs of its intended audience.

**Content of the Guidelines**

Good design is applicable everywhere, but Designing for Smart Growth focuses on design elements that are particularly important in smart growth areas within the San Diego region. It includes ten chapters that address design in both private and public development. While specific recommendations are made in each topic area, the guidelines are not meant to dictate such things as development densities or building heights. Rather, the guidelines discuss the important elements of design across a range of scales and intensity of development. The objective is to make the guidelines applicable to all of the place types identified in the RCP.

The subjects addressed in each chapter are briefly described below:

- **Introduction**- Provides an overview of the principles of smart growth, how and why the guidelines were developed, and how they relate to other SANDAG documents and policies.
- **Designing for the Region**- Explains what makes places great, how smart growth fits into the context of this region, and provides examples of how existing places could be transformed into smart growth places.
- **Site Design**- Describes how sites can be developed to connect to and be integrated into their communities, and how site design can promote sustainability.
- **Building Design**- Describes how building design can help define the public realm and fit into the existing context while helping to meet the region’s development intensity and sustainability goals.
- **Multimodal Streets**- Describes how to create “complete streets” that serve everyone whether they are driving, walking, riding a bike, or taking transit, in order to provide transportation choices, an essential element of smart growth development.
- **Transit Stations**- Explains how to design transit stations in a way that promotes convenient and universal accessibility.
- **Civic Buildings**- Discusses how to create public buildings as community focal points and gathering places.
- **Parks and Civic Space**- Explains how creating public open spaces contributes to creating attractive communities, increases environmental quality, and creates healthy, active neighborhoods.
- **Parking**- Discusses how to help reduce the demand for parking, provide no more than necessary, and design it in a way that supports walkable, pedestrian-oriented streets.
- **Smart Growth Score Card**- A multifactor score card for evaluating projects in smart growth areas that can be customized to address local priorities.
- **References**- Provides more than fifty references from around the region and across the country on the topics covered in the design guidelines.
In addition to the specific chapter topics, the guidelines address how sustainability and accessibility apply to each subject area. They also include information on specific topics such as form-based codes and crime prevention through environmental design.

**Distribution**

Interest in the guidelines has been high. Comments received from local agency staff, private developers, design professionals, and academics indicate that the document is eagerly awaited and will be used in a number of setting. If accepted by the Board of Directors, copies of Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region will be made available on compact disc, and it will be posted on the SANDAG Web site at [www.sandag.org/smartgrowthdesign](http://www.sandag.org/smartgrowthdesign). A limited number of hard copies also will be made available upon request.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region, Final Version (Board members and alternates only)

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3000200
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: WORK PROGRAM AND SCHEDULE

Introduction

The current 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was adopted in 2007. Federal law requires that SANDAG prepare a long-range transportation plan and make an air quality conformity determination every four years. SANDAG staff has prepared a draft work program and schedule to develop the 2050 RTP, which is slated for adoption in 2011. SANDAG is the first major metropolitan planning organization that will prepare an RTP according to provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Steinberg, 2008). Additionally, proposed roles and responsibilities of various working groups and Policy Advisory Committees are outlined. The purpose of this informational report is to provide an overview of the proposed work plan and its key elements to the Board of Directors. This informational report also was presented at the June 5, 2009, joint meeting of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

Discussion

2050 RTP Work Program: Key Inputs and Components

At the April 24, 2009, Board of Directors meeting, staff provided an overview of the proposed FY 2010 Integrated Work Plan to comply with SB 375. SANDAG staff now has developed a more detailed work program and schedule for the 2050 RTP that incorporates a variety of planning efforts. In accordance with state and federal guidelines, the 2050 RTP is scheduled for adoption by the Board of Directors in July 2011. The 2050 RTP Work Program and Schedule are included as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. A number of key inputs and components that will shape the development of a 2050 RTP are highlighted below.

2050 Regional Growth Forecast

Work already is underway to produce the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast, which will be used in the preparation of the 2050 RTP. The forecast is being developed in two phases. The first phase takes into account existing land uses, planned land uses, and potential redevelopment and infill areas. The second phase involves preparing alternative land use scenarios that can be applied beyond the horizon year of local general plans. The Board of Directors will be asked to approve the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast for planning purposes in early 2010. Additional information about the forecast, including possible transportation and transportation demand management (TDM) measures and upcoming public outreach activities, will be presented for Board discussion at the July 10, 2009, Board Policy meeting.
Updated Goals and Objectives

The Board of Directors adopted seven policy goals to guide the development of the 2030 RTP. Policy objectives also were established to help the region achieve those goals. As part of the 2050 RTP development, the Board of Directors will be asked to review and update the goals and objectives from the 2030 RTP based on emerging issues such as the implementation of SB 375.

Urban Core Transit Strategy

In summer 2009, SANDAG will begin the development of an Urban Core Transit Strategy to evaluate possible regional transit strategies that maximize peak-period transit mode share in the urban core. The strategy will result in three or four long-range strategic transit network alternatives that will be factored into the 2050 RTP. Additionally, the study will include short-term action plans and implementation strategies. The Board of Directors will be asked to approve these alternatives for use in the 2050 RTP development in spring 2010.

Sustainable Communities Strategy

The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) will be a new element of the RTP, as required by SB 375, and will be designed to show how regional greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets, to be established by the California Air Resources Board, would be achieved through development patterns, infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible. Additionally, the SCS must be consistent with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and must address protection of sensitive resource areas. If the SCS does not meet regional GHG reduction targets, an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) must be developed to demonstrate how the targets can be achieved.

The adopted Smart Growth Concept Map, which identifies existing and planned smart growth areas linked to existing and planned public transit, along with the identified habitat conservation areas, will serve as a basis for the SCS. Additionally, the results of the Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP) will provide options for additional measures that could reduce GHG emissions.

Other Key 2050 RTP Tasks

The results of related work efforts, such as the Regional Energy Strategy Update, RCAP, Regional Bicycle Plan, Comprehensive Freight Gateway Forecast, new border crossing at Otay Mesa East, airport multimodal planning, high-speed rail planning, corridor and subregional studies, collaborative projects with Tribal Nations, as well as interregional and binational strategies, will be incorporated.

Other major tasks include updates to the project evaluation criteria and plan performance measures, economic analysis of investment strategies, enhanced environmental justice analysis, new revenue projections, revised cost estimates for projects and services, and integration of technology and TDM measures into investment strategies. Additionally, the 2050 RTP will be subject to any new requirements established in the upcoming federal surface transportation reauthorization, which is anticipated to be passed in 2010, and will incorporate updated California Transportation Commission RTP Guidelines.
RTP/SCS Public Participation Plan

SANDAG regularly involves the public in regional planning efforts. A public participation plan is being prepared to help develop the 2050 RTP. On May 22, 2009, the Board of Directors approved the creation of a new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group to provide input on the development of key work elements in the planning process, including the public participation plan. Additionally, there will be a series of public presentations and workshops and other means for involving the public and receiving input on the work products and draft 2050 RTP. The Board of Directors will be asked to approve the Public Participation Plan in winter 2009.

2050 RTP Environmental Impact Report

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2050 RTP will require analysis beyond what has been included in previous RTP EIRs. The RTP environmental analysis will include GHG emissions baseline measurements and projections, as well as potential mitigation measures that could reduce emissions. The EIR also will include analysis of the additional elements required by SB 375, such as the SCS.

In addition, as part of the environmental review process for the RTP, SB 375 includes California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) streamlining provisions as an incentive to encourage certain types of projects that help achieve the GHG reduction target and are consistent with the SCS (e.g., residential or mixed-use projects that conform to SCS and transit priority projects that meet specified criteria). Cities and counties that find the CEQA streamlining provisions useful will have the opportunity to align their planning policies with those of the regional SCS. It should be noted, however, that the CEQA streamlining provisions are not mandatory and are intended to be a tool that local jurisdictions may use, if desired.

2050 RTP Proposed Roles and Responsibilities

A number of Policy Advisory Committees will provide oversight and policy direction for the development of the 2050 RTP. Several working groups also will provide input throughout the preparation of the plan. The new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group will play an integral role in the development of the 2050 RTP, along with the region’s public works directors and planning directors, who are represented in the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), respectively. The San Diego Region Conformity Working Group (CWG) will be consulted on the development of the air quality conformity analysis. Additionally, staff will make sure that key elements of the 2050 RTP development are brought to the Tribal Transportation Working Group to allow for substantive feedback and input. Finally, the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee’s responsibilities include participating in the ongoing refinement of the SANDAG transportation system performance measurement process and the project evaluation criteria used in the development of the RTP. Attachment 3 outlines the proposed roles and responsibilities of the Policy Advisory Committees and their working groups related to the development of the 2050 RTP.
Next Steps

In order to implement the proposed work plan, SANDAG will benefit from substantial work that is already underway. The adopted Smart Growth Concept Map together with regional habitat conservation areas will serve as a basis for the SCS. A number of planning efforts that will be incorporated in the 2050 RTP development have been initiated, such as the Interstate 5 South Multimodal Corridor Study, and Freight Gateway Forecast. Additionally, a discussion on new goals and policy objectives for the 2050 RTP will be brought to a future Board of Directors Policy meeting.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. 2050 RTP Work Program
2. 2050 RTP Schedule

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

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3000400
2050 RTP WORK PROGRAM

1. Develop Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Work Program
   • Review work program with core working groups, Policy Advisory Committees, and Board of Directors

2. Review and Update RTP Goals and Policy Objectives
   • Confirm consistency with updated Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) directives and Strategic Initiatives
   • Monitor and incorporate new transportation act/bill and other legislation, including Senate Bill (SB) 375 (as needed)
   • Monitor and incorporate updated California Transportation Commission RTP Guidelines (as needed)

3. Public Outreach and Involvement
   • Set up 2050 RTP Project Web page and maintain throughout RTP development and adoption
   • Create new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group and issue mini-grants for outreach to community based organizations
   • Develop Public Participation Plan (PPP) that meets federal transportation bill requirements and SB 375
   • Schedule events and develop outreach products
   • Conduct subregional workshops (3) on Draft 2050 RTP
   • Conduct public hearings (2) on Draft 2050 RTP
   • Analyze ongoing feedback and respond to comments received via the Web page, phone, e-mail, etc.

4. Prepare 2050 Regional Growth Forecast
   • Collect Existing Plans and Policies land use inputs (Phase 1)
   • Create demographic, housing, and economic estimates for Existing Plans and Policies
   • Generate New Growth Forecast (Population and Employment) for Existing Plans and Policies
   • Create and test alternative land use scenarios for capacity to 2050 (Phase 2) and review results with working group and Policy Committees
   • Conduct public workshops on select alternative land use scenarios
   • Generate preliminary draft Growth Forecast for review
   • Finalize 2050 Regional Growth Forecast
5. Incorporate Recommendations from Regional/Corridor/Subregional Studies into Development of Transportation Networks
   • Studies include the Interstate 5 (I-5) South Multimodal Corridor Study, Downtown Transportation Plan, Urban Core Transit Strategy, Regional Bicycle Plan, Impediments to Public Transit, Safe Routes to School Strategy, Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP), Regional Energy Strategy, State Route (SR) 11 and Otay Mesa East Port of Entry Financing Strategy, I-15 Interregional Partnership and Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG) I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan, Tribal Transportation Plans, Corridor System Management Plans, TransNet Early Action project development, Otay Mesa–Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan, California–Baja California Border Master Plan, and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)/Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Guidebook on Congestion Management Process (as needed)

6. Develop Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) (if needed)
   • Conduct workshop for SB 375 Implementation/Greenhouse Gases (GHG) Regional Targets/SCS development
   • Information meeting(s) with elected officials to obtain input on SCS
   • Develop draft SCS based on the adopted Smart Growth Concept Map and results from the Urban Core Transit Strategy and the RCAP
   • Generate alternative(s) land use/transportation scenario for an APS (if needed)
   • Develop draft APS if the SCS does not meet the regional GHG targets (if needed)

7. Update Revenue and Cost Projections for Projects and Services
   • Develop or revise cost estimates for all Unconstrained highway and transit projects based on requirements from federal transportation bill
   • Incorporate revised cost estimates for local streets and roads projects provided by the local jurisdictions
   • Incorporate SR 11–Otay Mesa East Port of Entry Financing Strategy
   • Develop initial revenue projections for the various local, state, and federal revenue sources for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected scenarios
   • Refine and finalize initial revenue projections and cost estimates for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected scenarios

8. Update Regional Arterial System (as needed)

9. Airport Multimodal and Rail Planning
   • Incorporate recommendations from the Airport Multimodal Action Plan (AMAP)
   • Incorporate Air–Rail Network Plan
   • Incorporate Regional Aviation Strategic Plan (RASP), including Destination Lindbergh
10. Develop Technology and Innovation Updates for the RTP
   • Incorporate transportation system management and monitoring systems into the RTP
   • Research future transportation infrastructure and architecture needs and incorporate into the RTP
   • Incorporate assumptions from Regional Energy Strategy Update relating to alternative fuels and vehicles into the RTP

11. Update the Goods Movement Action Plan (as needed)
   • Incorporate findings from the Comprehensive Freight Gateway Study

12. Update Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria
   • Review/revise criteria with a focus on updated goals and policy objectives

13. Update Performance Measures for RTP
   • Re-evaluate and update performance measures to be consistent with 2050 RTP goals and policy objectives
   • Develop measurable objectives consistent with updated RTP performance measures
   • Update base year and projected Levels of Service (LOS), Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), GHG emissions, travel time, speed, and other indicator data for the RTP

14. Develop Network and/or Land Use Alternatives
   • Develop multimodal (transit, high-occupancy vehicle [HOV], Managed Lanes, highway, bicycle, and pedestrian) network alternatives in conjunction with SCS/APS
   • Select networks and land use alternatives to be included in the different financial scenarios of the RTP and in the EIR

15. Analyze Alternatives and Select Preferred Unconstrained Network for RTP
   • Perform travel forecasts and evaluate overall performance
   • Apply updated performance measures, such as overall LOS, VMT, GHG emissions, economic indicators, and average corridor travel times, to provide a grid of overall effectiveness of each alternative
   • Develop Draft Preferred Network for review

16. Conduct Economic Analysis of Transportation Investment Scenarios

17. Develop Environmental Justice Assessment

18. Create Final RTP/SCS and EIR Scenarios
   • Create new Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios
   • Apply revised evaluation criteria to assist in project selection for RTP scenarios
• Develop transportation networks for Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Scenarios for review
• Create EIR alternatives

19. Perform Air Quality (AQ) Forecasts
• Discuss conformity criteria and procedures with San Diego Region Conformity Working Group (CWG)
• Address new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/FTA/FHWA requirements for AQ analysis (as needed)
• Prepare draft air quality conformity determination for Draft RTP for review
• Assist with AQ analysis for Draft and Final EIR
• Prepare final air quality determination

20. Produce Draft RTP

21. EIR Preparation
• Prepare and circulate Notice of Preparation for EIR
• Prepare Draft EIR, including enhanced analysis per SB 375
• Prepare Final EIR

22. Release Draft RTP/EIR for Public Comment

23. Prepare Draft Final RTP

24. Prepare Final EIR

25. Final RTP/EIR Adoption

26. Air Quality Conformity Determination by United States Department of Transportation
## 2050 Regional Transportation Plan Schedule

| 2050 RTP Work Program                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Goals & Objectives                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2050 Regional Growth Forecast        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Public Outreach / Workshops          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Stakeholders Working Group           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Airport Multimodal Planning          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Destination Lindbergh                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Air - Rail / High Speed Rail         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| RASP / AMAP                          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Regional / Subregional / Corridor Planning |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Urban Core Transit Strategy          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Impediments to Transit Study         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| I-5 South                            |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Regional Bicycle Plan                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Goods Movement                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Energy / Climate Change Planning     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Project Evaluation Criteria / Performance Measures |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Revenue & Cost Projections           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Initial 2050 RTP / SCS / RHNA Alternatives |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Evaluation of Alternatives           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Economic Analysis                    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Environmental Justice Analysis       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Final 2050 RTP / SCS / RHNA Scenarios |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Draft 2050 RTP and Air Quality Conformity |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Draft 2050 RTP EIR                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Draft Final 2050 RTP and Air Quality Conformity |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Adopt Final 2050 RTP / EIR / Air Quality Conformity |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
# Roles and Responsibilities for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Tasks</th>
<th>Working Groups</th>
<th>Policy Advisory Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Work Program</td>
<td>CTAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Policy Objectives</td>
<td>TWG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>SWG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>CWG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>ITOC</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/Corridor Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Core Transit Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 South Multimodal Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Multimodal Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Freight Gateway Forecast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Energy Strategy Update/Regional Climate Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial RTP/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)/Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RTP/SCS/RHNA Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2050 RTP and Air Quality (AQ) Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2050 Environmental Impact Report (EIR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Changes for the Draft Final 2050 RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Final 2050 RTP/EIR/AQ Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Board of Directors (BOD)

- Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
- Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)
- Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)
- Regional Working Group (EWG)
- San Diego Region Conformity Working Group (CWG)
- Tribal Transportation Technical Working Group (Tribal TWG)

### Working Groups

- Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
- Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)
- Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)
- Regional Working Group (EWG)
- San Diego Region Conformity Working Group (CWG)
- Tribal Transportation Technical Working Group (Tribal TWG)
Initial Comments of the Public, Item # 2  

June 26, 2009

Honorable Chair and Members of the Board:

Good morning. I’m Mike Bullock, a retired Lockheed Martin Systems Engineer, from Oceanside. I am interested in Smart Growth, Bicycles, and Transit. I plan to speak on two of today’s agenda items. I would like to tell you my impressions of SANDAG and then present you with a specific request.

Here are my qualifications. I contributed to your 2007 RTP. I have been honored to speak with individuals and groups here at SANDAG. I spoke for an hour with Thomas Brucoleri and Kim Weinstein of Ridelink. I gave a 90 minute presentation on car parking to members of the Technical Working Group and Ridelink. Twice, I was invited to speak with Mr. Leiter, first with Stephan Vance and the second time, with Coleen Clementine. I have attended about 5 Technical Working Group meetings. This is my 3rd Board Meeting. I’ve sent and received countless emails.

This organization is staffed by the very best employees. Yet, some of their work fails because this Board sometimes does not supply focus and the correct goal and objective.

The Regional Bicycle Plan and Smart Growth are both CEQA-required mitigations for your RTP’s highway expansion. Therefore they MUST have a single objective and that is to reduce driving.

The Bike Plan has 5 different goals and objectives. Only one of them is correct. Consequently most of the Bike Plan money is being spent in a way that will INCREASE driving, by reinforcing the common myth that a bike cannot be safely ridden on the street with cars.

Similarly the Smart Growth work is NOT focused on reducing driving. For example, the Smart Growth Incentive Plan does NOT rank competing projects on how much they will reduce driving.

A judge will look at this mitigation and wonder what went wrong. The plaintiff will show that the problem started here. It is never too late to do an important job right. Please identify the objective of Smart Growth and the Regional Bicycle Plan to be reduced driving.

Mike Bullock
mike_bullock@earthlink.net
760-754-8025
To all Mayors, Council Members, Members of the Board of Supervisors and Members of SANDAG Board:

In this difficult financial time, you will come under tremendous pressure from the Building Industry Association. It will be as though they suddenly realize that the price of housing is not determined by the cost of that housing. Their usual argument that higher fees will just be passed along to the home buyer doesn't hold up very well in this economy.

This is not the time to reduce development impact fees! This is the time to do a county-wide NEXUS study of the actual cost of new housing to San Diego citizens. Determine the actual cost of the new infrastructure whether it be roads, public transportation, schools, police and fire protection, water supply, sewage treatment, etc., that each new home requires. Determine what the environmental loss will be for each acre of habitat bulldozed for new housing. Determine if and how such losses can be mediated. Then determine a reality-based fee system that reflects the actual costs of growth and includes provisions for inflation.

Developers are not purchasing or optioning land for future development in this market. But this market will turn around, and when it does, developers will go back into business. If developers are given a fee-structure that reflects the true cost of growth, and are required to pay their fair share of the cost, they can factor that into the amount they are willing to pay for raw land.

As a citizen of San Diego County, I am heartily tired of bearing the tax burden of building the infrastructure required by new growth. It adds insult to the injury of the decrease in the quality of life that unchecked development has caused.

Please respond to me at the address below.

Sincerely

[Signature]

Address: W. Ballie
26934 Banbury Dr
Valley Center, CA 92082
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Bailie</td>
<td>26934 Banbury Drive</td>
<td>Valley Center</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downie R. Beckett</td>
<td>1205 Chalcedony Street</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Campell</td>
<td>3635 Pershing Avenue</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92104-3415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald C. de Blanc</td>
<td>1403 Timber Glen</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Embry</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2233</td>
<td>Valley Center</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. J. Emerson</td>
<td>1080 Klish Way</td>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Froome</td>
<td>5531 La Cuenta Drive</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92124-1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet &amp; Gordon Gastil</td>
<td>P.O. Box 249</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91944-0249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Keyes</td>
<td>57 East L Street</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Knecht</td>
<td>13291 Creekside Lane</td>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn LePage</td>
<td>1098 Turnstone Way</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92057-7716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Pellar</td>
<td>7224 Spoonbill Lane</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92011-5016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pomeroy</td>
<td>1568 Katella Way</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen L. Rollins</td>
<td>2249 Medford Place</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James &amp; Linda Schafer</td>
<td>1975 Encino Drive</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. C. Towl</td>
<td>1111 Alta Vista Avenue</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East County Bus Maintenance Facility (ECBMF) Budget Consolidation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors

(1) approve the transfer of the remaining $686,386 in SANDAG project 1142700 (ECBMF CNG Station) to SANDAG project 1049600 (ECBMF); and

(2) accept the transfer of $501,600 in dedicated funding, including federal grant E2007-BUSP-0062, from MTS CIP 11237 (East County Land Acquisition) to SANDAG project 1049600 (ECBMF).
Board of Directors

First Reading of Proposed Amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance Regarding Audit Reporting for the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP)

June 26, 2009

TransNet Extension Ordinance
Fiscal Audit – RTCIP Coordination Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Audit Process Milestones</th>
<th>Fiscal Audit Process</th>
<th>Existing RTCIP Deadlines</th>
<th>Proposed RTCIP Deadlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation of Audit Team</td>
<td>July-August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Auditor Site Visits</td>
<td>September-November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Financial Records Deadline</td>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Draft Audit Reports to SANDAG and Jurisdictions</td>
<td>November-December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finalize Audit Issues with Recipient Agencies</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Annual Report Preparation</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Draft Audit Reports and Annual Report to ITOC and TC (60-day review)</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Final Audit and Annual Reports Issued by ITOC</td>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Final Audit and Annual Reports Presented to BOD</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Each jurisdiction shall determine its own schedule for collecting and/or contributing private sector exactions to its Funding Program. This schedule shall be kept up-to-date and provided to SANDAG and the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee each year at the time of the annual review and audit. Each jurisdiction must submit its Funding Program documents, including an expenditure plan and financial records pertaining to its Funding Program, to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for a review and audit by July 1 of each year beginning July 1, 2009. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee shall review each jurisdiction’s Funding Program consistent with its auditing role as described in Section 11 of the Ordinance and the Statement of Understanding referenced in that Section."

Section G(2) of RTCIP Attachment
**TransNet Extension Ordinance - Proposed**

“Each jurisdiction shall determine its own schedule for collecting and/or contributing private sector exactions to its Funding Program. This schedule shall be kept up-to-date and provided to SANDAG and the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee each year at the time of the annual review and audit. Each jurisdiction must submit its Funding Program documents, including an expenditure plan and financial records pertaining to its Funding Program, to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for a review and audit by July December 1 of each year beginning July December 1, 2009. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee shall review each jurisdiction’s Funding Program consistent with its auditing role as described in Section 11 of the Ordinance and the Statement of Understanding referenced in that Section.”

Section G(2) of the RTCIP Attachment

**TransNet Extension Ordinance - Existing**

“The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee identified in Section 11 of the Ordinance shall be responsible for issuing an annual audit statement on each jurisdiction’s compliance with requirements of Section 9 of the TransNet Ordinance by October 1 of each year beginning October 1, 2009. SANDAG will report to the Board on the RTCIP and the annual audit statement in November of each year beginning in November 2009.”

Section G(5) of RTCIP Attachment
TransNet Extension Ordinance - Proposed

“The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee identified in Section 11 of the Ordinance shall be responsible for issuing an annual audit statement of each jurisdiction’s compliance with requirements of Section 9 of the TransNet Ordinance by October June 1 of each year beginning October 1, 2009 June 1, 2010. SANDAG will report to the Board on the RTCIP and with the annual fiscal audit statement in November June of each year beginning in November 2009 June 2010.”

Section G(5) of RTCIP Attachment

Next Steps

• Recommended by Transportation Committee and ITOC at June meetings
• Proposed Second Reading and Approval by Board of Directors at July 24, 2009 meeting
• Amendments to Board Policy 31 recommended by Executive Committee on June 12, 2009 and proposed for approval at July 24, 2009 Board of Directors meeting
• Give direction to auditors in July-August 2009
Recommendation

As recommended by the Transportation Committee and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee, the Board of Directors is asked to conduct the first reading of the CO-09-01, which would amend CO-04-01 to align the timeline for the RTCIP audits with the TransNet annual fiscal and compliance audit requirements (“Amendment” [Attachment 1]).

The Board of Directors is further asked to approve a one-time extension of time to September 1, 2009, for jurisdictions to submit financial records pertaining to their RTCIP Funding Programs for review and audit in order to allow sufficient time for the proposed Amendment to be considered.

Board of Directors

First Reading of Proposed Amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance Audit Reporting for the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP)

June 26, 2009
TDA/TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program

FY 2010 Funding Recommendations

June 26, 2009

Funding Availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>$4.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7.8 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 2010 Applications

- 26 Capital Projects $8.5 million
- 12 Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plans, Bicycle Parking, Support Programs $1.4 million
- 38 Total Applications $9.9 million

Project Evaluation Process

- **May 20, 2009:** Project presentations to Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group
- **May 21, 2009:** Review Panel
- **May 27, 2009:** Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group recommendations
- **June 10, 2009:** Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee review for eligibility and compliance with TransNet
- **June 19, 2009:** Transportation Committee recommendation
Recommended Funding Allocations

$1.15 Million - Bicycle Plans, Pedestrian Plans, Bicycle Parking, and Support Programs

- 5 Bicycle Master Plans
- 1 Pedestrian Master Plan
- 1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
- 3 Bicycle Parking Projects
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program
- SANDAG Regional Bicycle Map

$6.5 Million - Capital Projects

- 2 Bicycle Projects
- 8 Pedestrian Projects
- 8 Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects – Class I (Shared Use) Bike Path
Next Steps

• July and August 2009: Grant Agreements

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve (1) the list of projects for funding as shown in Attachment 6; and (2) Resolution No. 2009-30 approving the FY 2010 TDA Article 3 allocation as shown in Attachment 7.
Save Our Forests & Ranchlands- Quote list: Pro-Transit

"We’re not going to do it all with the technology alone. We have absolutely got to incorporate reductions in our dependence on vehicles," said Nichols. "Integrated land use and transportation planning is critical to reducing the need to drive and helping us to address climate change." -Mary Nichols, chair of the California Air Resources Board, which is charged with implementing California’s landmark climate change bill, AB32.

SANDAG will be the first regional metropolitan planning organization requested under newly adopted legislation (SB 375) to develop a regional GHG target and plan to reduce emissions associated with land use and transportation. it is clear that reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled will directly reduce emissions. Emissions from cars and light-duty trucks represented the largest fraction of total GHG emissions, or 46% of the total. -Energy Policy 37 (2009) 2831–2835. Applying California’s AB 32 targets to the regional level: A study of San Diego County greenhouse gases and reduction strategies
Scott J. Anders a, David O. De Haan b, Nilmini Silva-Send a, Sean Tanaka c, Lauren Tyner b

...the region can play a jurisdictionally direct role for a significant amount of the reductions needed. For example, we identified that at least 10% reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would be needed to achieve the reduction wedge for on-road transportation in addition to state mandates. Such reductions can be made only at the local level by city and regional planning organizations through land use development and transit planning. - Energy Policy 37 (2009) 2831–2835 Applying California’s AB 32 targets to the regional level: A study of San Diego County greenhouse gases and reduction strategies
Scott J. Anders a, David O. De Haan b, Nilmini Silva-Send a, Sean Tanaka c, Lauren Tyner b

The additional economic benefits from the transportation impacts of transit investment in major metropolitan areas are substantial. For every $10 million invested, over $15 million is saved in transportation costs to both highway and transit users. These costs include operating costs, fuel costs, and congestion costs. Public Transportation and the Nation’s Economy, Cambridge Systematics, Inc. 1999.

"One of my highest priorities is to help promote more livable communities through sustainable surface transportation programs." Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood

These figures reveal that investments in public transportation produce almost nine percent more jobs per dollar spent than road and bridge repair and maintenance projects, and nearly 19 percent more jobs than new road or bridge projects. For every $1.25 billion spent on public transportation projects (assuming half of the funds are spent on new capital projects and half are spent on operations), nearly 51,300 people are employed. –Surface Transportation Policy Project, 2004

With transportation contributing one-third of all global warming pollution nationally, it’s clear that we need transportation solutions that give people reliable, affordable alternatives to driving for every trip. Public transportation produces 95 percent less carbon monoxide (CO), 90 percent less in volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and about half as much carbon dioxide (CO2) and nitrogen oxide (NOx), per passenger mile, as private vehicles. -Public Transit Investment Fuels More Jobs Commentary, Carl Paine, Posted: Jan 19, 2009 www.newamericamedia.org
June 24, 2009

SANDAG
Board of Directors
401 B Street, Ste. 700
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Members of the Board,

I appreciate the Transit Impediments Study completed by San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) as part of the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan settlement agreement. The study comprehensively covered the current and potential financial and ridership obstacles in San Diego’s transportation system. I made statements during the Transportation Committee’s June 20th public hearing on the issue, and I am pleased to provide my full comments for your consideration below.

New funding sources are the absolute key to stabilizing and eventually strengthening San Diego’s transit system. Current formulas, restrictions and the general availability of money seem to almost cripple us from securing more from the sources with which we are most familiar. Reading how tied the hands of local agencies are confirmed for me how efficient SANDAG, MTS and NCTD have been with the funding streams.

At this critical juncture, when our services are being cut and passenger fares are being increased in the face of budget challenges, it is absolutely imperative that we pursue all funding options outlined in the study, at least through a preliminary investigatory phase. The study clearly stated on page 14, “As the transit agencies have to cut service to accommodate decline in other funds, their relative share of the national program also could be cut.” It is therefore inappropriate and shortsighted to eliminate any options at this time. Some proposals that may seem illogical for some jurisdictions may fit well in others, and SANDAG should take its role as the regional planning agency seriously in moving forward for the benefit of all of San Diego without distractions of NIMBYism or personal preference.

I was impressed by the possibilities considered in this study for new funding streams, including the benefit assessment districts. Some board members may hesitate allowing residents to consider assessments for transit. Many denser, urban neighborhoods, including those I represent, already tolerate transit. Residents in these areas may be willing to pay an assessment to improve the service so it works better for them, both directly and by decreasing congestion and changing surrounding land use.

We must also actively pursue ongoing federal transit operations funding as our congressional delegation discusses and develops MAP-21. We need to be lobbying in unison for more money...
overall in MAP-21; the amount authorized currently is not and will not be enough. Beyond that, championing additional flexibility in how funds can be used should be a priority. (Page 33)

I found the idea of a local Transit Operation and Protection Program which would prioritize ongoing maintenance and operations of current systems over new projects quite intriguing, and I would appreciate seeing that pursued. (Page 33)

I also want to applaud the discussion of coordinating our transit system with social services and would like to add major employers and business groups to that potential coalition. I completely agree that we can have a far more workable system if we do not operate in a vacuum. (Page 34)

My thorough review of the study did yield a few questions, and responses to these, either formally or operationally, could benefit the transit system and its riders.

The study suggested that the San Diego region could be hurt by our higher costs of doing business as related to the “cost per revenue mile” formula. Is this an obstacle we need to accept or an item that could be addressed in the federal transportation reauthorization bill? (Page 14)

Could the concern that Section 5310 Formula Funds for Service to Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities that MTS and NCTD cannot be provided with certainty “… that the nonprofit agency is the most qualified or most cost-effective choice” to serve as a contractor for elderly and disabled transportation be addressed with more oversight, tighter application processing or another administrative option? Though this is very minor money, it seemed like this could be somewhat easily remedied. (Page 16)

To involve the public more deeply in this conversation, I shared information about the Transit Impediments Study with my friends and neighbors. Some may have offered their input directly to SANDAG, and I am attaching online comments I received for your information.

Again, I appreciate the effort that went into the Transit Impediments Study and am grateful for the foundation it provides to move this conversation and our transit system forward.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

TODD GLORIA
Councilmember, District Three

TG:kek

Attachment
PUBLIC TRANSIT ALERT: Your Input Is Needed
Fri at 12:28pm

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) recently released its draft Transit Impediments Study. The report summarizes both financial and leadership impediments to maintaining long-term transit service levels throughout San Diego County. The report also includes potential alternatives based on overcoming the identified impediments, increasing and maintaining service levels and increasing and maintaining funding for transit operational expenses. The public comment period on this study is now open for a 60 day public review.

As a member of the Transit Board and SANDAG's Transportation Committee, I've been a vocal opponent of cutting transit service in our urban communities and increasing fares on San Diego's transit riders. This study is a step toward creating long term solutions to our lack of transit operation funding which is what causes cuts in service and increases in fares.

If you'd like to join me in demanding a transit system that works for all San Diegans, please review the Transit Impediments Study and send your feedback to SANDAG. The point of contact for your comments is below. You can read the study and learn more about this important issue by visiting http://sandeg.org/Kelso.asp?projectid=3264&action=projects
detail.

Thank you!

SPEAK OUT FOR PUBLIC TRANSIT

The SANDAG Board of Directors opened a 60-day public comment on this study on April 24, 2009. Written comments can be sent to Philip Term, Associate Regional Planner, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101. Phone: (619) 699-7330, E-mail: pter@sandag.org

Gary C. Hardt at 12:53am June 19:
We currently have one of the best transit's in the state, extend to SL, we should support expanding mass transit, making it more and more easier, so people will want to take it. I love the trolley system. We should extend it to North County along the 15, what a savings in traffic that would be.

Robert E. Lee at 3:59pm June 19:
Hmm, seems to me that taking transfers away was an impediment to low-income riders.

Brian Murphy at 1:10pm June 19:
Agree 100% with extending the trolley up the 15!!! Why did Caltrans extend the HOV lanes so far, even putting them way up off the ground (presumably at great expense). Instead of extending the trolley?

Robert E. Lee at 1:38pm June 19:
I agree about the 15, too. After all, that was the bargain that was struck when the 15 was plowed through City Heights a couple decades ago, that the 15 corridor would provide transit solutions for the working class folks in that neighborhood/community.

A Latham Staples at 5:28pm June 19:
It really irks me that we don't have an extension up the 5 through UTC. UTC already serves as a transit center second to downtown. With all the buses that move through here it would only make sense to have the rail stop.

Darynne Hassan-Hall at 1:17pm June 19:
I'd like to see transit improvement in the Bonita area.
Applications

Lois Beth at 1:22pm June 19

There are many ways to improve our transit system:
1. Build an extension on the trolley directly to the airport. The trolley now travels within shot of the airport, making it convenient to walk there. This doesn't involve having to travel on Harbor Dr.
2. I see these new big buses and I'm asking “WHY?” Have you ever seen any of those accordion buses traveling around town? Normally you could load the buses on the buses into a minivan. It would take less fuel and the buses would have more passengers. Take a bus in San Francisco and see how low cost and frequent buses work. The only problem in S.F. is that the buses are so full that one has to stand. I wouldn't mind.
3. The city's answer to the rider-ship on buses is to charge more to ride, or to make one pay for a transfer. The fact that you have to transfer to get from Point A to Point B is painful enough, let alone getting charged to do it. No wonder the buses are empty!

Robert E. Lee at 1:16pm June 19

Up to this point, the UTC extension has not happened because the county was getting the cost estimates confused. I have no updated numbers, but with materials costs that have gone up, the total is now way out of D.C., maybe the local transit board, SANDAG, etc., can take another look at the proposed UTC extension, and get the money lined up now while it's still available.

Robert E. Lee at 1:11pm June 19

I'm enjoying this policy discussion, Lois. I agree about integrating trolley service more directly with the airport. It could greatly cut down on some of the traffic that now dogs the road if the airport. We should look at which option is the least expensive, more cost effective. Moving the trolley tracks and service area to the airport or building a moving, pedestrian walkway from the current trolley stop over to the airport. Rider option is cheaper, but definitely deserves to happen, one way or the other.

Paul Ciulla at 1:10pm June 19

For ridership to become adopted culturally by a majority of residents, San Diego mass transit must innovate and use a long haul/short haul hybrid system. Long haul = trolley, LRV, coax, etc. Short haul = electric vehicles (like GEMs) either as taxis or personal vehicles.

Johnny Von G at 1:05pm June 19

good to see todd doing an awesome job!!

David Anglezovski at 1:04pm June 19

I hear the new airport plan includes a trolley stop (when they move the terminal). What about the Zoo link that's suppose to go up Park? That is something we (and the tourist) could use.

Christopher R Paddock at 1:03pm June 19

can we get a public aerial gondola that goes from the old trolley park to uni heights down to mission valley and get bikers off texas?

Brian J Rager at 1:00pm June 19

I would love to see light rail trolley service down Adams, down Park, and down University Ave, and then downtown.

Christopher: I believe there is a nice lighted gradient foot path in the plans for Texas street to get walkers and bikers off the street.

Jim Schuster at 12:59pm June 19

I've wondered for about 20 years now why we don't have a trolley running through the mostly dense populated area of the county which has to be mid-city. A trolley running from downtown near Balboa Park, to Hillcrest, North Park and City Heights would be heavily used and take a lot of cars off the road. I recognize that it would probably cost a ZILLION dollars to build, but still it would be the best place to have a trolley.

Move San Diego at 11:49pm June 19

Great ideas everyone. Great to see so much interest in more effective public transit. Todd and Move San Diego will be on
KUSI on Monday talking about what San Diego should be demanding for the future of our public transit.

Jim Leckliter at 3:16pm June 19
How about connecting all the transit systems, the speed rail in escondido I think it is should connect to our trolley system. The center is expensive and if the trolley was expanded would save money and SD money. IDEE the transfer fee for sure.

Lyn Swint at 2:46pm June 19
I like the trolley and always take it if I need to go downtown - if I can find a parking spot at the Old Town transit center. Was almost late for jury duty a couple of times because it was full and I had to drive around a while before finding a legal spot 6-8 blocks away from the station. That last always seems to be full by 8am. And the Linda Vista lot is filled up fast too and if I use it I have to transfer at Old Town anyway.

I would love to see a trolley extension up I5 to the UCSD and UTC area. And a station with some parking for it in the Bank/Morena/IS area would be wonderful. It would really help the I5 traffic for those of us (me) who go regularly to the area. I would have used it RT 3 times this week if it existed.

Todd Gloria at 4:02pm June 19
Thanks for the feedback. Keep it coming. Quick response: trolley service along I5 to UCSD UTC is planned. Bus Rapid Transit is planned to the Zoo/Roabi Park, along Park Blvd, and downtown El Cajon Blvd. Details on both projects are at http://sandiego.org/metro.asp?project=9#&subsection=home,subcatbusinfo Again, check out the draft study and send your thoughts to SANDAG. Better public transit in San Diego is possible!

Gary C. Hardin at 5:00pm June 19
The trolley line up the I5 north, was probably political. A lot of communities fight the trolley extension, because it supposedly brings the homeless to their communities easier. Which is a ridiculous reason.

Gary C. Hardin at 6:32pm June 19
Regarding the airport trolley extension, we know that the taxi companies and other airport shuttles strongly opposed this from the get go, that's why we don't have it to the airport today.

Curt McCaskill at 7:15pm June 20
The trolley does not stop at the three most popular destinations in our city, Sea World, the San Diego Zoo, and the airport. I agree with GR's comments, the heavy services will appear. Time that got fixed, I've never understood why Europeans do this so well and we fail, perhaps looking at what drives their success can be ours. But the bottom...

Read More

Amy Donlan at 8:16pm June 20
Why doesn't HTS listen to Alan Hoffman? The guy's the only one who can fix this mess.

Victor Roman at 1:34am June 21
Mid city needs some kind of transit with a dedicated ROW. I don't care if it's LRT or BRT as long as it doesn't have to slow down or stop at every intersection. The ROW is expensive to build, build them first and throw in a cheap BRT and then upgrade to LRT later.

Also, enclosed bus stops that you have to pay to enter would make things much faster. You pay to get into the bus stop, the bus pulls up, everyone just waits on at once without having to pay. They do this in Argentina, they have metal tubes you pay to get into and then you just step onto the bus when it arrives.

Selfishly, I wish there was at least a bus route that would take me from Mid City to Sorrento Valley/Mira Mesa where I work. There's a route that goes the opposite direction each day. I miss walking downtown, taking the express bus or trolley.

Write a comment...
Honorable Chair and Members of the Board:

From State Senator Lowenthal, comes the following information:

"In the short term, changes to parking policy can reduce traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions more than all other strategies combined."

The Transit Impediments Study needs to include unbundling the cost of car parking because that will greatly increase transit ridership. In my comments on this document I attached my input to the Smart Growth Design Guideline. That Word file's, entire Section 9.8, "The Future of Parking" needs to be incorporated into the Transit Impediments Study.

I understand that the Transit District does not control most car parking. However where it does, it can set an example. It has complete control over parking at Coaster stations and at those stations it has a policy, so-called "free parking", that maximizes driving to the station instead of maximizing ridership. The Transit Impediments Study is the correct place to tell the Transit District that the goal of the parking policy at Coaster Stations should be to maximize ridership.

Section 9.8.4, of my input to the Smart Growth Design Guideline describes how that can be done.

The Transit District's very significant Compass Card program was left out of the Transit Impediments Study's Technology Enhancement Section. That really disappointed me. Compass cards are a great start. We should all realize that although we may need pay stations and 1-day RFID tickets for a time, that approach to parking and using transit will quickly go the way of the phone booth. As soon as essentially all parkers and riders have valid RFID mailing accounts, a whole new world of marketing and targeting service will open up to the transit districts. The Transit Impediments Study's Table 2, Factors Influencing Interest in Future Riders, hints at this extreme importance.

Too often, governments fail to use a system's approach and the latest technology. Please have the Transit Impediments Study include a description of how parking policy can increase ridership.

Mike Bullock
mike_bullock@earthlink.net
760-754-8025
Mike Bullock’s proposed improvements to the first draft of

DESIGNING FOR SMART GROWTH
CREATING GREAT PLACES,
MORE CHOICES AND LESS DRIVING IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION


Highlights:

1.) Traffic reduction and saving money on parking, by adopting good parking policies are identified as ways to help get projects built (its not just about great design)

2.) New Parking subsection (Section 9.1) to cover the cost, value, and pricing of parking

3.) Throughout “Guidelines”, the phrase “Parking Demand Management” is replaced by neutral words.

4.) Current, draft sub-sections on parking are renamed so as to identify them as what they are: Best Practice

5.) A new parking subsection (Section 9.8) is added to cover the future of parking.
   a.) Unbundled Cost and Spontaneous Sharing
   b.) The RFID Age, Examples and the Vendor Role
   c.) Features of Future Parking (“Intelligent Parking”)  
   d.) Train Station Applications
   e.) Legal Reach
   f.) Conclusion

6.) Scorecard to more heavily weigh reducing VMT

7.) 14 Additional references: CTC Amended Guidelines, 12 on Cashout, Intelligent Parking

Michael Bullock
mike_bullock@earthlink.net
1800 Bayberry Drive
Oceanside, CA 92054
760-754-8025
March 12, 2009
Ground rules: “Should be” means that I am saying that the “Is” wording should be changed to the “Should be” words. All changes are shown in blue, except those made in the extra time given for comments (to March 26th) which are shown in violet. My comments are in green.

On the Title Page, the picture is fine.

Is:

creating great places
in the san diego region

Should be:

creating more choices and less driving
in the san diego region

Or perhaps,

Should be:

creating great places, more choices, and less driving
in the san diego region

Chapter 1 has a 2-paragraph introduction. That is fine. However, the 2nd paragraph, which is:

SANDAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted in 2004, offers a vision for change in the San Diego region that strongly emphasizes sustainability and smart growth. It also underscores the importance of high-quality urban design, acknowledging that higher-intensity infill development can win acceptance with members of the public only if it is designed well. The RCP notes that good design “can be the difference between a sense of overcrowding and a feeling of vibrancy.” To ensure that new infill development has high-quality design, the RCP calls for SANDAG to prepare a set of smart growth design guidelines.

needs to be balanced by the following paragraph:

Should be added:

However, winning acceptance from members of the public is not the only hurdle. There is always a need to balance good design with acceptable cost. A failure to reduce car-parking cost could prevent a project from getting built. Chapter 9 gives cost estimates for surface, structure, and underground parking. It also defines and details operational methods to reduce the need for parking by reducing driving. These methods give potential drivers a free choice they often lack. Since a primary goal of Smart Growth is to reduce driving, these operational considerations are of paramount importance. Finally, these methods are important because less traffic can also help a project win acceptance from members of the public.

1.1 Purpose of the guideline
**Is:**

*Designing for Smart Growth* fulfills the RCP’s vision by providing design guidelines for infill development throughout the San Diego region. It is a key part of SANDAG’s Smart Growth Tool Box, which includes both planning and financing tools. The guidelines in *Designing for Smart Growth* are based on best practices from communities throughout the San Diego region, as well as other cities in California and throughout the United States. Many of these guidelines have been illustrated by showing examples from the San Diego region; however, *Designing for Smart Growth* also provides examples from other cities in California and throughout the United States.

**Should be:**

The purpose of *Designing for Smart Growth* is to reduce driving. It also fulfills the RCP’s vision by providing design guidelines for infill development throughout the San Diego region. It is a key part of SANDAG’s Smart Growth Tool Box, which includes both planning and financing tools. The guidelines in *Designing for Smart Growth* are generally based on best practices from communities throughout the San Diego region, as well as other cities in California and throughout the United States. Many of these guidelines have been illustrated by showing examples from the San Diego region; however, *Designing for Smart Growth* also provides examples from other cities in California and throughout the United States. Since reformed car-parking policies have a significant potential to reduce driving, their descriptions could go beyond current practice. Such descriptions could result in vendors coming forward with proposals to help cities and developers pioneer these new methods.

**Is:**

1.3.2 Local Plans and Policies

*Designing for Smart Growth* is intended to serve as an inspiration for developers, designers, local governments and citizens throughout the San Diego region. It does not replace the Specific Plans, design guidelines, engineering standards and zoning ordinances that local jurisdictions have already adopted to regulate design in their communities. However, local jurisdictions in the San Diego region are encouraged to use *Designing for Smart Growth* as a starting point for their own planning efforts, as well as a reference to help them understand the key principles of creating great places.

**Should be:**

1.3.2 Local Plans and Policies

*Designing for Smart Growth* is intended to serve as an inspiration for developers, designers, local governments and citizens throughout the San Diego region. It does not replace the Specific Plans, design guidelines, engineering standards and zoning ordinances that local jurisdictions have already adopted to regulate design in their communities. However, local jurisdictions in the San Diego region are encouraged to use *Designing for Smart Growth* as a starting point for their own planning efforts, as well as a reference to help them understand the key principles of creating great places that will reduce driving. Often, local governments will want to improve their parking ordinances and add conditions to their approvals of new developments so that the economic discrimination against those that drive less will be eliminated.

**Is:**

6.1.5 Vehicle and Bicycle Parking
Adequate parking must be available at transit stations for people who arrive at the station by car or bicycle.

- Provide secure bicycle parking in the form of bike lockers or “bike stations” with valet parking. Use bike lockers that clearly indicate when they are occupied, so station patrons can see they are being used.
- Locate unsecured bicycle parking such as bike racks in places with high foot traffic, so that they receive natural surveillance from passersby.
- Design transit stations to provide for increased bicycle parking in the future as mode share increases.
- Incorporate an appropriate amount of vehicle parking, using parking structures wherever possible. Manage demand by charging a fee for parking where appropriate.
- Place surface parking lots in clusters that are large enough to be developed in the future with mixed-use buildings, offices, townhouses, multi-family dwellings or parking structures.

Should be:

6.1.5 Vehicle and Bicycle Parking
Adequate bicycle parking must be available at transit stations. Car parking supply and car parking policies should be adopted to maximize the use of transit.

- Provide secure bicycle parking in the form of bike lockers or “bike stations” with valet parking. Use bike lockers that clearly indicate when they are occupied, so station patrons can see they are being used.
- Locate unsecured bicycle parking such as bike racks in places with high foot traffic, so that they receive natural surveillance from passersby.
- Design transit stations to provide for increased bicycle parking in the future as mode share increases.
- Incorporate an appropriate amount of vehicle parking, using parking structures wherever possible. Manage demand by charging a fee for parking where appropriate.
- Place surface parking lots in clusters that are large enough to be developed in the future with mixed-use buildings, offices, townhouses, multi-family dwellings or parking structures.
- The methods described in Section 9.8.4 should be used. It is likely that at least some, if not all, of the parking will have been provided for the riders of the train, LRT, or BRT, which is the focus of the transit station. More specifically, it will have been built for those riders that originate their trips at the station and, in general, return to the station. If so, these riders constitute a beneficiary group at the station, as explained in Section 9.8.1. This means that the transit-portion of the parking should be priced using the full-cost pricing methods described in Section 9.1 and the earnings achieved should be distributed to the riders, again, as described in Chapter 9.8.

Chapter 9, Parking

Introductory words:
Is:

A primary goal of smart growth is to enable people to modify their travel behavior by using alternate modes of travel, reducing trip length and combining trips. As a result, communities that reflect the principles of smart growth will have a reduced number of vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled. However, not all vehicle trips will be replaced by transit, walking or bicycling trips. A well-designed place must accommodate all modes of travel, including the automobile. The challenge for designers is to provide a parking supply that is slightly constrained but does not deter customers, frustrate tenants or create problems for nearby residents. It is also essential to accommodate parking while still creating walkable, pedestrian-oriented streets.

Should be:

One of the best metrics of smart growth is how well it enables people to modify their travel behavior by using alternate modes of travel, reducing trip length and combining trips. Smart growth will generate less vehicle miles traveled (VMT), compared to our general, current standards of development. One of the primary ways it can do this is by making parking costs visible and optional. This feature is often referred to as "unbundling the cost of parking". It is our most cost-effective means of reducing driving.

Reducing driving helps get a project built, in two ways. First, it supports reducing the amount of parking required. The cost of parking can make a project economically unfeasible. Second, less driving will make the project less objectionable to those living close to it.

However, not all vehicle trips will be replaced by transit, walking or bicycling trips. For the foreseeable future, a well-designed place must accommodate automobiles. The challenge is to require a parking supply and a parking policy that does not deter developers, businesses, or those looking to buy real estate or; after the development is in operation, does not deter customers, frustrate tenants, or create problems for nearby residents. It is also essential that the parking is physically situated to minimize its harm to the goal of creating walkable, pedestrian-oriented streets.

Cost and Pricing are left out. This is unacceptable. The following is a new section that is needed. I suggest that it be placed as the first section, so that the numbers of the following sections are advanced by 1. Both the current Section 9.3 (which will become Section 9.4) and the new Section 9.8 will benefit from this information.

Should be added:

9.1 Cost, Value, Pricing, and the Use of Each

On September 23, 2008, a panel of experts reviewed the Oceanside, Ca. "Coast Highway Vision". Parts of this plan were described as smart growth.

At the review, developer Tom Wiegel said, “Parking is the number 1 reason to do nothing.”

Developers must estimate the cost of parking when they assess the economic feasibility of projects. Planners need to also be able to do the same thing. Requiring less parking can help reduce the cost. In order to responsibly do that, the parking cost needs to be unbundled from the cost of other transactions. A cost cannot be unbundled if it is unknown. For example, the best way to unbundle parking cost is to put a fair price on parking. However, a fair price cannot be determined without knowledge of the cost.

While cost estimates support economic feasibility assessments, actual, as-built cost is the best basis for determining the fair, “full-cost” or “full-value” price. Actual cost will differ from estimated cost and will depend
on the sale price of land, the cost of materials, and cost of labor. As projects are built, it is important to have a record of the actual, as-built cost of the parking.

9.1.1 Estimated and Actual Cost

9.1.1.1 Surface Parking

One acre of surface parking will accommodate 120 cars. Coastal land, zoned for mixed use could be expensive. For example, at $1.2 million per acre, the land for a single parking space costs $10,000. Construction cost should be added to this to get the actual, as-built cost of each parking space. Estimated cost can be determined by using appraised land value and construction estimates. After the parking is developed, it is important to get the true, as-built cost put into a permanent data file.

9.1.1.2 Parking-Garage Parking

One acre of parking-garage parking will accommodate considerably more than 120 cars. The construction cost of the garage and the value of its land can be added together to get the total cost. Dividing that total cost by the number of parking spaces yields the total, as-built cost of each parking space. Although adding levels to a parking garage may seem like a way to cut the cost of each parking space, for the case of expensive land, there is a limit to the usefulness of this strategy because the taller the parking garage, the more massive the supporting structural members must be on the lower levels, which increases total cost. Parking-garage parking spaces are often said to cost between $20,000 and $40,000. It is important to get the true, as-built cost put into a permanent data file.

9.1.1.3 Underground Parking

In order to compute an estimate for the cost of a parking space that is under a building, it is necessary to get an estimate of the building with and without the underground parking. The difference, divided by the number of parking spaces, yields the cost of each parking space. The cost or value of land plays no role in the cost of this parking. However, it does not follow that this parking is cheap. Underground parking spaces are often said to cost between $60,000 and $90,000 dollars each. Although there will be an “as built” cost of the building with the parking, there will never be an “as built” cost of the building without the parking. However, after the construction is done, the estimate for the cost of the underground parking should be reconsidered and re-estimated if that is needed. It is important to get the final, best-estimate cost put into a permanent data file.

9.1.2 Value

Initially, value and cost are the same. For surface parking and parking-garage parking, the value would initially be the same as the as-built cost. For underground parking, the value would initially be the same as the best-estimate cost. However, over time the value must be updated. Both construction costs and land-value costs will change. The value assigned to a parking place should always be based on the current conditions.

9.1.3 Pricing

Parking space “values”, as describe above, must be converted to a yearly price by using a reasonable conversion factor. This conversion factor could be based on either the “cost of money” or the “earnings potential of money”. It is expected that this conversion factor would be 2% to 5% during times of low interest rates and slow growth; but could be over 10% during times of high-interest and high growth. For example, if surface parking value is $12,000 and it is agreed upon to use 5% as the conversion factor, then each parking spot should generate $600 per year for “profit” plus the amount needed for operations and maintenance.
These amounts of money, that are required to be generated in a year, need to be re-calculated every year or so, since both the values and the conversion factors will, in general, change each year.

Once the amount generated per year is known, the base price per unit year can be computed by dividing it (the amount generated per year) by the expected fraction of time that the space will be occupied, over a year. For example, if a parking space needs to generate $900 per year but it will only be occupied 50% of the time, the time rate charge is $1800 per year. This time rate can then be converted to an hourly or even a “per minute” base, time rate. There is no reason for any significant round off when time rates are applied. In general, each second of parking should increase the total charge.

Is:

9.1 Surface Parking

Should be:

9.2 Surface Parking

Is:

9.2 Parking Garages

Should be:

9.3 Parking Garages

Is:

9.3 Parking Demand Management

Most parking regulations seek to ensure that people who want to visit a site are not turned away by a lack of parking, and do not spill over onto other streets or parking lots. Traditional parking requirements typically meet these goals by requiring an excessive number of vehicle parking spaces for each land use. However, when the demand for parking is carefully managed, the amount of parking can be reduced, potentially by as much as 25 percent, while still meeting the needs of drivers.

Regarding the change in section title: Charging the full price for a loaf of bread does not “manage the demand” of bread. These measures are more about removing an inequity that increases demand. “Demand Management” is a phrase that helps propagate the myth that we have to manage people’s natural tendencies.

Should be:

9.4 Best-Practices to Reduce Numerical Requirements
Most parking regulations seek to ensure that people who want to visit a site are not turned away by a lack of parking, and do not spill over onto other streets or parking lots. Traditional parking requirements typically meet these goals by requiring an excessive number of vehicle parking spaces for each land use. However, when the demand for parking is not being increased by hiding the cost of parking and forcing everyone to pay, regardless of whether or not they drive, the amount of parking can be reduced while still meeting the needs of drivers. One study of employee and student parking indicated that by introducing an economic reward for not driving, driving decreased by about 25 percent.

Is:

9.3.1 Unbundled Parking Costs and Cash-Out Programs  
Should be:

9.4.1 Unbundled Parking Costs and Cash-Out Programs

Is:

9.3.2 Shared Parking

Should be:

9.4.2 Shared Parking

Is:

9.3.3 Parking Technologies

Should be:

9.4.3 Parking Technologies

Is:

9.3.4 Vehicles that Reduce Demand

Should be:

9.4.4 Vehicles that Reduce Demand
Is:

9.4 Bicycle Parking

Bicyclists require safe, secure places to park their bikes, just as drivers require space for their cars.

- Include bicycle parking in all parking lots as well as in above ground parking structures.
- Provide secure bicycle parking in limited-access garages or storage areas where practical.
- Locate bicycle parking areas near building entrances, and provide a clear pedestrian path between the parking area and the entrance.
- Provide durable, permanently-anchored bicycle racks that allow bikes to be secured with U-locks or cable locks. Use racks that can support the frame at two points, such as inverted U racks.
- In large bicycle parking areas, include spaces that are long enough to accommodate a bicycle that is towing a trailer.

Should be:

9.5 Bicycle Parking

Bicyclists require safe, secure places to park their bikes, just as drivers require space for their cars.

- Include bicycle parking in all parking lots as well as in above ground parking structures.
- Provide secure bicycle parking in limited-access garages or storage areas where practical.
- Locate bicycle parking areas near building entrances, and provide a clear pedestrian path between the parking area and the entrance.
- Provide durable, permanently-anchored bicycle racks that allow bikes to be secured with U-locks or cable locks. Use racks that can support the frame at two points, such as inverted U racks.
- In large bicycle parking areas, include spaces that are long enough to accommodate a bicycle that is towing a trailer.
- Amend off-street parking ordinances to include a requirement for numerically and functionally sufficient bicycle parking. For places of employment, Class 1 (lockers or inside parking) should be required.

Is:

9.6 Parking Standards and Policies

Planners, urban designers and architects can ensure that vehicle parking is incorporated into new projects as thoughtfully as possible. However, local jurisdictions set the basic requirements for vehicle parking, such as the minimum number of spaces to be provided and the provisions for shared parking between multiple land uses. Cities and counties can use the following guidelines as a starting point to write parking ordinances that support the principles of smart growth.

9.6.1 Minimum and Maximum Requirements

Parking requirements are often drawn from parking generation rates published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. These rates typically reflect a small number of studies that measure peak parking demand at suburban locations. The maximum parking demand in these studies often becomes the minimum
parking standard in local zoning ordinances, which encourages more people to drive. To support alternatives to the automobile, parking requirements must be more carefully tailored to local needs.

- Reduce minimum parking requirements so that the market can determine how much parking is needed on a site.
- Reduce or eliminate parking requirements where there are shared parking areas that can accommodate peak parking demand.
- Set maximum parking standards in areas where public transit is well established, frequent and convenient.
- Allow for reduced parking requirements if a project includes transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, such as providing on-site car-sharing vehicles, van pool parking and discounted transit passes.
- Allow projects to reserve landscaped areas for future use as surface parking lots, if warranted by demand.

### 9.6.2 Parking Management Districts

Local jurisdictions can create parking management districts in which the amount and cost of parking is regulated, so that the area meets its parking needs while promoting transit use, ridesharing and other alternatives to the single-occupancy vehicle.

- Provide publicly-owned, centralized parking facilities by collecting impact fees, in-lieu fees and other assessments from developers.
- Manage the price of on-street parking so that no more than 85 percent of visible spaces are occupied at a given time. This ensures that drivers who are willing to pay for a convenient, on-street parking space can find one as quickly as possible, rather than increasing congestion as they search for a space.
- Increase parking fees at times of day when parking demand is highest.
- Provide discounted parking rates in locations that are less convenient.
- Use revenues from parking fees to finance streetscape improvements, enhanced transit and day-to-day maintenance.
- Establish district-wide parking caps in places with frequent transit service.

### 9.6.3 Shared Parking

Different land uses often experience peak parking demand at different times of the day or week. In addition, businesses are often located so close to one another that people can park once and walk between them. As a result, many jurisdictions allow multiple land uses to provide shared parking areas, which reduces the total amount of parking that must be provided.

If a parking lot is shared between two separately-owned properties, it is essential for both property owners to sign a legally binding agreement that guarantees access to the parking spaces. The local jurisdiction should have the power to enforce this agreement. Most cities and counties that allow shared parking, such as the City of San Diego, have developed model agreements that must be signed by the property owners as well as the local jurisdiction’s attorney.

- Reduce the total parking requirement for multiple land uses that can be visited in a single trip, or that experience peak demand at different times of the day.
- Allow parking facilities to be located on separate sites from the land uses they serve.
- Set a maximum distance, typically no more than 1,000 feet, between an off-site parking facility and the land uses that it serves.
- If a parking lot has a different property owner than the businesses that use the parking lot, require a legally binding agreement between the property owners. Give the local jurisdiction the power to enforce this agreement.

### 9.6.4 Parking Configuration

Developers can often make more efficient use of a site when they have flexibility to configure vehicle parking spaces in nontraditional ways.
• For residential uses, allow tandem parking spaces, where one car parks behind another, as well as stacked parking spaces, where two or three cars park above one another on a hydraulic lift.
• Allow large commercial and institutional uses to meet their peak parking demand by temporarily converting regular parking areas to higher-capacity valet parking areas.

Should be:

9.7 Best Practice Standards and Policies

Planners, urban designers and architects can ensure that vehicle parking is incorporated into new projects as thoughtfully as possible. However, local jurisdictions set the basic requirements for vehicle parking, such as the minimum number of spaces to be provided and the provisions for shared parking between multiple land uses. Cities and counties can use the following best-practice guidelines as a starting point to write parking ordinances that support the principles of smart growth.

9.7.1 Minimum and Maximum Requirements
Parking requirements are often drawn from parking generation rates published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. These rates typically reflect a small number of studies that measure peak parking demand at suburban locations. The maximum parking demand in these studies often becomes the minimum parking standard in local zoning ordinances, which encourages more people to drive. To support alternatives to the automobile, parking requirements must be more carefully tailored to local needs.

• Reduce minimum parking requirements so that the market can determine how much parking is needed on a site.
• Reduce or eliminate parking requirements where there are shared parking areas that can accommodate peak parking demand.
• Set maximum parking standards in areas where public transit is well established, frequent and convenient.
• Allow for reduced parking requirements if a project includes transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, such as paying car parking cashout to employees or providing on-site car-sharing vehicles, van pool parking and discounted transit passes.
• Allow projects to reserve landscaped areas for future use as surface parking lots, if warranted by demand.

9.7.2 Parking Management Districts
Local jurisdictions can create parking management districts in which the amount and cost of parking is regulated, so that the area meets its parking needs while promoting transit use, ridesharing and other alternatives to the single-occupancy vehicle.

• Provide publicly-owned, centralized parking facilities by collecting impact fees, in-lieu fees and other assessments from developers.
• Manage the price of on-street parking so that no more than 85 percent of visible spaces are occupied at a given time. This ensures that drivers who are willing to pay for a convenient, on-street parking space can find one as quickly as possible, rather than increasing congestion as they search for a space.
• Increase parking fees at times of day when parking demand is highest.
• Provide discounted parking rates in locations that are less convenient.
• Use revenues from parking fees to finance streetscape improvements, enhanced transit and day-to-day maintenance.
• Establish district-wide parking caps in places with frequent transit service.
• Establish parking accounts and automatic payment systems. Coral Gables, Florida has a system where drivers register their cell phones, credit cards, and license plates and then pay by calling in. Establishing parking accounts is the future of parking.
9.7.3 Shared Parking
 Different land uses often experience peak parking demand at different times of the day or week. In addition, businesses are often located so close to one another that people can park once and walk between them. As a result, many jurisdictions allow multiple land uses to provide shared parking areas, which reduces the total amount of parking that must be provided.

If a parking lot is shared between two separately-owned properties, it is essential for both property owners to sign a legally binding agreement that guarantees access to the parking spaces. The local jurisdiction should have the power to enforce this agreement. Most cities and counties that allow shared parking, such as the City of San Diego, have developed model agreements that must be signed by the property owners as well as the local jurisdiction’s attorney.

- Reduce the total parking requirement for multiple land uses that can be visited in a single trip, or that experience peak demand at different times of the day.
- Allow parking facilities to be located on separate sites from the land uses they serve.
- Set a maximum distance, typically no more than 1,000 feet, between an off-site parking facility and the land uses that it serves.
- If a parking lot has a different property owner than the businesses that use the parking lot, require a legally binding agreement between the property owners. Give the local jurisdiction the power to enforce this agreement.

9.7.4 Parking Configuration
 Developers can often make more efficient use of a site when they have flexibility to configure vehicle parking spaces in nontraditional ways.

- For residential uses, allow tandem parking spaces, where one car parks behind another, as well as stacked parking spaces, where two or three cars park above one another on a hydraulic lift.
- Allow large commercial and institutional uses to meet their peak parking demand by temporarily converting regular parking areas to higher-capacity valet parking areas.

The following additional section is needed to describe the future of parking. The SGDG cannot just be about “best practice”. How could Coral Gable, Florida develop a system where “drivers register their cell phones, credit cards, and license plates and then pay by calling in”, if they were afraid to go beyond best practice? If SANDAG sticks to best practice, they reinforce the idea that innovation is too risky. Besides inform, SANDAG needs to challenge and inspire.

9.8 The Future of Parking

Sections 9.2 through 9.7 describe the best current parking practices. However, planners need to also be aware of possibilities that go beyond best practices. Government is not always the best at recognizing new technology that could enable significant improvements in methods. Successful businesses are those that innovate and automate. This section is meant to inspire governments to do the same thing for parking policies.

SANDAG has a special responsibility to consider the future of both road-use pricing and pricing for parking. This is because these strategies are specifically identified in our Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Guidelines, issued by Caltrans. As found in SANDAG modeling so far, the pricing of parking appears to have a particularly large potential to reduce driving. SANDAG therefore has a responsibility to encourage pricing in the guidelines that it generates for local governments. Unless efficient methods and strong rationale for pricing is sufficiently described, it may be unlikely that local governments will implement the best-possible methods to put a price on parking and thereby unbundle its cost.
9.8.1 Unbundled Cost and Spontaneous Sharing

"Unbundled cost" means that people that use parking can see exactly what it costs and people that don’t use the parking will escape its cost entirely. In other words, parking cost is visible and optional. This conforms to the usual rule of the free market where a person only pays for what they choose to use. So it is fair. Letting consumers escape the cost of parking if they choose not to park will reduce driving. One study of eleven cases indicated that employees and students might, on average, drive 25% less if they were given a clear, economic incentive.

The most effective form of sharing would be a system that allows anyone to park anywhere at any time and for any length of time. Proper pricing could make this feasible. For mixed use, the sharing of parking means that less parking will be needed because, for example, it could be used mostly by employees during the day and mostly by residents at night.

Although most experts agree that unbundled cost and sharing are the keys to efficient use of parking, there are no current best practices that accomplish both.

However, there is a method of fully unbundling the cost of parking that encourages sharing. It is applicable in all cases and it is described in an unpublished draft report, called *Intelligent Parking*. The method benefits from spontaneous sharing between all drivers. It is described as follows.

If parking has, in effect, been gifted to a group, such as those using a train from a train station or the students of a school, then that group becomes the “parking beneficiary group”. If parking has been paid for by a group or is, either directly or indirectly, being paid for by a group, then that group becomes the parking beneficiary group. Note that in both cases, the members of the group must have the choice to drive or not drive. For example, an office development is required to provide parking. This cost is passed down until it necessarily lowers the wages of the employees. So, for this case, the employees are the beneficiary group. Retail customers and residents are two other obvious beneficiary groups. The method of unbundling can now be simply stated. The full and fair price for the parking is charged. This money, minus the collection cost, is given to the members of the beneficiary group.

How the monthly earnings are divided up among the members of the beneficiary group depends on the type of beneficiary group. For each member, the total monthly earnings dollar amount is always multiplied by a quantity and divided by the sum (the sum is the denominator) of that quantity, taken over all members. For example, for employees, the multiplier is the number of hours that the employee worked over the month while the denominator is the total number of hours worked by all employees over the month. At a school, for the students, the numerator is the total time spent at the school, over the month, while the denominator is the sum of the same quantity, for all the students. At a transit station, the numerator is all of the passenger’s monthly hours on the round trips taken, over the month, while the denominator is the total number of hours spent by all passengers on round trips over the month. At a shopping center, the numerator is the sum of the money spent by the shopper, over the month, while the denominator is the total amount of money spent by all shoppers over the month. (This could be adjusted, if the shopping center management wanted to reward for time spent at the shopping center. This might require that shoppers have RFID on their person, as would be true for train passengers, to efficiently charge them for their fares.) At a condominium, the numerator is the number of parking places that were paid for (directly or indirectly) by the resident family and the denominator is the total number of parking places at the condominium project; similarly, for apartment complexes.

More details are in *Intelligent Parking*, http://moderntransit.org/sdc/IntelligentParking6 and are also described below.

9.8.2 The Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) Age, Examples and Vendor Role

Government will eventually enter into an RFID (radio frequency identification) age. Organizers of large athletic events already have. For example, over 20,000 people ran the 2008 Bay-to-Breakers foot race in San Francisco. Each runner had a “chip” in their shoe lace. Each runner’s start time and finish time were recorded.
and all results were available as soon as the last runner crossed the finish line. Organizers that put on large open-water swims, foot races, and bike rides have routinely used RFID for many years. An RFID vendor in San Diego states that passive RFID units cost less than $5, are reliable, are durable, and they could be used to identify cars as well as people.

Certainly, government and in particular transit agencies and parking districts could use this technology. For example, when a person that has an RFID unit which is tied to a billable address with an open account gets on a bus or a train, they should not have to pay at that time, visit a pay station, or "swipe a card" that has a positive balance. SDGE customers that pay their bills are not required to pre-pay. The same courtesy should be extended to most transit riders, people that drive on roads, and people that park cars. There should be one monthly bill for all three activities.

The RFID "chips", the frequency scanners that detect the RFIDs and the computer software that prepares the invoices can all be implemented in the private sector. Government’s job is to define the ideal system and let vendors bid on the right to develop, prototype, install, test, debug, assume all liability for, change ordinances, and operate the described system. In return, they will probably want “p” percent of charges, for “n” years; then “q” percent.

9.8.3 Features of Future Parking (“Intelligent Parking”)

Intelligent Parking has one billing agency for all parking, public and private; on-street and off-street. Generally, credit-worthy drivers get billed monthly for their parking and also receive earnings if they belong to a beneficiary group. Ultimately, these invoices should also include charges for transit use and highway use. (See Page 3 of http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/rtp/Adopted_Addendum_2007_RTP_Guidelines.pdf.) Credit-worthy drivers have parking accounts and are able to “park and go”, with no action needed. Intelligent Parking is “user friendly”.

Intelligent Parking is fully shared. The cost of parking is fully unbundled from other transactions, such as getting a wage, paying rent, owning a condominium, or purchasing goods or services. If someone doesn’t park, they don’t pay, either directly or indirectly, because the earnings that they get balance out their losses.

Intelligent Parking must be rigorous in specifying who gets earnings, where “earnings” are defined to be revenue minus collection cost.

Data collection is by car detectors, frequency scanners, RFID units (transponders) in or on the vehicle, pixel collection for cars with no RFID, and pay stations for customers with no RFID.

Pay stations will often have the capability of setting up an account and dispensing an RFID unit to a person that has good credit.

Intelligent Parking has instantaneous, congestion pricing for each “block”, with a “block” being about 40 parking spots, for off-street parking. This means that pricing is determined by an algorithm, as a function of block occupancy, to preserve the minimum vacancy (15%) that has been suggested by Professor Donald Shoup. (Shoup authored of The High Cost of Free Parking.) This vacancy is preserved by having the computer set the price in real time, as a function of occupancy rate. When the occupancy goes above 70%, the price is increased by the application of a geometrically increasing multiplier. The multiplier increases with each 5% increase in occupancy. These algorithms are shown in Tables 2 and 3 of Intelligent Parking. A base 2 results in a multiplier of 16 when the occupancy goes above 85%; a base 3 results a multiplier of 81. The base is set to prevent occupancy from exceeding 85%. The base would not have to be an integer. People would pay the time-averaged rate, over the time that their car is parked.

Records of the use and earnings of every parking space are stored in the computer. Such data could be used to support decisions to either increase or decrease the supply of parking.

On-demand predictions of price and which spaces to use at a given price need to be available to users so that they can develop a plan for parking before they start their trip. Drivers planning a trip would specify the hours
of the trip, the address (or addresses) they will visit, and the maximum price rate they are willing to pay. The system will recommend a parking strategy and assign probabilities to the prices. This will decrease driving around looking for parking.

For on-street parking, the following (somewhat arbitrary) unique rules apply.

- In front of single-family homes, 100% of the earnings go to the residents. There is no permit parking.
- In front of duplexes and everything else, the earnings are evenly split between the city and the beneficiary groups associated with the building on the street.
- For blocks where parking is 0 – 50% full, the parking is free.
- Above 50% the pricing is the same as for off-street parking.

### 9.8.4 Train Station Application

The assumption is made that the train-station parking exists for the benefit of all of the train riders that make round trips on the train from the station. It is not just for train riders that park in the station. It is also not there to raise money for the agency running the train. Therefore the train riders are the beneficiary group, as defined above. For a train station, a parking base price (per unit time) needs to be established, as discussed in Section 9.1. All cars and all riders need to have accounts and be outfitted with RFID units. Instantaneous congestion pricing needs to be established, so that charges are, in general, time averages of the various parking rates that are applied during the time a car was parked. The congestion pricing algorithms are shown in the Tables 2 and 3 of Intelligent Parking. This will ensure that there is available parking throughout the parking lot.

Since the parking lot is there for the benefit of those that use the train, the following is true. Each month, every person that parks a car gets billed and each train rider gets parking-lot earnings and a bill for their use of the train. Bus riders get billed for their use of the bus, but get no parking lot earnings, since the parking lot is for the train riders. People that park cars that do not use the train benefit those that ride the train, because they increase their earnings. With instantaneous congestion pricing, there is literally no theoretical limit to how much money could be earned by the transit-station parking. The only limit is how much people want to park and want to pay; no one is forced to do anything. It is conceivable that train riders that do not use the parking lot would be able to ride round trip from a North County station to San Diego for almost no net money, when their parking-lot earnings are taken into account.

### 9.8.5 Legal Reach

Government can implement a parking plan at the train station, on the streets, and at new developments. However, it cannot implement a parking plan at existing developments. This should not cause a problem however. Intelligent Parking is so beneficial to all concerned that after it is understood by those running existing developments they will request that their developments be brought into the Intelligent Parking regime. Neighborhoods will also make this request.

### 9.8.6 Conclusion

With congestion pricing, Intelligent Parking creates the potential for multiple, new classes of consumers. Large amounts of revenue will sometimes be generated. There will always be vacancy. Enforcement and collection will be automatic. Intelligent Parking will stop the economic discrimination against those that drive less, which is good, because government has no reason to encourage driving. Less parking will be needed.

The Smart Growth Scorecard needs to be changed so that reducing VMT is the primary metric. This may be impossible given our current knowledge. However, Smart Growth that is far from transit with
“free parking” is not, as far as I know, a verified method of reducing VMT. Transit Access and unbundling the cost of parking needs outweigh the other considerations.

Is:

The Smart Growth Scorecard is a tool to help local jurisdictions and community organizations determine whether a project incorporates the most fundamental design issues that are addressed in Designing for Smart Growth. The Scorecard also provides a straightforward way to compare different projects with one another.

Should be:

The Smart Growth Scorecard is a tool to help local jurisdictions and community organizations determine whether a project incorporates the most fundamental design issues that are addressed in Designing for Smart Growth and how likely it is that it will reduce VMT. The importance of reducing VMT motivated increasing the weighting factors for Question 10, Transit Access, and for Question 14, “Parking Management”, which includes the unbundling of parking cost. Projects will have to score well on at least one of these questions in order to compare well with projects that score well on both of these two questions. The Scorecard provides a straightforward way to compare different projects with one another.

Is:

10. Transit Access 1 Scoring Weight

Should be:

10. Transit Access 8 Scoring Weight

Is:

14. Parking Demand Management 1 Scoring Weight

Should be:

14. Parking Management 8 Scoring Weight

On the Final Project Score sheet:

Is:

14. Does the project incorporate strategies to manage parking demand?
14. Does the project incorporate strategies to properly manage parking?

Add the following references:

Under General References:


Addendum to the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan, Guidelines Addressing Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions During the RTP Process, Adopted by the California Transportation Commission on May 29, 2008.  

Under Parking:


Introduction

- 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) settlement agreement identified studies to be completed for 2050 RTP
- A study on impediments to public transit is one element of this settlement agreement
- Purpose of study is to identify and analyze:
  - All known and reasonably foreseeable financial impediments to maintaining transit service levels
  - All known and reasonably foreseeable impediments to maintain long-term transit ridership
  - All known and reasonably foreseeable recurring sources to cover funding for operations
Actions to Date

- Board received overview of study at April 24, 2009 meeting
- Board actions from this meeting:
  - Accepted study for public distribution for 60 days
  - Referred to Transportation Committee for review of study alternatives (discussed at June 19, 2009 meeting)

Further Details on Potential Regional/Local Level Funding

- Additional Transportation Sales Tax (proposed Quality of Life measure)
  - ¼ - ½ cent could generate in the range of $117M-$234M annually
  - Requires 2/3 voter approval
- Transit Center User Fees
  - $3/parking space fee could generate approximately $1M-$2M annually
  - SANDAG/transit agencies can levy
  - Would require new structure to administer
Further Details on Potential Regional/Local Level Funding

- Parcel Taxes
  - Alameda-Contra Costa County recently doubled $48 parcel tax for transit to $96
  - Similar tax could generate in the range of $35M-$70M annually if applied to San Diego region
  - Local jurisdictions can levy; requires 2/3 voter approval

- Payroll Taxes
  - New York has 0.34% tax in MTA service area; Portland has 0.66% for Tri-Met service area
  - Similar tax could generate in the range of $175M-$340M annually if applied to all County wages/salaries
  - Local jurisdictions can levy; requires 2/3 voter approval
  - Would require new structure to administer
Further Details on Potential Regional/Local Level Funding

- **Rental Car Fees**
  - Currently being charged under CA Tourism Marketing Act and spent at state level by Office of Tourism
  - No current authority to levy locally/regionally; would require state legislation
  - New York has rental car fee of 5% for MTA service area
  - A 1%-5% fee could generate in the range of $2M-$10M annually

- **Benefit Assessment & Parking Assessment Districts**
  - Local jurisdictions can approve; nexus study required
  - Potential revenues depend on how they are implemented

Further Details on Potential Regional/Local Level Funding

- **Development Impact Fees & Exactions**
  - Local jurisdictions can approve under Mitigation Fee Act; nexus study required
  - Fees can only be applied to transit capital expenses

- **Community Facilities Districts**
  - Local jurisdictions can approve under Mello-Roos Law with approval from property owners in district
  - Appears that statutes do not allow funding for transit operating expenses
Further Details on Potential Regional/Local Level Funding

- **Tax Increment Finance**
  - Can only be used for capital expenses
  - New state legislation would be required to amend Community Redevelopment Law

- **Real Estate Transfer Taxes**
  - Maximum tax currently being assessed ($0.55 per $500), split evenly between County and each city
  - New state legislation required for additional tax increase for non-charter cities
  - Charter cities can forgo its half of tax (“conforming tax”) and levy a separate tax in its place (“non-conforming tax”) with 2/3 voter approval
  - Examples range from $1.10/$1000 in Riverside to $15/$1000 in Berkeley
Input from June 19
Transportation Committee Meeting

• APCD increased vehicle registration fee to $4, but allocation of funds undetermined
• Further explore Cap and Trade opportunities for transit to serve as emissions offsets for companies
  • Note: not a funding source SANDAG directly controls
• Success noted with Benefit & Parking Assessment Districts for various projects, and its potential application to transit
• Interest in analyzing sources that can be focused on specific sub-areas
• Overall support for continued exploration of other revenue sources, with realization that raising taxes in current economic climate will be difficult

Public Comments

• Comments received to date:
  • Caltrans
  • Corey Briggs
Next Steps

- Finalize Transit Impediments Study based on public comments and Board action today
- Continue work on proposed Quality of Life initiative and exploration of other funding sources as part of development of 2050 RTP

Recommendation

The Board is asked to consider the alternatives identified in the Transit Impediments Study for possible implementation in order to increase and maintain service levels or increase and maintain funding for transit operational expenses.
Designing for Smart Growth
Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region

Purpose and Uses for Smart Growth Design Guidelines

- Provide a reference for local agencies and professionals
- Support local plans and design requirements
- Refine RCP smart growth place type definitions
Project Challenges

- Provide relevant guidance without being overly prescriptive
- Include appropriate level of detail while keeping the document brief and user-friendly
- Create a useful reference for laypeople and professionals alike
- Ensure guidelines are appropriate for the San Diego region

Public Outreach Meetings

- Interactive exercise exploring how Design Guidelines can be used in the future
- Some of the ideas we heard:
  - Use them to write new design guidelines for our city
  - Dovetail with guidelines in our existing General Plan
  - Streamline permitting for appropriate design
  - Refer to parts of the Guidelines in staff reports
  - Provide them to community groups, so they can use the Guidelines as a reference
Topics Addressed in Design Guidelines

- Site and Building Design
- Multimodal Streets
- Transit Stations
- Civic Buildings

Topics Addressed in Design Guidelines

- Parks and Civic Space
- Parking
- Sustainability
- Universal Design
5.3.1 Multimodal Design of Wide Arterial Streets

Communities may want to provide high vehicular mobility and a pedestrian-friendly environment on the same major arterial street, or they may be faced with excessively wide streets. The solution to these challenges is the multiway boulevard, which combines a high-capacity central roadway with slower, low-volume, pedestrian-oriented access lanes on each side of the street. The central roadway accommodates through movement. The access lanes accommodate on-street parking, loading, bicycle travel and access to abutting properties, as well as wide sidewalks that are separated from the central roadway by tree-lined medians.

- Control through traffic on the central roadway with traffic signals. Use stop signs to control traffic on the access lanes.
- Use a multiway boulevard's central roadway for transit service, with bus stops located on the medians between the access lane and the through lanes.
- Direct bicyclists to the local access lanes, using shared lane markers where adjacent to on-street parking.
- Design buildings adjacent to a multiway boulevard so that they front directly onto the access lanes.

Examples of Design Guidelines

Fallbrook (Rural Village)
The village core in Fallbrook reflects many of the same characteristics of high-quality design as larger and more urbanized places in the San Diego region.
Smart Growth Scorecard

- Evaluates proposed projects based on criteria in Design Guidelines
- Applies to single buildings, larger development projects and streetscapes
- Local jurisdictions can revise the Scorecard and give different weights to each question
Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee recommends that the Board of Directors accept *Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region* for distribution and for use as resource in the SANDAG smart growth toolkit.

Designing for Smart Growth

*Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*
Honorable Chair and Members of the Board:

Because you failed to define smart growth as growth that would minimize driving it was instead redefined as “building great places”. As you may know, unbundling the cost of parking is the best way and the cheapest way to reduce driving. I submitted a 21 page document describing how the Smart Growth Design Guideline could help to bring about parking reform in a timely manner. Only my suggestion that off-street ordinances should include a requirement for bike parking was incorporated into the final version.

Consultants, working on parking, will not go beyond best practice. However, we live in a time where technology is changing rapidly and we need to have our parking policies also change rapidly. Best practice is not good enough.

Here’s what I asked for that is still needed:

1.) Traffic reduction and saving money on parking, by adopting good parking policies are identified as ways to help get projects built.

2.) A new Parking subsection (Section 9.1) to cover cost, value, and the pricing of surface, parking-garage, and underground parking. Currently there is nothing on these important topics.

3.) A renaming of sub-sections on parking to identify them as Best Practice. However, one Best Practices is still left out:

   a.) Coral Gables, Florida has a system where drivers register their cell phones, credit cards, and license plates and then pay by calling in. Establishing parking accounts is the future of parking. This best practice MUST be included.

This Guideline can’t just be about best practice. Coral Gables, Florida had to go beyond best practice. This Guideline needs to challenge and inspire cities to see the future of parking. Therefore, a new parking subsection (Section 9.8) is needed on the future of parking.

   a.) Unbundled Cost and Spontaneous Sharing
   b.) The RFID Age, Examples and the Vendor Role
   c.) Features of Future Parking
   d.) Train Station Applications
   e.) Legal Reach
   f.) Conclusion

Mike Bullock
mike_bullock@earthlink.net
760-754-8025
2050 RTP – What’s New

• 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

• Urban Core Transit Strategy
  – Develop long-range transit network alternatives, short-term action plans, and implementation strategies

• Sustainable Communities Strategy
  – New element of RTP per SB 375
  – Meet regional GHG targets through development patterns, infrastructure investments, and transportation measures
2050 RTP – What’s New

• Airport Multimodal Planning

• Energy/Climate Planning
  – Regional Energy Strategy Update and Regional Climate Action Plan

• Economic Analysis of Investment Strategies

• Updated CTC RTP Guidelines

• New Federal Transportation Bill/SAFETEA-LU Reauthorization

2050 RTP – Other Key Tasks

• Goals and Objectives

• Project Evaluation Criteria & Performance Measures

• Enhanced Environmental Justice Analysis

• Regional and Corridor Studies
  – I-5 South
  – Regional Bicycle Plan
  – Goods Movement
  – Binational and Interregional Planning
2050 RTP – Other Key Tasks

- Revenue Projections
- Project Cost Estimates
- Public Participation Plan
- Environmental Impact Report
  - Additional analysis required

2050 RTP Development Process
2050 RTP Oversight

- Board of Directors

- Policy Committees
  - Transportation Committee
  - Regional Planning Committee
  - Borders Committee

- Technical/Stakeholders Input
  - Stakeholders Working Group
  - Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee
  - Regional Planning Technical Working Group
  - San Diego Conformity Working Group
  - Tribal Transportation Technical Working Group
  - Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee
Next Steps

• 2050 Regional Growth Forecast discussion at the July Policy Board meeting
• Goals and objectives discussion at a future Policy Board meeting
• Public participation plan
• Project evaluation criteria and performance measures
2009 Summer Electricity Outlook

2008 Review

- California Independent System Operator (CAISO) had adequate supplies for state
  - Actual peak was 46,814 Megawatt (MW)
  - Forecasted peak was 48,900 MW
  - Imports were close to 10,000 MW on high-load days, as compared to CAISO medium-case forecast of 8,750 MW
  - No system alerts, only 3 days with Flex Alerts

- SDG&E System had adequate supplies
  - Actual peak was 4,351 MW on October 1
  - Forecasted peak was 4,568 MW
  - Fairly mild summer (July – September)
2009 State Outlook – Supply Adequate Under Most Operating Conditions

• Load Forecast (MW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008 Actual</th>
<th>2009*</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAISO Control Area</td>
<td>46,814</td>
<td>45,379</td>
<td>-1,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern CA (SP 26)</td>
<td>26,446</td>
<td>25,412</td>
<td>-1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>+205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Forecast is for average weather

• CAISO-wide generation additions are up but dry hydro conditions may offset some of the gain

2009 Outlook – Statewide Supply

• Much improved California-wide load and supply balance than last year driven by:
  • Expected decrease in loads in California
  • Gain in new in-state generation
  • Import availability back up to historical levels

• However, still need to watch for:
  • Hotter-than-average days, especially if all western states are hot
  • Hotter than forecast
2009 Outlook for San Diego Region – Adequate but Tighter than Rest of the State

• Outlook for SDG&E is about equal to last year
  • In contrast to rest of state, San Diego is not seeing decrease in peak loads this year as compared to past years
  • Generation additions about equal to forecasted load growth

• San Diego may be separately affected by local weather, performance of local generators & transmission line outages

• Conservation & demand response continue to be important tools in providing reliable power & helping customers save money

Local Government Partnership with SANDAG

SDG&E’s Local Government Partnership Program will be partnering with SANDAG to provide Energy Roadmaps to all local governments through 2011

Will expand upon the current CEC Partnership and the Sustainable Region Program
Energy Roadmap – What is it?

*Energy Roadmap*: Provides a framework for local governments to identify municipal energy-saving measures and develop energy savings programs

- Comprehensive energy assessment of municipality; addresses aspects of city operations, policy development & education opportunities
- Provide standardized approach to energy planning & projects based on state, regional and local goals
- Build institutional knowledge at local governments
- Serve as conduit to additional energy efficiency program funds
- Performance monitoring component

Energy Roadmap – Who is Involved?

Cross section of City staff
- City Planner
- Economic Development
- Environmental Services
- Financial Services
- Public Works / General Services
- City Council / Mayor
- City Manager

SANDAG and SDG&E

Partner to develop recommendations on municipal energy efficiency and renewable opportunities
Energy Roadmap – Elements

Contains 6 Overarching Elements:
- Facilities Retrofits
- Land-Use Planning, Codes and Standards
- Education and Outreach
- Clean Transportation
- Emerging Technologies
- Partnerships/ Grants/ Incentives/ Funding

Clean Transportation: Nissan Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nissan</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Electric Vehicle</td>
<td>• Promote EV Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Battery</td>
<td>• Infrastructure Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EV Knowledge &amp; Support</td>
<td>• Legislation / Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EV Fleet Vehicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companies</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• EV fleet vehicles</td>
<td>• Expand renewable electricity sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infrastructure Support</td>
<td>• Capacity expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EV awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each partner’s strengths can be leveraged

A sustainable future requires all stakeholders working together
AB 811: Right-sizing Photovoltaics with Energy Efficiency is a Winning Combination

- AB 811 enables local governments, through their property taxes, to finance energy efficiency and renewable installations in their jurisdictions.

- Energy efficiency measures for residential customers provide a more cost-effective way of achieving energy savings than photovoltaic (PV) installations alone.

- Energy efficiency combined with right-sized PV system can save as much as a larger PV system alone, at lower cost.

- Efforts to support residential PV should incorporate energy efficiency considerations (as the California Solar Initiative Handbook instructs).

AB811 Program Template - Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Energy Efficiency Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Audit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Energy Efficiency Measures (Loan-Eligible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebate Measures List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Energy Efficiency Measures (Not Loan-Eligible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solar Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar PV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?

Thank You!
Debt Program Update

June 26, 2009

SANDAG Variable Rate

SANDAG Variable Rate, Net of LIBOR Receipt Compared to Swap Payment and 30 Year Fixed Rate Bond Index

Interest Rate

Week

- SANDAG Variable Rate, Net of LIBOR Receipt
- SANDAG Swap Payment
- 30 Year Fixed Rate Bond Index
Debt Program Update

June 26, 2009

SANDAG Debt Structure

- $100 million commercial paper program; Citigroup
  - Dexia Liquidity

- $600 million swaps:
  - Goldman Sachs
  - Merrill Lynch
  - Bank of America

- $600 million of variable rate debt:
  - Goldman Sachs and Barclays (replacing Lehman)
    - JP Morgan Liquidity
  - DeLaRosa (replacing UBS) and JP Morgan
    - Dexia Liquidity
  - J. P. Morgan
Existing LIBOR/SIFMA Swaps

3.8165%

65% of LIBOR
Converts to SIFMA Municipal Swap Index in 2018

SANDAG

Series 2008 Bonds

Goldman Sachs (50%) and Merrill Lynch (50%)