TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, September 18, 2009
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• PROPOSED FUND EXCHANGE WITH NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT TO PROVIDE OPERATING SUPPORT

• INTERSTATE 15 CORRIDOR LANES: SR 78 - NORDAHL ROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

• STATUS REPORT: SR 11/OTAY MESA EAST PORT OF ENTRY FINANCIAL STRATEGY

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

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

MISSION STATEMENT

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Transportation Committee meeting.

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
**TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

Friday, September 18, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF JULY 31, 2009 MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on this agenda. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

**CONSENT (3 through 4)**

| +3. | PROPOSED NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT SERVICE CHANGES FOR JANUARY 2010 (Dan Levy) | INFORMATION |

North County Transit District (NCTD) is proposing a number of route and service changes for January 2010. The proposed changes result in a net reduction of $1.84 million. None of the changes are regionally significant, as defined in Board Policy No. 018, Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation.

| +4. | SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT (Jim Linthicum) | INFORMATION |

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

**REPORTS (5 through 13)**

| +5. | ENCINITAS GRADE SEPARATION PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FY 2010 BUDGET AMENDMENT (Alex Estrella) | APPROVE |

SANDAG and City of Encinitas are cooperatively working on the Encinitas Grade Separated Pedestrian Crossing project that includes the design, engineering, and environmental documentation for four grade separated pedestrian crossings along the Encinitas rail corridor. Funding for this project was approved by the California Transportation Commission under the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) totaling $1,248,000. Phase 1 (environmental document, design permit, and project study report) was completed in FY 2009 for a total cost of approximately $798,000. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve a budget amendment for the FY 2010 Capital Improvement Program to add $450,000 in Traffic Congestion Relief Program funds for Phase 2 of the Encinitas Grade Separation Pedestrian Crossing Project as reflected in Attachment 1. Phase 2 of the Project will include the completion of the Final Plans and Specifications.
The Interstate 5 (I-5) South Multimodal Corridor Study is examining potential transportation improvements along the I-5 corridor in the City of Chula Vista. The study, which is a collaborative effort between Caltrans, the City of Chula Vista, and SANDAG, has examined seven initial alternatives. Utilizing criteria developed in conjunction with the study’s Ad Hoc Technical Working Group three alternatives have been selected for further, more detailed study. Staff will present the three alternatives and ask the Transportation Committee to approve the three recommended transportation alternatives for additional study.

In Fiscal Years 2001 to 2003, the Board of Directors approved three Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims for several capital rural projects. These capital projects have been completed and a balance of $530,481 remains. At its August 20, 2009, meeting, the Metropolitan Transit System Board of Directors approved to use the balance to fund FY 2010 operations. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Resolution No. 2010-02, in substantially the same form as Attachment 1, revising TDA claims.

North County Transit District (NCTD) has requested additional staff support to complete outstanding engineering and construction services associated with the SPRINTER Project. The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment 4 to Addendum 2 to the Master MOU with NCTD in the amount of $25,000 in substantially the same form as Attachment 1 and to add the SPRINTER Project Manager Assistance Project (1115200) into the FY 2010 Program Budget.

This item approves budget changes to the Substation Improvement Project. The project budget would be increased to complete rehabilitation work at an existing traction power substation near the Grossmont Trolley Station. Funds would be moved into the project from the MTS capital budget with the approval of an MOU and by allocating available funds in SANDAG grants to the project budget. The Transportation Committee is asked to: (1) authorize the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), in substantially the same form as attached, allowing the transfer of $195,000 from MTS Substation Transformer Rehabilitation project to SANDAG Substation Standardization project; and (2) approve the transfer of an additional $195,000 from completed capital projects to the Substation Standardization as shown in Table 1; and (3) approve an increase of $390,000 to the Substation Standardization project budget.
+10. PROPOSED FUND EXCHANGE WITH NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT TO PROVIDE OPERATING SUPPORT (Sookyung Kim)  

RECOMMEND  

At its April 29, 2009, meeting, the Board of Directors received a report that discussed possible short-term alternatives that could provide “bridge funding” for public transit operators to meet operating shortfalls. North County Transit District (NCTD) proposes to exchange approximately $1.3 million of its Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 funds with SANDAG for a like amount of TransNet. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the request by the NCTD Board of Directors for an exchange of FTA Section 5307 funding in the amount of $1,313,000 with a like amount of TransNet funds.

+11. INTERSTATE 15 CORRIDOR LANES: STATE ROUTE 78 - NORDAHL ROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT (Gustavo Dallarda and Richard Chavez)  

RECOMMEND  

The Nordahl Road Bridge over State Route 78 (SR 78), located just west of the SR 78 interchange with Interstate 15 (I-15), ultimately requires full reconstruction in order to bring it to full design standards. The cities of Escondido and San Marcos have agreed to contribute to the construction of the new bridge as part of a development agreement that requires the addition of capacity to the structure. To avoid widening a bridge that ultimately needs to be replaced, the Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to: (1) execute an agreement with the cities of Escondido and San Marcos that provides that the cities will collectively commit to a $10 million contribution to the Nordahl Road bridge project, and that SANDAG will transfer $2 million in savings from favorable bids received on the I-15 North segment to the design of the proposed Nordahl Road bridge replacement project; and (2) execute a transfer with Caltrans for an additional $1 million in TransNet funds under a separate existing agreement from the I-15 North segment budget to fund the design of a westbound auxiliary lane on SR 78 between I-15 and Nordahl Road.

+12. STATUS REPORT: STATE ROUTE 11/OTAY MESA EAST PORT OF ENTRY FINANCIAL STRATEGY (Marney Cox, Mario Orso, Christina Casgar)  

DISCUSSION  

SANDAG, in cooperation with Caltrans, the U.S. General Services Administration, and other stakeholders, is proposing to develop the new Otay Mesa East Port of Entry and associated transportation network, including State Route 11. The improvements on the U.S. side of the border are expected to cost between $615 and $715 million and will be funded through tolls, fees, and other revenues. This information item focuses on a review of findings and options that will help shape the project’s ultimate financial strategy.

+13. COMPASS CARD STATUS UPDATE (James Dreisbach-Towle)  

INFORMATION  

Staff will provide the Transportation Committee with an update on recent Compass Card project activities and the status of the planned launch.
The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority is moving ahead with advanced planning for the consolidated rental car facility (CONRAC) and other on-airport improvements for Phase 1 of the Destination Lindbergh Plan. It is important for SANDAG to start advanced planning work for the Phase 1 Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) to ensure the coordination of the development of the ITC and CONRAC facilities. Developing detailed capital cost estimates for the freeway connecting ramps also is being proposed. Staff will present estimates to complete these work efforts and possible funding sources for Transportation Committee discussion.

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, October 2, 2009, at 9 a.m.
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF JULY 31, 2009

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Jack Dale (East County) at 9:00 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Judy Ritter (North County Inland) and a second by Vice Chair Matt Hall (North County Coastal), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the July 17, 2009, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Michael Toney, a member of the public, spoke regarding future plans for the airport, water supply, and other issues.

Paul Jablonski, Executive Director, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), spoke regarding the recent award to MTS by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA). APTA has selected MTS as North America’s Outstanding Public Transit System for 2009.

Chairman Bob Campbell (North County Transit District [NCTD]) expressed his congratulations to Mr. Jablonski and the employees at MTS.

Supervisor Ron Roberts, County of San Diego expressed his congratulations.

Vice Chair Jerry Rindone (MTS) expressed his congratulations.

Albert Phoenix, Southern California Tribal Chairman’s Association (SCTCA), stated that Jane Clough-Riquelme, Senior Regional Planner has been awarded the Distinguished Leadership Award for a Professional Planner from the California Chapter of the American Planning Association (APA) for her work with the SCTCA. He expressed his sincere congratulations.

Mr. Jablonski reiterated his appreciation to his employees for their work in achieving the APTA award.

Nathan Johnson, ATU Local 1309, expressed his appreciation and his union’s support of Mr. Jablonski.
CONSENT (3 through 7)

3. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): FORMATION OF AN AD HOC TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP TO PROVIDE INPUT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RTP PERFORMANCE MEASURES (INFORMATION)

As part of the development of the 2050 RTP, the Executive Director, with concurrence from Board Chair Holt-Pfeiler, will establish an Ad Hoc Technical Working Group (TWG) to review and update the transportation project evaluation criteria and performance measures for the 2050 RTP. One or two volunteers from the various existing transportation and planning technical groups would join transportation agency staff on the working group. The Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Technical Working Group will begin meeting in September 2009, and conclude its activities by summer 2010.

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

Section 5310 of SAFETEA-LU provides federal funds for social service agencies to purchase vehicles and related equipment that are used to transport seniors and persons with disabilities. These funds are available through a statewide competition. The Transportation Committee is asked to concur with the scores for the 17 eligible projects awarded by the Local Review Committee for the FY 2008-2009 federal 49 U.S.C. 5310 program funding, and find that: (1) the applications are in conformance with the Coordinated Plan, and (2) the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 5310 have been met by all applicants recommended for funding.

5. SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP REAPPOINTMENT (APPROVE)

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the reappointment of six members to the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council for three-year terms.

6. SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT (INFORMATION)

This item provides a monthly status report on the SPRINTER rail project, including discussion of implementation and effectiveness of project cost control measures.

7. BUS RAPID TRANSIT/RAPID BUS DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION (INFORMATION)

At the March 20, 2009, Transportation Committee meeting, additional information was requested on a proposed work effort that would address Bus Rapid Transit/Rapid Bus development and implementation, which this item provides.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Ritter, and a second by Councilmember Jim King (South County), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 3 through 7.
8. STATE ROUTE 76 PROJECT UPDATE (INFORMATION)

The Caltrans project team has delivered on a number of key milestones for the next section of the State Route (SR) 76 project from Melrose Drive to South Mission Road. The project has been developed using a design sequencing process and the recent certification of the right-of-way on a tremendously aggressive schedule is the latest in a series of actions that will lead to the advertisement of the project this fall in order to begin construction by the end of this year. Several members of the project team will be present in order to recognize their efforts on this key Early Action Program project.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director, recognized the team that brought this project forward.

Action: This item was provided for information.

9. FEASIBILITY STUDY TO EXTEND PROPOSED HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM TO INTERNATIONAL BORDER (DISCUSSION)

Since February 2009, SANDAG has been studying the feasibility of extending the state’s proposed high-speed train (HST) system from its current terminus in downtown San Diego to the International Border and specifically to Tijuana International Airport. Along with engineering and environmental work currently underway on the main Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire HST corridor, this analysis is a key component of SANDAG’s Regional Air-Rail Network Study and the Airport Multimodal Accessibility Plan as required by Senate Bill 10 (2007). In addition to studying a potential link to an intercity station on the U.S. side near the Tijuana International Airport, the study also will discuss the potential to operate a high-speed commuter rail service along the same tracks between the International Border and southwest Riverside County. To date, potential south county corridors and commuter rail station locations have been identified and evaluation criteria have been developed. A stakeholders working group has reviewed the work to date and additional targeted public meetings in the south county area have been completed. Additional public outreach is planned before the study’s scheduled completion in September 2009. The Transportation Committee is asked to provide input on the proposed project evaluation criteria to be used in evaluating alternative alignments for feasibility study of the Downtown/Lindbergh Field to International Border HST segment.

Action: This item was presented for discussion.

10. REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP RECOMMENDATION (RECOMMEND)

At its May 22, 2009, meeting, the Board of Directors approved the establishment of the Regional Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) to provide input on the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and other related initiatives. Staff reviewed the report and provided an overview of the selection process and the recommended membership slate.
Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Anthony Young, (City of San Diego), and a second by Chairman Campbell, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the slate of members and alternates indicated in Tables 1 and 2 to serve as at-large citizen representatives on the SWG.

11. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: STATUS REPORT (INFORMATION)

The TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) Status Report outlines the status, successes, and challenges of implementing the TransNet EMP under the Memorandum of Agreement signed in March 2008 by the Board of Directors. This report has been presented to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) and is being presented to the Regional Planning Committee, Transportation Committee, and Board of Directors for information.

Action: This item was provided for information.

12. TransNet EMP FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY UPDATE, FY 2010 FUNDING ALLOCATION, AND FY 2010 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT CRITERIA (RECOMMEND)

Action: Upon a motion by Chairman Campbell, and a second by Councilmember Ritter, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the updated Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategic Plan, the proposed management and monitoring activities and budget for FY 2010 totaling $4 million, and, subject to Board Policy No. 017, authorize staff to solicit proposals and enter into contracts or amend existing contracts accordingly; and (2) adopt the modifications to the submittal and evaluation criteria for land management grants for FY 2010.

13. PRELIMINARY DRAFT REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY UPDATE (INFORMATION)

SANDAG is updating its Regional Energy Strategy (RES) as part of its partnership with the California Energy Commission (Energy Commission). The RES Update includes information on transportation fuels and transportation planning. Staff presented an overview of the preliminary draft report and will be seeking acceptance from the Regional Planning Committee to distribute the draft report to the public at its meeting on Friday, July 31, 2009. A final draft is expected to be completed in September 2009.

Action: This item was provided for information.

14. REGIONAL CLIMATE ACTION PLAN PROGRESS REPORT (DISCUSSION)

SANDAG is developing a Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP) as part of its partnership with the Energy Commission. Staff presented an overview of the draft guiding principles, policy measures and performance monitoring measures and sought input from the Committee. A final draft is expected to be completed by December 2009 or January 2010. The Transportation Committee is asked to discuss and provide input on the development of the Regional Climate Action Plan.

Action: This item was provided for discussion.
15. UPCOMING MEETINGS (INFORMATION)

The Transportation Committee meetings, originally scheduled for Friday, August 7, and Friday, August 21, 2009, have been cancelled. The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, September 18, 2009, at 9 a.m.

16. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Dale adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m.
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TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

September 18, 2009

PROPOSED NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
SERVICE CHANGES FOR JANUARY 2010

File Number 3320100

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: INFORMATION

Introduction

North County Transit District (NCTD) conducts three service changes annually. These service changes reflect current labor agreements and are based on providing the flexibility for the District to make needed changes as service demand changes throughout the year. BREEZE fixed-route bus ridership in FY 2009 declined by 16 percent for a number of reasons, including: the economic downturn, the August 2008 service reduction of 10.7 percent due to sales tax revenue reductions, fare increases, and replacement of some service by the SPRINTER. It should be noted that BREEZE service productivity (passengers per revenue hour) improved slightly despite these factors. In FY 2010, NCTD has continued to lose revenue as a result of the loss of the State Transit Assistance funds and the continuing reduction in sales tax receipts.

NCTD is proposing to reduce midday and weekend services on four routes in January 2010, as well as making additional route modifications on six routes. NCTD held a public hearing on the proposed changes on September 3, 2009, and the NCTD Board of Directors is scheduled to act on the proposed changes at its regular meeting on September 17, 2009.

Discussion

If the proposed fixed route service changes are made in January 2010, NCTD will realize a net savings of approximately $1.84 million, which includes the loss of about $60,000 in fare revenue. SANDAG has reviewed the proposed eliminations for regional significance as required under SANDAG Board Policy No. 018. These changes are being proposed to respond to an immediate need to lower costs and additional changes may be expected when the NCTD Mobility Plan is completed early next year. The Transportation Committee is scheduled to receive an update on the Mobility Plan at its November 6, 2009, meeting.

SANDAG staff has reviewed the proposed changes in relation to Board Policy No. 018, and has concluded that none of the proposed changes are regionally significant. The proposed changes include:

- Routes 317/321 – Service Reduced to peak hours weekdays only
  - Maintains limited local service to employment areas in Vista and Carlsbad
  - Conclusion: Not regionally significant

- Routes 317/319 – Saturday Service Discontinued
  - Eliminates poorly performing local feeder service in Oceanside on Saturdays
  - Conclusion: Not regionally significant
• Routes 317/318/319 – Sunday Service Eliminated
  – Eliminates poorly performing local feeder service in Oceanside on Sundays
  – Conclusion: Not regionally significant

• Routes 302/305/331 – Realignment of Routes and New Van Shuttle (331)
  – Shortens 302 and Extends 305 to accommodate loss of use of driveway at Kaplan College
  – Van Shuttle replaces 302 and 305 on Robelini Dr, Sycamore Ave, and University Avenue in Vista.
  – Conclusion: Not regionally significant

• Route 318 – Shorten Route
  – Improves scheduling and eliminates duplication with SPRINTER in Oceanside
  – Conclusion: Not regionally significant

• Route 319 – Discontinue South of Mira Costa College
  – Eliminates service in Oceanside where there is duplication, and allows better scheduling.
  – Conclusion: Not regionally significant

• Route 315 – Trim Low Ridership Trips
  – Eliminates several early morning and late evening trips to Camp Pendleton that are experiencing low ridership
  – Conclusion: Not regionally significant

• Route 395 – Reductions to the Span of Service and Frequency
  – This service connects Oceanside with Camp Pendleton and San Clemente. The changes result in a better match between demand and capacity.
  – Conclusion: Not regionally significant

Conclusion

NCTD is proposing service reductions through selective reductions in span of service and frequency to meet the current fiscal challenge and reductions in ridership. None of the proposed changes are regionally significant, and no action is required by SANDAG. The NCTD Mobility Plan which is due for completion in 2010 will address in greater detail potential changes to provide for a sustainable transit network in North County.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Summary of Proposed Route Changes for January 2010 Service Change

Key Staff Contact: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
## NCTD
### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ROUTE CHANGES FOR JANUARY 2010 SERVICE CHANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>DAY TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF ROUTE</th>
<th>NATURE OF CHANGE</th>
<th># OF DAILY PASSENGERS AFFECTED*</th>
<th>ESTIMATED ANNUAL DIRECT FARE REVENUE INCREASE (DECREASE)</th>
<th>ESTIMATED NET ANNUAL COST INCREASE (DECREASE)</th>
<th>FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS INCREASED (DECREASED)</th>
<th>NET IMPACT ON PEAK BUS REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Oceanside to Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>Truncate at Vista Transit Center; eliminate Sycamore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($593,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($593,000)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Oceanside to Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>Truncate at Vista Transit Center; eliminate Sycamore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($102,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($102,000)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Sun./Hol.</td>
<td>Oceanside to Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>Truncate at Vista Transit Center; eliminate Sycamore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($113,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($113,000)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Escondido to Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>Extend to Vista Transit Center; eliminate Sycamore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($6,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($6,000)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Escondido to Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>Extend to Vista Transit Center; eliminate Sycamore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Sun./Hol.</td>
<td>Escondido to Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>Extend to Vista Transit Center; eliminate Sycamore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 (new)</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Buena Creek Sta. to Kaplan College</td>
<td>Van shuttle on Sycamore &amp; University Dr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$209,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$209,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 (new)</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Buena Creek Sta. to Kaplan College</td>
<td>Van shuttle on Sycamore &amp; University Dr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 (new)</td>
<td>Sun./Hol.</td>
<td>Buena Creek Sta. to Kaplan College</td>
<td>Van shuttle on Sycamore &amp; University Dr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302/305/331</td>
<td>Annual Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($480,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($480,000)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Town Center North to Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>Reduce span of service</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>($138,000)</td>
<td>($3,000)</td>
<td>($135,000)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Town Center North to Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>Reduce span of service</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>($25,000)</td>
<td>($2,000)</td>
<td>($23,000)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Sun./Hol.</td>
<td>Town Center North to Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>Reduce span of service</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>($28,000)</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
<td>($27,000)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Annual Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($191,000)</td>
<td>($6,000)</td>
<td>($185,000)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>RDO/Oceanside to Vandegrift/Gold</td>
<td>Operate weekday peaks only, 4 round trips</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>($182,000)</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
<td>($177,000)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>RDO/Oceanside to Vandegrift/Gold</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>($66,000)</td>
<td>($3,000)</td>
<td>($63,000)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Sun./Hol.</td>
<td>RDO/Oceanside to Vandegrift/Gold</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>($73,000)</td>
<td>($2,000)</td>
<td>($71,000)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Annual Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($327,000)</td>
<td>($10,000)</td>
<td>($317,000)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NCTD
### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ROUTE CHANGES FOR JANUARY 2010 SERVICE CHANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>DAY TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF ROUTE</th>
<th>NATURE OF CHANGE</th>
<th># OF DAILY PASSENGERS AFFECTED*</th>
<th>ESTIMATED ANNUAL DIRECT COST INCREASE (DECREASE)</th>
<th>ESTIMATED ANNUAL FARE REVENUE INCREASE (DECREASE)**</th>
<th>ESTIMATED ANNUAL COST INCREASE (DECREASE)</th>
<th>FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS INCREASED (DECREASED)</th>
<th>NET IMPACT ON PEAK BUS REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Oceanside TC to RDO SPRINTER</td>
<td>Shift east terminus to El Camino Real; shorten span</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
<td>($2,000)</td>
<td>($98,000)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Oceanside TC to RDO SPRINTER</td>
<td>Shift east terminus to El Camino Real; shorten span</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>($18,000)</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
<td>($17,000)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Sun./Hol.</td>
<td>Oceanside TC to RDO SPRINTER</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>($66,000)</td>
<td>($2,000)</td>
<td>($64,000)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($184,000)</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
<td>($179,000)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>RDO Station to Quarry Creek</td>
<td>Extend to Sr. Center; truncate at MiraCosta 30-minute service on weekdays</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>($279,000)</td>
<td>($6,000)</td>
<td>($273,000)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>RDO Station to Quarry Creek</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>($107,000)</td>
<td>($6,000)</td>
<td>($101,000)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Sun./Hol.</td>
<td>RDO Station to Quarry Creek</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>($119,000)</td>
<td>($4,000)</td>
<td>($115,000)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($565,000)</td>
<td>($16,000)</td>
<td>($549,000)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Carlsbad Village to Palomar College via Legoland</td>
<td>Operate select weekday peak trips hourly</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>($327,000)</td>
<td>($14,000)</td>
<td>($313,000)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Mon.-Thurs.</td>
<td>Oceanside Transit Center to San Clemente via Outer Camps</td>
<td>Reduce frequency of and span of service; start service at 7 AM; operate 4 NB and 5 SB trips</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>($213,000)</td>
<td>($7,000)</td>
<td>($206,000)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Oceanside Transit Center to San Clemente via Outer Camps</td>
<td>Fridays, start service at 7 AM, eliminate Camp Del Mar trips; last NB trip at 12:23 AM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>($26,000)</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
<td>($25,000)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Oceanside Transit Center to San Clemente via Outer Camps</td>
<td>90-min headway until 12PM, then hourly, last trip leaves OTC at 12:33 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($21,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($21,000)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Sun./Hol.</td>
<td>Oceanside Transit Center to San Clemente via Outer Camps</td>
<td>90-min headway until 12PM, then hourly, last trip leaves OTC at 10:18 PM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>($50,000)</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
<td>($49,000)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($310,000)</td>
<td>($9,000)</td>
<td>($301,000)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($2,318,000)</td>
<td>($61,000)</td>
<td>($2,258,000)</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All Route Proposals Annual Impacts**

- **TOTAL WEEKDAY RIDERS AFFECTED**: 151
- **TOTAL SATURDAY RIDERS AFFECTED**: 178
- **TOTAL SUNDAY RIDERS AFFECTED**: 155

* "Affected" means service is no longer within 0.25 miles of former routing.
** Fare Revenue Decrease estimated based on # of passengers affected at average fare of $0.95 per passenger.
SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT

Introduction

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

Discussion

All major work is complete. However, minor concrete work along the corridor and grading in Loma Alta Creek are still in progress.

A settlement agreement was signed on June 19, 2009, resolving all outstanding construction issues on the Mainline project. The agreement addresses the final quantities of work, the cost of change orders, and the settlement of all potential construction claims and disputes. This eliminates the biggest risk to project budget. On August 25, 2009, the FTA-appointed Project Management Oversight Consultants met with NCTD and SANDAG staff for their final Monthly Progress Meeting.

Discussions are ongoing with the SPRINTER consultant design team regarding the final payment for all work performed.

The new estimate at completion (EAC) for the entire project is $478.4 million, a reduction of $900,000 from the previous estimate. Assuming all design issues are resolved, the only outstanding risks to budget involve the final costs of work done for others and the final cost of the owner-controlled insurance program. The project budget set by the NCTD Board and included in the Amended Recovery Plan for the FTA is $484.1 million, giving NCTD an additional $5.7 million of capacity between budget and EAC.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

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

Since March 2005, the City of Encinitas with consultant support from SANDAG has been working on the development and analysis of alternatives for grade-separated, pedestrian crossings along the Encinitas rail corridor. The purpose of the Encinitas Grade Separated Pedestrian Crossings project is to undertake the design, engineering, and environmental clearance for four project locations along the Encinitas rail corridor. The intent is to (1) improve pedestrian access within the Encinitas community between beaches, schools, commercial areas, and residential neighborhoods; and (2) improve rail safety conditions within the proposed project sites.

DISCUSSION

The Encinitas Grade Separated Pedestrian Crossing project is being conducted in two phases and is being funded by Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) funds totaling $1,248,000. Under Phase 1, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was completed for three (Montgomery Avenue, Santa Fe Drive, El Portal Drive) of the four sites and was adopted by the City of Encinitas Planning Commission on December 18, 2008. A Project Study Report/Project Report was subsequently completed in June 1, 2009. Completion of the final environmental report and PSR/PR for the fourth crossing (Hillcrest Drive) is underway pending completion of more detailed environmental and technical studies and expected to be completed in May 2010. Phase 1 expenditures totaled approximately $798,000.

Key activities under Phase 2 will include initiation and completion of final design and engineering tasks that will lead to development of plans and specification documents in preparation for potential construction work efforts. Phase 2 work efforts and scope will be limited to a subset of the four sites based on available TCRP funds (currently estimated at $450,000), after Phase 1 total expenditures. Pending the approval of the FY 2010 Capital Improvement Program, Phase 2 work efforts are anticipated to be completed in August/September 2010.

Staff will provide an update report to the Transportation Committee highlighting the progress of the Encinitas Grade Separation Pedestrian Crossing projects at a future meeting.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachment: 1. Encinitas Grade Separated Pedestrian Crossing

Key Staff Contact: Alex Estrella, (619) 699-1928, aes@sandag.org
PROJECT NUMBER: TBD  
PROJECT NAME: ENCINITAS GRADE SEPARATION PEDESTRIAN CROSSING  
PROJECT MANAGER: Alex Estrella  
PHONE NUMBER: (619) 699-1928

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Project includes the development and analysis of alternatives for grade-separated, pedestrian crossings along the Encinitas rail corridor. The purpose of the Encinitas Grade Separated Pedestrian Crossings project is to undertake the design, engineering, and environmental clearance for four project locations along the Encinitas rail corridor. The construction of grade-separated pedestrian crossings would provide safe pedestrian movement through the rail corridor and improve community access. Safety would be improved as the opportunity for interaction between pedestrians and trains would be diminished.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION
The purpose of the Encinitas grade-separated pedestrian crossings are to (1) improve pedestrian access across the rail corridor to safely access public recreational facilities, schools, commercial and residential areas; and (2) improve the safety conditions within the project area by eliminating train and pedestrian interaction through grade-separation. The limited number of pedestrian crossings hinders east-west pedestrian movement resulting in trespassing of the railroad right-of-way to reach nearby coastal recreation areas, businesses, schools and residential neighborhoods. Illegal crossing of the rail corridor poses a safety hazard to pedestrians and rail operations. Approximately 52 train movements occur along this rail corridor segment each weekday and frequency is projected to increase over 80 movements in the next 10 years.

PROGRESS TO DATE
The Encinitas Grade Separated Pedestrian Crossings project is being conducted in two phases. Under Phase 1, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was completed for three (Montgomery Avenue, Santa Fe Drive, El Portal Drive) of the four sites and was adopted by the City of Encinitas Planning Commission on December 18, 2008. A Project Study Report/Project Report was subsequently completed in June 1, 2009. Phase 2 will include initiation and completion of final design and engineering tasks that will lead to development of plans and specification documents in preparation for potential construction work efforts.

EXPENDITURE PLAN ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11</th>
<th>FY 12</th>
<th>FY 13</th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FUTURE YEARS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</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>Miscellaneous Equipment</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>Engineering &amp; Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</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>Right-of-Way</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>Construction</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>Environmental</td>
<td>$798</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</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>Total</td>
<td>$798</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING PLAN ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCE</th>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11</th>
<th>FY 12</th>
<th>FY 13</th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FUTURE YEARS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE: STIP - TCRP</td>
<td>$798</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: $798 | $450 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $1,248 |
ACTION NO. 6

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 6

September 18, 2009

Action Requested: APPROVE

INTERSTATE 5 SOUTH MULTIMODAL CORRIDOR STUDY: SCREENING OF TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES File Number 3330200

Introduction

SANDAG, in collaboration with the City of Chula Vista and Caltrans, is conducting an Interstate 5 (I-5) Multimodal Corridor Study (Study) to examine potential transportation improvements between State Route 54 (SR 54) and Main Street in the City of Chula Vista. This Study will complement a larger effort by Caltrans to prepare a highway Project Study Report (PSR) for a longer segment of I-5 from SR-15 to the international border with Mexico. Attachment 1 illustrates the study area for both planning efforts. The I-5 South Multimodal Corridor Study was initiated in February 2009 and is expected to conclude in fall 2010.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the three recommended transportation alternatives for additional study.

Discussion

Study Background

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

The Study is evaluating multimodal improvements to accommodate current and future traffic demand including freeway and interchange improvements, light rail transit and freight rail services running parallel to I-5, and bus transit/pedestrian/bicycle circulation adjacent to I-5. This study will propose capital improvements with estimated costs and a conceptual phasing plan for financing and construction. The study effort is being led by the City of Chula Vista and SANDAG with collaboration from Caltrans. The consultant firm AECOM has been hired to perform planning and engineering work for the Study.

An ad hoc technical working group has been established and meets on a monthly basis to provide input on various aspects of the Study. The working group includes staff from Caltrans, the City of Chula Vista, City of Coronado, City of Imperial Beach, City of National City, City of San Diego, Metropolitan Transit System, Port of San Diego, San Diego Imperial Valley Railroad, Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway, California Northern Railroad – RailAmerica, and SANDAG.
Additionally, separate Rail and Traffic Working Group meetings have been held to focus on specific traffic and rail operational issues.

**Study Purpose and Need**

Like much of the San Diego region, the I-5 South Corridor is expected to experience population growth in the coming years. Existing transportation infrastructure will need to be improved to better serve existing and future travel demands. The Study strives to identify a transportation improvement strategy that will allow for the efficient movement of people and goods, promote intermodal connections within the corridor, expand travel choices, and maintain or improve future level of service and travel times. The recommended projects and services also should support the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and promote economic growth.

**Alternatives Evaluated**

The Study working group identified seven build alternatives for initial consideration and evaluation (Attachment 2). These alternatives as well as a no-build alternative were evaluated utilizing quantitative and qualitative criteria created by the Study working group based on RTP project evaluation criteria. The criteria utilized SANDAG transportation modeling data and evaluated each alternative’s ability to: serve peak period trips, provide congestion relief and travel time savings, serve goods movement, support Smart Growth plans, as well as minimize environmental impacts and capital and operating/maintenance costs.

**Summary of Findings**

The analysis led to the recommendation of Alternatives 1, 2, and 4 for further study, in addition to the No Build Alternative.

- **Alternative 1** contains many improvements included in the 2030 RTP Reasonably Expected revenue scenario including the addition of two high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, freeway access improvements (auxiliary lanes and ramp metering), Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route 640, increased local bus frequency, South Line rail track improvements, rail grade separations at E Street, H Street, and Palomar Street; and increased transit parking facilities. This alternative rated well in the categories of cost, low potential environmental and community impacts and contained the smallest right-of-way. It also fared well in the area of improved transit.

- **Alternative 2** builds on the improvements contained in Alternative 1 with the modification of shifting the I-5 centerline to the west and the addition of braided ramp system to improve interchange spacing and function. This alternative performed well in the areas of improved freeway operations, cost, potential community and environmental impact, and contains good transit improvements.

- **Alternative 4** offers additional transit improvements. This alternative includes the two HOV lanes, rail grade separation, increased local bus service, and freeway access improvements included in Alternative 1 but also adds a third main rail line which would be used for peak-period express Trolley service and freight rail at night. This alternative also includes two additional Arterial Rapid bus routes which would provide east-west bus service. This alternative was the best performing from a transit perspective, had a high potential for increased goods movement, and high compatibility with Smart Growth planning.
The eliminated alternatives include Alternatives 3, 5, 6, and 7. Alternative 3 which included four Managed Lanes in addition to many of the improvements included Alternative 2 would require the largest right-of-way of any of the alternatives and its high cost was not justified by limited performance benefits. Alternative 5 analyzed relocating the trolley tracks to the west side of I-5. This alternative created lower transit ridership, increased transit operating costs, and had negative community and smart growth impacts. Alternative 6 considered the addition of a third mainline rail that would be utilized only for freight operations. The addition of a third rail line would require significant capital investment and this alternative did not perform as strongly as Alternative 4 which included a third rail line which would contain additional Trolley service during the day and could be utilized by freight rail at night.

Alternative 7 contained the same improvements as Alternative 1 with the addition of High Speed Rail (HSR) and a potential High Speed Commuter Rail (HSCR) station in the vicinity of H Street in Chula Vista. SANDAG is currently conducting a study to examine the feasibility of extending the state’s proposed HSR from Lindbergh Field to the international border with Mexico. Interstate 5 is one of three corridors being considered for the HSR route. The initial alternatives analysis also includes an alternative featuring a potential HSR/HSCR line located to the west of I-5 with a potential HSCR station in the vicinity of H Street. While not the express focus of the I-5 South Multimodal Corridor Study, a HSR/HSCR alignment located to the west of I-5 could be incorporated into any of the three recommended alternatives pending the results of the HSR study.

This analysis was shared with management level staff from the City of Chula Vista, Caltrans, and SANDAG on July 22, 2009, and with the Study working group on August 3, 2009. The Chula Vista City Council received an information item on the Study progress to date and recommended alternatives at its August 11, 2008, meeting. Additionally, an evening public outreach meeting which presented the seven alternatives and the three recommended for further study was held in the City of Chula Vista on August 25, 2009.

**Next Steps**

Pending the Transportation Committee approval of the three alternatives recommended for additional study, the Study working group and the consultant team will move forward with more detailed environmental, engineering, and cost analysis of the three alternatives. A second set of more detailed evaluation criteria will be used to determine a final recommended improvement strategy, which may contain a hybrid of projects and services from multiple alternatives. The Transportation Committee will be asked to take action on the recommended strategy in spring 2010 for incorporation into the 2050 RTP development. The final Study report is expected in fall 2010. The recommendations of the Study also will be carried forward and incorporated into the larger Caltrans I-5 South PSR.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Interstate 5 South Study Area  
2. Interstate 5 South Multimodal Corridor Study Alternatives

Key Staff Contact: Rachel Kennedy, (619) 699-1929, rke@sandag.org
No Build

LEGEND

- TCIF Mainline Track Improvements
- Centralized Track Control and Automatic Train Stop (CTC & ATS)
- Improve Siding at Palomar Street
Concept Alternative 1
(Recommended for Further Study)

LEGEND
- 8F + 2HOV
- Access Improvements (Ramp Metering and Aux Lanes)
- Rail Grade Separations
- TCIF Mainline Track Improvements
- Increase Bus Frequency
- BRT Route 640 (2 In-Line Stations)
- Increased Parking Facilities
- Arterial Improvements
Concept Alternative 2
(Recommended for Further Study)

LEGEND
- 8F + 2HOV (Shift CL I-5 West) • Increase Bus Frequency
- Braided Ramp System • BRT Route 640 (2 In-Line Stations)
- Rail Grade Separations • Increased Parking Facilities
- TCIF Mainline Track Improvements • Arterial Improvements
Concept Alternative 3

LEGEND
- 8F + 4 ML (Shift CL I-5 West)  
- Braided Ramp System  
- Rail Grade Separations  
- TCIF Mainline Track Improvements  
- Increase Bus Frequency  
- BRT Route 640 (2 In-Line Stations)  
- Increased Parking Facilities  
- Arterial Improvements
Concept Alternative 4
(Recommended for Further Study)

LEGEND
- 8F + 2HOV (Shift CL I-5 West)
- Access Improvements (Ramp Metering and Aux Lanes)
- Third LRT Mainline Track (Express Trolley)
- Freight Shared Third Mainline Track
- Rail Grade Separations
- Increase Bus Frequency
- ART Route 627 and Route 635
- Increased Parking Facilities
- Arterial Improvements
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Introduction

In Fiscal Years (FY) 2001 to 2003, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved three Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims for several capital projects serving the rural area operated by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). These capital projects have been completed and a balance of $530,481 remains. MTS has requested that the remaining funds be used for operations.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Resolution No. 2010-02, in substantially the same form as Attachment 1, revising TDA claims.

Discussion

In 2003, the County of San Diego divested from providing public transit service, including the rural service to MTS. Prior to the consolidation of transit services, TDA was allocated specifically for the rural service. There are three open claims from 2003 and prior – claim numbers 247, 252, and 255 for bus stop improvements, communications equipment, and facilities-related capital projects. These capital projects are complete. A balance of $13,595 remains in claim number 247 (spent $966,616 out of an allocation of $980,211); a balance of $470,000 remains in claim number 252 (spent $403,937 out of an allocation of $873,937); and a balance of $46,886 remains in claim number 255 (spent $2,696,421 out of an allocation of $2,743,307). The remaining balance unspent for the three claims totals $530,481. These TDA claim amendments would close out these claims and the funds would be available for other capital or operating needs. Pursuant to the TDA Manual, when circumstances warrant a revision to an existing claim in which the operator wishes to use the funds for purposes other than for which it was originally allocated, the claim amendment requires approval by the transit agency board and approval by SANDAG Transportation Committee. The MTS Board of Directors, at its August 20, 2009, meeting, approved to transfer of the remaining capital funds to support FY 2010 operations. Additionally, MTS has since merged the rural service with its fixed-route service and allocation of TDA for rural service is no longer relevant.

LAUREN WARREM
Director of Finance (Acting)

Attachment: 1. Resolution No. 2010-02

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, ski@sandag.org
RESOLUTION NO. 2010-02

APPROVING REVISIONS TO TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
ARTICLE 4 FIXED ROUTE GENERAL PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 4 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC) listed below require revisions; and

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

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Transportation Committee as follows:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Original Allocation</th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>$980,211</td>
<td>($13,595)</td>
<td>$966,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>- $0 -</td>
<td>$13,595</td>
<td>$13,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>- $0 -</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$873,937</td>
<td>($470,000)</td>
<td>$403,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>- $0 -</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$2,743,307</td>
<td>($46,886)</td>
<td>$2,696,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>- $0 -</td>
<td>$46,886</td>
<td>$46,886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 18th day of September 2009.

______________________________           ________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

ATTEST: ________________________________

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

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

September 18, 2009

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 8

Action Requested: APPROVE

AMENDMENT 4 TO ADDENDUM 2 TO THE MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT TO THE SPRINTER RAIL PROJECT

File Number 1115200

Introduction

After the passage of SB 1703, SANDAG signed a Master Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the North County Transit District (NCTD) and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) to define the functions and responsibilities of the agencies. An addendum to the MOU was approved to provide SANDAG staff and consultant assistance to NCTD in the delivery of the SPRINTER Project. The addendum was subsequently amended to provide additional assistance at the request of NCTD. This Amendment 4 requests an additional $25,000 of authority to assist NCTD with SPRINTER Project close out activities.

Discussion

Addendum 2 to the Master MOU with NCTD was executed on June 16, 2005. It provided reimbursement for SANDAG assistance on the NCTD SPRINTER Project, not to exceed $275,000. Amendment 1 to Addendum 2 was approved by Board Action on November 17, 2006, to provide an additional $1,225,000 for a total of $1,500,000 to assist NCTD implement the provisions of its Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Amended Recovery Plan. NCTD requested a second amendment to Addendum 2 for $250,000 which was approved by the Transportation Committee on May 2, 2008, for a total of $1,750,000. On December 12, 2008, the Transportation Committee approved a budget increase of $325,000 in accordance with Addendum 11 of the Master MOU to fund the continued work of NCTD staff transferred to SANDAG for a total of $2,075,000.

NCTD recently requested an additional $125,000 for staff support bringing the total to $2,200,000. During the development of the FY 2010 SANDAG Program Budget, it was anticipated all support work would be complete and therefore the FY 2010 Budget did not include additional support services for SPRINTER assistance. In order to continue to provide uninterrupted service, the Executive Director under his authority has executed a third amendment to Addendum 2 to the MOU for $100,000 with NCTD. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Amendment 4 to Addendum 2 to the MOU and the remaining $25,000 increase and add the SPRINTER Project Manager Assistance Project (1115200) into the FY 2010 Program Budget.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment 4 to Addendum 2 to the Master MOU with NCTD in the amount of $25,000 in substantially the same form as Attachment 1 and to add the SPRINTER Project Manager Assistance Project (1115200) into the FY 2010 Program Budget.
This action was approved by the NCTD Board at its September Board meeting.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Manager and Project Implementation

Attachment: 1. Draft Amendment 4 to Addendum 2 to the Master MOU between SANDAG, NCTD, and MTDB Defining Functions and Responsibilities of the Three Agencies: Staff Assistance on Oceanside–Escondido (SPRINTER) Project

Key Staff Contact: Jim Linthicum, (619) 699-1970, jlin@sandag.org
AMENDMENT 4 TO ADDENDUM 2
TO THE MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS,
THE NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT,
AND THE METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD
DEFINING THE FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
OF THE THREE AGENCIES:
STAFF ASSISTANCE ON OCEANSIDE – ESCONDIDO (SPRINTER) PROJECT

This Amendment 4 to Addendum 2 is made and entered into this ____ day of September 2009, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments (“SANDAG”) and the North County Transit District (“NCTD”).

RECITALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the parties seek to append the MOU with this Amendment 4 to Addendum 2 to describe the manner in which SANDAG will provide additional staff assistance to NCTD on the SPRINTER project; and

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

I. This Amendment 4 shall supersede the provisions set forth in Addendum 2, and all previous amendments thereto, to the extent set forth below. The parties shall remain bound to the terms of the MOU, Addendum 2 and Amendments thereto except to the extent the terms of this Amendment 4 conflict with those documents in which case this Amendment 4 shall supersede.
II. Paragraphs 5 and 6 of Section III, entitled “SANDAG Staff Assistance,” shall be amended to instead read as follows:

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

6. The amount of this Amendment 4 shall be $25,000. The total cost to be reimbursed to SANDAG under all amendments to Addendum 2 for SPRINTER engineering support shall not exceed $1,875,000 over the life of the SPRINTER project, unless subsequently amended by mutual agreement of NCTD and SANDAG.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Amendment 4 to Addendum 2 on the date and year first written above.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: ____________________________
Office of the General Counsel

NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD

By: ____________________________
Matthew Tucker, Executive Director

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

By: ____________________________
Gary L. Gallegos, Executive Director
San Diego Association of Governments

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

September 18, 2009

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 9

Action Requested: APPROVE

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM BUDGET TRANSFERS

File Number 1142100

Introduction

SANDAG implements Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) projects that require construction contracting. These projects are included in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) of the SANDAG Program Budget. SANDAG policy authorizes the Transportation Committee to approve budget amendments up to $500,000 for transportation items. The proposed action transfers $195,000 from MTS Substation Transformer Rehabilitation project and $195,000 from completed SANDAG capital projects to increase the project budget of the Substation Standardization project by $390,000.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to:

1. authorize the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), in substantially the same form as attached, allowing the transfer of $195,000 from MTS Substation Transformer Rehabilitation project to SANDAG Substation Standardization project; and
2. approve the transfer of an additional $195,000 from completed capital projects to the Substation Standardization as shown in Table 1; and
3. approve an increase of $390,000 to the Substation Standardization project budget.

Discussion

SANDAG is rehabilitating existing traction power substations on the MTS Trolley Orange Line as part of SANDAG capital project 1142100 Substation Rehabilitation. The Substation Rehabilitation Project scope includes rehabilitation of three substations and the installation of a substation and isolation switches on the Orange Line. The total cost for the work exceeds the existing project budget; therefore, one substation at the Grossmont Trolley Station was not included in the initial construction work. The cost to complete the substation rehabilitation is $540,000. $150,000 of this amount is available in the project budget. An additional $390,000 is needed to complete the work at Grossmont substation.

MTS considers the rehabilitation of all three substations to be a high priority project; therefore, SANDAG and MTS staff coordinated to identify additional funding to complete the project as scoped. The MTS Board approved the transfer of $195,000 from its Substation Transformer Rehabilitation project to the SANDAG Substation Standardization project at its August 20, 2009, meeting. Today’s action would approve the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for this transfer. In addition, SANDAG has identified an additional $195,000 from completed capital projects, as shown in Table 1, that is available and eligible to fund this work. Staff recommends applying these funds to this substation rehabilitation project as it will utilize unallocated and available grant funds on a high priority regional transportation project.
Table 1 summarizes the recommended actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project (CIP #)</th>
<th>FY 10 Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Budget Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substation Standardization Project (1142100)</td>
<td>$3,618,000</td>
<td>$4,008,000</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

- Transfer from MTS Substation Transformer Rehabilitation Project (11225) $195,000
- Transfer of remaining balances from completed capital projects $195,000

JACK BODA
Director Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments: 1. MTS Board Item No. 10, August 20, 2009
2. Memorandum of Understanding

Key Staff Contact: John Haggerty, (619) 699-6937, jhag@sandag.org
Agenda

Item No. 10

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

August 20, 2009

SUBJECT:

MTS: GROSSMONT SUBSTATION REHABILITATION MOU AND FUNDS TRANSFER

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Directors:

1. authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (in substantially the same form as Attachment A) for a fund transfer to the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) to rehabilitate the Grossmont substation under SANDAG’s construction contract No. 5000956, which would include construction management services; and

2. forward a request to the SANDAG Transportation Committee to transfer $88,000 from Grant No. CA-03-0525 and $107,000 from Grant No. CA-03-0655 to Capital Improvement Program (CIP) 1142100 to exercise an option for rehabilitation of the Grossmont substation (as summarized in Attachment B).

Budget Impact

$195,000 would be transferred from MTS CIP 11225 (Substation Transformer Rehabilitation) to SANDAG’s CIP 1142100 (Fletcher Parkway Substation and Orange Line Substation Rehabilitation).

DISCUSSION:

SANDAG currently has a construction contract (5000956) with Mass Electric, Inc. to rehabilitate three Orange Line substations. The contract includes an option for rehabilitation of one more substation at Grossmont—this option has not been exercised so far due to the lack of funding. Rehabilitation work of three substations will be...
completed in the next four to six weeks. The project has about $150,000 left in construction contingency that could be used toward exercising the option; however, the bid price for the Grossmont substation rehabilitation option is $515,344, which would leave a shortage of $365,344.

SANDAG also has two old grants with leftover funds (Grant No. CA-03-0525 with $88,000 and Grant No. CA-03-0655 with $107,000) totaling $195,000. Staff recommends that the MTS Board of Directors forward a request to the SANDAG Transportation Committee to transfer these funds to SANDAG CIP 1142100 and use it toward exercising an option for rehabilitation of the Grossmont substation.

MTS CIP 11225 (Substation Transformer Rehabilitation) has $195,000 available in the project budget. SDTI staff has carefully reviewed the needs and priorities for the current substation improvement projects and recommends transferring $195,000 from MTS CIP 11225 to SANDAG CIP 1142100 (as summarized in Attachment B). This transfer together with the leftover contingency funds from CIP 1142100 and a transfer from two old grants would provide $540,000, which would be sufficient for exercising the contract option and providing funds for construction management and administration of the project.

San Diego Trolley, Inc. (SDTI) staff considers the substation rehabilitation a higher priority over the transformer rehabilitation for the following reasons:

1. The primary cause of a fire resulting in the loss of two substations in the past was due to a weak design and components in the contactors of the substation. SDTI is aggressively pursuing replacement of the contactors with motorized circuit breakers in the substation rehabilitation projects. So far, 7 substations have been rehabilitated, and exercising the option to rehabilitation the Grossmont substation would increase it to 8.

2. The SANDAG substation contract has been awarded and is in place. Due to the lack of funding, the option for Grossmont was not exercised in the past. Staff believes that MTS would have significant cost savings by exercising the current option rather than waiting for future funding and a new bid solicitation.

Paul C. Jablonski  
Chief Executive Officer

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

Attachments:  
A. Memorandum of Understanding  
B. Budget Transfer Summary
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AND METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
REGARDING FUNDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF GROSSMONT SUBSTATION
REHABILITATION PROJECT

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is made and entered into effective as of this ___ day of September 2009, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments ("SANDAG") and Metropolitan Transit System ("MTS").

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Agreement:

WHEREAS, SANDAG implements construction projects for MTS on its light rail system; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has hired a construction contractor for rehabilitation of three light rail vehicle substations on the MTS Orange Line, including the Grossmont substation rehabilitation; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has not previously authorized the contractor to rehabilitate the Grossmont substation because of insufficient funds; and

WHEREAS, the MTS Board at its August 20, 2009, meeting approved a transfer of funds from MTS capital project 11225 to SANDAG Capital Project 1142100 for construction and construction management of the Grossmont Substation Rehabilitation Project (Project); and

WHEREAS, MTS desires to utilize SANDAG construction management services for the Project; and

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

WHEREAS, SANDAG has a resident engineer available to help manage the project; and

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

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

AGREEMENT

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

SANDAG AGREES:

1. To execute the option under SANDAG contract number 5000956 (funded by SANDAG Capital Project 1142100), for rehabilitation of the Grossmont substation in accordance with the plans and specifications included in the contract bid documents.
2. That a not-to-exceed amount of $195,000 provided under this agreement in conjunction with other funding sources as shown in Exhibit A, is the amount estimated for SANDAG to complete the construction via its contractor and provide construction management for the Project. The total amount for the Grossmont substation rehabilitation for construction and construction management shall not exceed $540,000. In the event SANDAG believes this amount will be exceeded, it will notify MTS, and the parties will meet to discuss whether an amendment to this MOU is appropriate.

3. To provide construction management services including the provision of a Resident Engineer (RE) to manage the Project.

4. That the maximum amount for construction management services shall not exceed $30,000 without prior written approval from MTS.

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

6. Neither MTS nor any director, officer, agent, or employee thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by SANDAG under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to SANDAG under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, SANDAG shall fully defend, indemnify, and save harmless MTS, its officers, directors, agents, and employees from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind, and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by SANDAG under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to SANDAG under this MOU.

MTS AGREES:

1. To fund a portion of the cost for the construction and construction management of the Project up to the maximum amount of $195,000. In the event SANDAG notifies MTS that this amount or the total estimated amount of the Project of $540,000 will be exceeded, MTS will meet with SANDAG to discuss whether an amendment to this MOU is appropriate. In no event shall SANDAG have responsibility to move forward with the Project until the parties are able to identify sufficient funds to complete the work.

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

3. Neither SANDAG nor any director, officer, agent, or employee thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by MTS under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to MTS under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, MTS shall fully defend, indemnify, and save harmless SANDAG, its officers, directors, agents, and employees from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind, and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by MTS under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to MTS under this MOU.
THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE:

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

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

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

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

3. That unless it is amended by the parties in writing, this MOU shall terminate on April 15, 2010, or on such earlier or later date as the parties may agree to in writing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

MTS

______________________________
GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

______________________________
PAUL J ABLENSKI
Chief Executive Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
Office of General Counsel

______________________________
Office of General Counsel

Exhibit A – Funding Summary for Grossmont Substation Rehabilitation
### Exhibit A – Funding Summary for Grossmont Substation Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS Project 11225</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1142100 Const. Contingency</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other SANDAG Grants</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$540,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED FUND EXCHANGE WITH NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
TO PROVIDE OPERATING SUPPORT

Introduction

At its April 24, 2009, meeting, the SANDAG Board of Directors received a presentation that among other things provided an avenue for ‘bridge’ funding for the transit operators struggling with their operating budgets. Since then, the North County Transit District (NCTD) has proposed to exchange its Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 funds for the more flexible TransNet.

Discussion

The region’s transit operators, like many public transit systems around the country, have seen a significant decline in revenues resulting in operating deficits. In response, SANDAG presented funding alternatives, both short term and long term, to support both NCTD and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) at the April 24, 2009, Board of Directors meeting. Although the long-term proposals discussed would take time to develop, two short-term options were presented. In response, NCTD has proposed to exchange its FTA 5307 in the amount of $1,313,000 with a like amount of TransNet funds in order to help bridge the gap in its operating budget. The NCTD Board is scheduled to approve this item at its September 17, 2009, meeting.

SANDAG would exchange the funding currently programmed for the Blue Line Rehabilitation project which currently has both FTA and TransNet funding. As reported back in April, the Blue Line project was identified as the vehicle in which fund exchanges would be processed. SANDAG staff is scheduled to present a status update including the funding plan for the project at a future Transportation Committee meeting.

LAUREN WARREM
Director of Finance (Acting)

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, ski@sandag.org
INTERSTATE 15 CORRIDOR EXPRESS LANES:
STATE ROUTE 78 – NORDAHL ROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

Introduction

On July 18, 2008, the Transportation Committee authorized staff to begin working with the city of Escondido, the city of San Marcos, and Caltrans to develop a strategy to replace the Nordahl Road bridge over State Route (SR) 78 and improve access to and from the Interstate 15 (I-15) Express Lanes. This issue also was presented to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) at its July 16, 2008, and September 9, 2009, meetings. Preliminary engineering has been completed, and the recommended improvements include the replacement of the Nordahl Road bridge, realignment of the on and off ramps at the SR 78 Nordahl Road interchange, and the addition of a westbound auxiliary lane between I-15 and Nordahl Road at a total estimated cost of $41 million (Attachment 1). This strategy would avoid widening the existing Nordahl Road bridge, which is in need of replacement to accommodate the future widening of SR 78 and to address a height clearance restriction. The project team is ready to begin design work on the proposed projects.

Recommendation

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

1. Execute an agreement with the cities of Escondido and San Marcos that provides that the cities will collectively commit to a $10 million contribution to the Nordahl Road bridge project, and that SANDAG will transfer $2 million in savings from favorable bids received on the I-15 North segment to the design of the proposed Nordahl Road bridge replacement project; and

2. Execute a transfer with Caltrans for an additional $1 million in TransNet funds under a separate existing agreement from the I-15 North segment budget to fund the design of a westbound auxiliary lane on SR 78 between I-15 and Nordahl Road.

Discussion

Bids were opened on June 19, 2008, and October 23, 2008, for the construction of the I-15 North segment between Centre City Parkway and SR 78. Two contracts were awarded for the construction of the I-15 North segment. In the current economic climate, favorable bids are being received for the region’s transportation infrastructure projects, including the winning bids for the I-15 North segment, which were 12 and 3 percent under the engineer’s estimate. Construction is scheduled to be completed in December 2011.

The cities of Escondido and San Marcos have been investigating modifications to the Nordahl Road bridge for some time. Bridge widening is needed to support traffic from an adjacent new hospital.
under construction in the city of Escondido. From both a taxpayer’s and engineering perspective, it would be more cost-effective to replace and widen the Nordahl Road bridge in lieu of widening alone. A bridge replacement strategy avoids costly re-work as the bridge will need to be replaced during the future planned TransNet project to widen SR 78. Bridge replacement also would fix an existing height clearance problem. This bridge has been struck numerous times by over-height vehicles resulting in the need for emergency repairs.

Earlier this year, Caltrans completed a traffic operations analysis on SR 78 between I-15 and Nordahl Road. High volumes from the northbound and southbound connector ramps to westbound SR 78 cause congestion during the morning and afternoon commutes. The resulting bottleneck backs up traffic onto I-15 (see Attachment 1). Eliminating this bottleneck will provide for a more efficient transition from the new improvements on the I-15 corridor. The average delay per vehicle is up to 14 minutes and is projected to increase to over 30 minutes in 2030 if no improvements are made.

The proposed improvements include the replacement of the Nordahl Road bridge, realignment of the on and off ramps at the SR 78 Nordahl Road interchange, and the addition of a westbound auxiliary lane between I-15 and Nordahl Road. These improvements are estimated to cost $41 million. The cities of Escondido and San Marcos have committed to pledge $10 million collectively toward the project, which represents the cost of widening the bridge (Attachments 2 and 3). Staff recommends that the Executive Director be given the authority to execute an agreement with the cities of Escondido and San Marcos that provides that the cities will commit a $10 million collective contribution to the Nordahl Road bridge replacement project, and that SANDAG will transfer $2 million of TransNet funds made available due to the favorable bids received from the I-15 North project budget to the Nordahl Road bridge replacement project. Staff further recommends that the Executive Director be given the authority to execute a transfer with Caltrans under a separate existing agreement of an additional $1 million in TransNet funds from the I-15 North segment budget to fund the design of a westbound auxiliary lane on SR 78 between I-15 and Nordahl Road. This action to develop the design plans for the projects will get them shovel-ready for construction, which could start in early 2011.

Assuming $13 million is secured for the project as outlined above, an estimated $28 million shortfall would remain from the total $41 million estimated cost. Once the design of the projects has advanced, a construction funding plan will be developed and brought forward for approval, which could include the use of construction bid savings in the corridor and/or other funding opportunities that may become available.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments: 1. Nordahl Road Bridge and SR 78 Auxiliary Lane Location Map
2. September 1, 2009, letter from Escondido City Manager Clay Phillips
3. September 1, 2009, letter from San Marcos City Manager Paul Malone

Key Staff Contact: Gustavo Dallarda, Caltrans Corridor Project Director, (619) 688-6738, gustavo.dallarda@dot.ca.gov
September 1, 2009

San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
Attn: Mr. Gary Gallegos, Executive Director

Subject: SR 78 Bridge Replacement at Nordahl Road Project

Dear Mr. Gallegos:

As a follow-up to the telephone conference call held this morning between the City of Escondido, the City of San Marcos, and SANDAG, this letter is confirmation of our commitment to fund our $5,000,000 share of the cost towards the SR 78 Bridge Replacement at Nordahl Road Project. This commitment is in response to SANDAG's proposal to transfer $2,000,000 for the design work on the project. We truly appreciate your efforts and cooperation in identifying the necessary funding to keep this regionally significant project moving forward.

Sincerely,

Clay Phillips
City Manager

cc: Paul Malone, San Marcos City Manager
    Charles Grimm, Assistant City Manager
    Edward Domingue, Director of Engineering Services
    Robert Zaino, Deputy Director of Engineering Services
September 1, 2009

Mr. Gary Gallegos, Executive Director
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: San Marcos Funding Commitment for the Nordahl Road Bridge Replacement at SR 78

Dear Gary,

It is my understanding that SANDAG staff will be proposing a $2,000,000 TransNet funding request to the Board of Directors at their September 25th meeting for design work on the Nordahl Road-SR 78 bridge replacement. I appreciate your efforts to keep this vital project moving forward.

This letter is to confirm the City of San Marcos commitment to participate in the amount of $5,000,000 towards the completion of the project.

Please let me know if you have any questions in this regard.

Sincerely,

Paul Malone
City Manager

Cc: Clay Phillips, Escondido City Manager
    Gustavo Dallarda, Caltrans District 11
    Charles “Muggs” Stoll, SANDAG
    Mike Edwards, City Engineer
STATUS REPORT: STATE ROUTE 11/OTAY MESA EAST PORT OF ENTRY
FINANCIAL STRATEGY

Introduction

SANDAG, in cooperation with Caltrans, the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), counterpart agencies in Mexico, and other project stakeholders, is working on developing the new Otay Mesa East Port of Entry (POE) and associated transportation network, State Route 11 (SR 11). The project is located approximately two miles east of the existing Otay Mesa border crossing and will constitute a third border crossing along the San Diego region’s border with Tijuana. The improvements on the U.S. side of the border are expected to cost in the range of $615 million to $715 million and are to be funded through tolls, fees, and other revenues such as the Proposition 1B Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF).

The Transportation Committee has received periodic updates on the status of the State Routes 905 and 11 projects. The updates have provided information on project progress and key milestones completed, including:

- Passage of state legislation (Senate Bill 1486 entitled the Otay Mesa East Toll Facility Act) authorizing SANDAG to collect tolls to finance the project
- Caltrans’ completion of the Phase 1 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR)
- U.S. Department of State’s approval of a Presidential Permit that authorizes the U.S. General Services Agency (GSA) to build the Otay Mesa East POE as a vehicular and pedestrian border crossing
- The allocation of $75 million in Proposition 1B TCIF funds for project construction

Caltrans is currently managing the project-level environmental studies, including engineering and design. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds ($13.0 million) and federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) funds ($0.8 million) are supporting the current Caltrans work efforts.

The unique nature of the project will require resourcing and coordinating a wide range of professional services during the early project development phase, prior to the construction phase. As a result, SANDAG staff has been meeting with a wide variety of agencies and organizations that have had similar project experiences or are interested in partnering to complete some portion of the overall work. This report focuses on findings from these discussions, as well as a potential course of action for the Transportation Committee to consider.
Background

Both the San Ysidro and Otay Mesa Ports of Entry stand out compared to the other United States-Mexico border crossings. The San Ysidro-Puerta Mexico POE is the busiest international land crossing along the U.S.-Mexico border. The Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay POE continues to accommodate the third highest dollar value of trade among all southern border POEs. The volume of cross border vehicle and pedestrian crossings and associated border delays has been increasing rapidly for more than a decade, especially in the northbound direction.

Steady growth in global and regional economic integration squeezes ever more people and goods through border infrastructure that was sized for a much smaller and significantly less security-conscious economy. Northbound peak wait times at existing facilities can routinely last for more than two hours for passenger vehicles, and commercial truck drivers have often logged four hours in line. According to the SANDAG-Caltrans study, 2007 Update: Economic Impacts of Border Wait Times in the San Diego-Baja California Border Region, the border traffic congestion and delays cost the U.S. and Mexican economies an estimated $7.2 billion in gross output (value of goods and services produced) and more than 62,000 jobs in 2007. A third border crossing at East Otay Mesa could reduce delays caused by traffic congestion, better accommodate projected trade and travel demand, and increase economic growth and job opportunities on both sides of the border without sacrificing border safety and security.

Currently, SANDAG has secured $75 million in California Proposition 1B Trade Corridor Improvement Funds, which will partially fund the construction phase, expected to begin in 2012. The funding for the design phase, traffic and revenue study, and right-of-way (ROW) acquisition still must be identified. In the more immediate future, SANDAG must begin to develop and implement the financing strategy that will fully fund the construction phase. Below is a list of key milestones and the currently available funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Target Completion Dates</th>
<th>Amount and Source of Available Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Tier II EIS/EIR</td>
<td>Winter 2009</td>
<td>$13.8M STIP/ SAFETEA-LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Tier II EIS/EIR</td>
<td>Winter 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Right of Way</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Funding Not Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Construction</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$75M Prop. 1B TCIF/ Borrowing &amp; Toll Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Construction</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $88.8M Estimate Range of Remaining Funds Needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Strategy: Research and Key Findings

As mentioned above, during the past several months, SANDAG staff has sought out and participated in more than 20 information gathering meetings with construction management firms, investment banks, federal transportation partners, and tolling experts to collect information about similar projects and to identify potential opportunities and obstacles in project development. Staff also has consulted with SANDAG’s financial advisor, Public Financial Management, Inc. (PFM). PFM is very experienced in toll-based financing. This due diligence process has resulted in the following findings that may be used to help shape the project’s financial strategy and approach.
**Finding #1:** Several large diversified construction and construction management firms have expressed an interest in participating in the project. According to SB 1486, SANDAG, in cooperation with Caltrans, will manage the process to complete SR 11 and the third border crossing facility; using private sector firms where appropriate. In light of these potential future opportunities firms have stayed in touch with staff, a sign of their interest in the project and recognition that the project is feasible.

**Finding #2:** Federal TIFIA Loans (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998) provide an attractive borrowing option. Typically TIFIA loans offer a low rate of interest, a flexible pay back schedule during the project’s “ramp up” period, and can cover up to 33 percent of project costs. TIFIA may be used for ROW acquisition but only after the project receives a record of decision on the environmental document, making this source of funds unavailable for early design stage project costs.

**Finding #3:** At this time, as shown in the table above, because most of the revenues that will pay for the project’s costs are expected to be generated from tolls, SANDAG and Caltrans must ensure that the project’s toll revenue generation capacity is included in the decision matrix at all times and is weighed appropriately. To address this concern SANDAG should consider adding financial advisors to the project team to develop and analyze toll revenue capacity to ensure it covers project costs.

**Finding #4:** A review of project delivery strategies utilized by other agencies was conducted, including the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority that serves the Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors and the Orange County Transportation Corridor Agencies. Our research and discussions with transportation finance professionals indicates that the most common and effective structure in a toll-based financing is to engage the services of a financial advisor, investment banker and legal counsel early in the process. The financial advisor is compensated regardless of whether or not the transaction is completed; whereas the investment banker is compensated at the time the toll financing is completed.

**Next Steps**

The development and implementation of the financial strategy is critical to the success of the project and its most immediate need. SANDAG’s current financial advisor, PFM, has expertise in this area and is prepared to assist with the procurement of an investment banker. PFM would assist with managing the investment banker throughout the project, ensuring that the financial decisions being made result in the most cost effective implementation of the project financing. There are sufficient funds available in the SANDAG FY 2010 Budget to engage the services of PFM. As stated previously, the investment banker is compensated when the toll financing is completed, similar to how the investment bankers were compensated when SANDAG sold $600 million of TransNet bonds in 2008.

In addition to planning for a potential toll revenue financing in 2012, as part of the project team the project’s financial advisors and investment bankers also could undertake a review of additional financial opportunities related to joint development, real estate acquisition, ancillary facility development, toll collection methodology, and could assist in a TIFIA project application.
Over the coming year, SANDAG staff is anticipating the need for additional consultant services, such as legal services and an investment grade traffic and revenue study. In the meantime, much of the preliminary design and environmental work being carried out by Caltrans will continue, keeping the overall work on the project on schedule.

Information about this proposed financial and implementation strategy is scheduled to be discussed with the Borders Committee on September 25, 2009. The Transportation Committee will have another opportunity to provide input at the October 2, 2009, meeting. The result of these discussions will be shared with the Board of Directors in October.

MARNEY COX
Chief Economist

Key Staff Contacts:  Marney Cox, (619) 699-1930 mco@sandag.org
                      Christina Casgar, (619) 699-1982 cca@sandag.org
COMPASS CARD STATUS UPDATE

Introduction

The Compass Card was launched in May 2009 for COASTER and Premium Express Bus pass holders. SANDAG, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and North County Transit District (NCTD) have been working with the system vendor, Cubic Transportation Systems (Cubic), to complete a comprehensive upgrade of the software to ensure the system was functioning properly prior to launching the Compass Card for Regional pass holders. The system upgrade has been completed and the three agencies are conducting comprehensive testing to make certain the system works as expected for customers and that revenue is properly accounted for.

Contingent on the conclusion of successful testing, the agencies will begin selling Regional passes and subsequently SPRINTER/BREEZE passes on the Compass Card. Staff’s report provides an update on the upgrade and testing and the system’s readiness for launching these passes.

Discussion

The Compass Card has been in revenue operation since May 2009 with approximately 5,000 active cards in circulation. Primarily these Compass Cards are used by COASTER monthly pass holders and the Premium Express bus riders in the Interstate 15 (I-15) corridor.

SANDAG, NCTD, MTS, and Cubic jointly agreed to complete a planned system upgrade before beginning the conversion of the Regional pass products, a population of approximately 70,000 transit users. The software upgrade was necessary to improve stability and reliability of the system; allow our patrons to self manage their Compass accounts online in similar fashion to online banking; and to provide us greater capacity and flexibility in managing our employer-based transit pass program.

The upgrade included three major aspects. First, SANDAG acquired new hardware and relocated all of the Compass Card central system servers to a managed co-location facility for increased system reliability in terms of power and communication. The second aspect consisted of an upgrade to all of the central system software comprised of databases, application software, and a system to process debit and credit transactions. The last aspect was the software upgrade to all of our approximately 1,200 field devices including ticket vending machines, bus fareboxes, rail station smart card validators, and point-of-sale cash registers.

This upgrade was completed on August 21, 2009, and the three agencies have been conducting testing and contacting existing Compass Card users to assess the system’s functioning. Indications are that the upgrade has improved the system and resolved previously identified issues. Testing and outreach are continuing this week and if the results are positive, sales of the regional pass will begin.
Staff anticipates the complete transition of the paper Regional pass and SPRINT/BRreeze pass to the Compass Card will occur over a 3- to 4-month timeframe. This will give both the transit agencies and SANDAG sufficient time to conduct marketing and education to the riding public as well as give patrons time to adjust to the new fare media before eliminating paper monthly passes.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

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

The Destination Lindbergh Plan, which was completed earlier this year, includes a 2015 Phase 1 improvement plan for development of a consolidated rental car facility (CONRAC) and Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC), as well as long-term plans for direct freeway connecting ramps to a northside airport terminal.

The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) is already moving ahead with advanced planning for the CONRAC facility and other on-airport improvements for the Phase 1 plan. It is important for SANDAG to start advanced planning work for the Phase 1 ITC to ensure the coordination of the development of the ITC and CONRAC facilities. This advanced planning work would entail developing and evaluating alternatives for the ITC station layout, developing capital cost estimates (including right-of-way needs), outlining a ground access plan, refining transit ridership estimates, evaluating opening day traffic level of service impacts, developing a preliminary environmental assessment, and outlining a financial funding plan and implementation schedule. This advanced planning study would be completed by October 2010, and would set the stage for the formal environmental studies.

Developing detailed capital cost estimates for the freeway connecting ramps also is being proposed. Having these cost estimates will enable us to seek future federal funding, in the multiyear transportation authorization bill and/or annual appropriations process.

The current estimated cost to undertake these two work efforts is in the range of $1 million to $1.5 million. A number of possible funding sources have been identified, including carryover consolidated planning grant funds recently approved by Caltrans ($493,338), an FY 2010 Caltrans planning grant ($300,000), and a funding contribution from the City of San Diego ($200,000). Any additional funding could come from SANDAG Contingency Reserve. This item was presented at the Executive Committee at its September 11, 2009 meeting, and support was given for moving ahead with these two planning efforts. Staff is currently working with Caltrans to develop a detailed cost estimate for this work effort and will bring an FY 2010 budget amendment to the Board of Directors at its September 25, 2009, meeting, in order to allow this work effort to begin as soon as possible.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contacts: Tim Watson, (619) 699-1966, twa@sandag.org
Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906, dsc@sandag.org
District 11 Maintenance Division employee Maria Garza is the district maintenance employee who was critically injured in the line of duty last week and is facing a long recovery at a local hospital. She continues her recovery at a local hospital from critical injuries suffered when she was struck by an errant motorist while in the line of duty.

Maria's family reports that she is doing better and that her vital signs have stabilized. She had surgery to repair multiple broken bones throughout her body. She is still in critical condition.

The California Transportation Foundation (CTF) has established an assistance fund. Employees wishing to contribute should make their checks out to **CTF Assistance Fund (with "Garza" designated in the check memo line)** and mail to:

CTF  
581 La Sierra Dr.  
Sacramento, CA 95864

Amounts received by CTF are not tax deductible and cancelled checks will serve as receipts.

If you wish to assist with the family's immediate needs and donate cash, please contact Public Information Officer Cathryne Bruce-Johnson in Building One, Floor Two, Cubicle #19 (just around the corner from the District Director's Office). Cathryne will see that contributions are forwarded to Maria and her family. Maintenance employees working in the field may give their contributions to Frank Santibanez at the Chula Vista Yard or Nemia Gubio at the Kearny Mesa Yard.

Another way you may contribute to the fund is to buy a commemorative t-shirt from the San Diego Bicycle Coalition's Bike the Bay event, celebrating last month's 40th anniversary of the San Diego-Coronado Bridge. The Public Information Office has a limited number of these Gildan preshrunk cotton, long-sleeve shirts in a variety of sizes. These shirts normally sell for about $18, but you can get one now for just $10 -- with $5 from each shirt sale going to the Maria Garza Fund! You must pay in cash and the deadline for orders is Friday, Sept. 25.
Background

• Project purpose:
  – Improve pedestrian access
  – Improve rail safety
• Up to four grade-separation locations:
  – Near public schools
  – Access to public facilities and commercial areas
  – Existing pathways
  – Coastal Rail Trail system
• TCRP funding used to complete:
  – Preliminary engineering, environmental document (Phase 1)
  – Final design work (Phase 2)
Current Efforts

- **Phase 1**
  - Adopted MND in December 2008
  - Completed PSR/PR in June 2009

- **Hillcrest crossing**
  - PSR/PR & ED underway

- **Phase 2**
  - Up to four crossings
  - Final designs and specifications
  - Costs estimates

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve a budget amendment for the FY 2010 Capital Improvement Program to add $450,000 in Traffic Congestion Relief Program funds for Phase 2 of the Encinitas Grade Separation Pedestrian Crossing Project as reflected in Attachment 1.

Phase 2 of the Project will include the completion of the Final Plans and Specifications.
77% of Californians say the state should focus transportation planning dollars on expanding public transit.

Just 18% say the state should focus on building freeways and highways.

78% of Californians favor encouraging local governments to change land use and transportation planning so that people wouldn't have to drive as much.

83% of Californians with income under $40,000/year said that rising gas prices were a serious financial hardship, 69% of Californians agreed overall.

- 90% new highway capacity in California's metropolitan areas is filled within 4 years.
- 60-70% of San Diego County highways are filled within 2 years of completion.
August 31, 2009

Devon Muto
Chief, Advanced Planning
Department of Planning and Land Use
County of San Diego
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental for the San Diego General Plan Update.

Dear Mr. Muto:

The Attorney General provides these comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for San Diego County’s proposed General Plan Update (General Plan or Project).\(^1\) We note at the outset that the County has expressed an intent to address climate change. Among other things, the County has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory, and proposed a policy to draft a Climate Action Plan and mitigation measures that seek to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions.

Unfortunately, the documents in their current form are unlikely to achieve the County’s intent and, moreover, are legally deficient under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). To assist the County in revising its documents, we attempt in this letter not only to identify current legal deficiencies, but also to describe a number of potentially effective and feasible alternatives and measures that could assist the County in meeting the requirements of CEQA and the County’s stated climate and sustainability goals.

I. Inadequate Disclosure and Analysis of Adverse Environmental Impacts

CEQA mandates that an EIR identify and analyze all significant adverse effects of a project. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21100; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15126.) While the DEIR does discuss the General Plan’s effect on global warming, the discussion is inadequate. For

\(^1\) The Attorney General submits these comments pursuant to his independent power and duty to protect the natural resources of the State from pollution, impairment, or destruction in furtherance of the public interest. (See Cal. Const., art. V, § 13; Gov. Code, §§ 12511, 12600-12612; D’Amico v. Bd. of Medical Examiners (1974) 11 Cal.3d 1, 14-15.) While this letter sets forth some areas of particular concern, it is not intended to be an exhaustive discussion of the DEIR’s compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.
instance, the DEIR estimates projected greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions only through 2020, rather than for the time period the General Plan is meant to cover, through 2030 as required by CEQA. In addition, even if it were appropriate to focus exclusively on projected GHG emissions for 2020, the record does not substantiate how the DEIR’s implementation strategy will meet the County’s stated emissions reduction goal. The DEIR’s discussion of GHG emissions is conclusory and does not describe the methodology used to arrive at the GHG reduction predictions. Nor does it analyze how mitigation measures are expected to lead to such reductions.

In addition, the DEIR has not adequately discussed the potential impacts from the General Plan’s proposal for developing “Villages” – urbanized cores in the less developed areas of the County. The County would allow more residential and commercial density in these centers, unsupported by public transit, with the hope that this will limit new development in surrounding areas that are currently semi-rural or rural. This approach to lessening GHG emissions seems counterintuitive. Based on past experience, it would appear just as likely that the new Villages will become commuter communities, reliant on other areas for services and jobs. Studies have shown that dispersing jobs into suburban and exurban locations not served by public transit contributes to greater vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and thus higher GHG emissions. The County concedes that it cannot quantify any GHG reduction associated with the Village approach. (Inventory, at p. 32.) Thus, there is insufficient evidence in the record to support the County’s belief that creating new urban areas in the rural sections of the County will lead to lower VMT. If the County chooses to retain Villages as an important piece of the General Plan, much more analysis is needed to demonstrate how the County will prevent these Villages from merely becoming commuter communities far away from public transportation, thereby increasing rather than decreasing VMT.

II. Failure to Formulate and Evaluate a Range of Reasonable Alternatives

CEQA requires public agencies to refrain from approving projects with significant environmental impacts when there are feasible alternatives that can substantially lessen or avoid those impacts. (Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish & Game Commission (1997) 16 Cal.4th 105,

---

2 See Table 10, p. 33, Appendix K, GHG Emissions Inventory (Inventory) and DEIR, pp. 2.17-36-37.
3 Inventory, at p. 31.
4 Indeed, the County briefly considered a “Village Intensification Alternative” but rejected it because it could result in “greater impacts related to air quality, traffic, noise, and land use conflicts.” (DEIR, at p. 4-7.)
5 As the County notes, “it is likely that a high percentage of residents in the unincorporated communities will need to commute over a moderate distance to access employment.” (DEIR, at p. 4-7)
134; Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15002, subd. (a)(3), 15021, subd. (a)(2).) The “cursory rejection” of a proposed alternative “does not constitute an adequate assessment of alternatives as required under CEQA” and it “fails to provide solid evidence of a meaningful review of the project alternative that would avoid the significant environmental effects identified . . . .” (Mountain Lion Foundation, 16 Cal.4th at 136.)

The County has selected as the proposed project the Referral Map Alternative. As described in Chapter 4 of the DEIR, the Referral Map Alternative was created at the specific direction of the Board of Supervisors,7 “because it would accommodate more development than the Draft Land Use Map.” As the DEIR notes, the Referral Map Alternative would thus result in greater environmental impacts. The documents in their current form do not support adoption of the Referral Map Alternative because they do not demonstrate the infeasibility of more environmentally protective alternatives, such as the Hybrid Map (316,658 fewer VMT), the Draft Land Use Map (331,236 fewer VMT), or the Environmentally Superior Map (841,776 fewer VMT).8

In addition, the DEIR identifies the Project’s climate change-related impacts as significant and unavoidable. This conclusion currently is unsupported, as there are many alternatives and mitigation measures that the County has not yet explored that are potentially capable of reducing those impacts. Our office has created an informational sheet that contains many useful resources and examples that the County may want to consider.9 Below we discuss certain options in additional detail.

A. Development Phasing Requirements

The County could, for example, consider adopting a phased approach to development that limits growth over a specified time period (for example, 10 years) to an “Urban Development Area” and reserve future growth to an “Urban Reserve” that will be developed only when specific criteria are met. This approach could manage growth effectively while providing the County and developers flexibility and certainty. Phasing provides an effective approach to managing the pace and location of growth. As an example, the Attorney General’s recent settlement agreement with the City of Stockton phases-in new growth in a manner that will not undermine downtown Stockton and complements existing commercial and residential zones. (A copy of the Stockton agreement is available at http://ag.ca.gov/cms_attachments/press/pdfs/n1608_stockton_agreement.pdf.)

7 The driving factor for the development of alternatives appears to be the population targets developed by community groups and approved by the Board. (DEIR, at p. 4-6.)
8 Relatedly, it appears that VMT may be underestimated as a result of relying on a regional average rather than the VMT generated within County unincorporated communities further from job centers.
Another example of phasing the County could consider is in the Visalia General Plan. Visalia sets specific growth criteria that must be met before development can advance to the next growth area.\textsuperscript{10} According to the City of Visalia’s Assistant City Manager and Community Development Director, the phasing policy has resulted in orderly concentric growth, efficient use of land and infrastructure and revitalization of the downtown.

These types of phasing approaches, particularly in combination with a lower-carbon alternative, would provide the flexibility and certainty the County needs, while resulting in more compact, sustainable growth, fewer VMT, and fewer adverse environmental impacts. We recommend strongly that the County review these examples and analyze whether adopting similar phasing measures would be feasible.

B. City-County Coordination

The DEIR could, but does not, analyze a City-Urban Centered Alternative that would direct more of the growth projected for San Diego County to the existing cities. The DEIR does not disclose or analyze the amount of growth that could be accommodated in a City and Urban Centered Alternative (including vacant legal suburban and rural lots of record in the County). Such an alternative could be combined with the Environmentally Superior Map or the Draft Land Use Map alternatives to accommodate growth and housing. It is reasonable to assume that such an alternative could result in even lower VMT and GHG emissions than the alternatives considered by the County.

The General Plan is a golden opportunity to show leadership in developing joint efforts to coordinate with cities on promoting growth in adjacent areas that are already urbanized, or in guiding development to areas where essential services and transportation already exist. The County could work with the cities to accommodate growth projections with policies that jointly promote increasing land use densities and intensities on the land use map for urban categories, infill first policies, requirements directing new infrastructure and service dollars to infill areas, and reducing fees for high quality mixed-use infill projects in priority growth areas in the interface between cities and unincorporated urban areas.

There are many instances of county-city collaborations directed at climate change (see, e.g., the Sonoma County Climate Action Plan),\textsuperscript{11} at more sustainable patterns of development

\textsuperscript{10} These criteria include: (1) adequate residential, commercial and industrial capacity for the projected population; (2) inclusion of a 30% vacancy factor (flexibility factor) for residential development and 20% for commercial development [in the growth boundary]; (3) adequacy of infrastructure and other urban services and facilities; and (4) community growth priorities, among other factors. (See http://www.ci.visalia.ca.us/civca/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=3406#page=169.)

\textsuperscript{11} See http://www.coolplan.org.
Devon Muto, Chief, Advanced Planning
County of San Diego
August 31, 2009
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(see, e.g., Kings County Joint Housing Element)\textsuperscript{12}, and at revenue sharing (see, e.g., Yolo County's pass through agreements with its cities.)\textsuperscript{13} The County should consider including such specific policies to facilitate collaboration with the cities. We would be happy to provide the staff with other examples that could serve as models for the County to consider.

III. Deficiencies Related to Mitigation Measures

There are several deficiencies with the DEIR's evaluation of mitigation measures relating to climate change impacts, as described below.

A. Analysis of Projected Reduction of GHG Emissions

The DEIR's discussion of the County's GHG emissions and the projected reductions in the County's GHG emissions from proposed mitigation measures does not satisfy CEQA's requirement to disclose to the public and the decisionmakers the General Plan's GHG emissions impacts. (CEQA Guidelines § 15144.) The DEIR's discussion of projected reductions merely includes tables showing projected emissions reductions from the mitigation measures in the DEIR "when combined with federal, State, and regional programs." (DEIR, at p. 2.17-29.) The source for the DEIR emissions reduction tables is listed in the Inventory. (DEIR, at p. 2.17-1, 36 and 37.) However, the Inventory provides very little detail regarding the DEIR's underlying assumptions. The DEIR should contain more detailed analysis of the projected reductions resulting from the proposed mitigation measures relating to GHG emissions impacts.

B. Unenforceable Mitigation Measures

Currently, many of the County's proposed mitigation measures, general plan policies, and implementation measures relating to climate change are not specific and enforceable. CEQA requires that mitigation measures must be "fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures" so "that feasible mitigation measures will actually be

\textsuperscript{12} Kings County and its four cities jointly prepared and adopted the current housing element and are in the process of jointly preparing a housing element update. This collaboration allows the County and its cities to share the cost of the housing element update, and to direct new housing to the best locations in the County, including within its cities. San Mateo County, an urban county like San Diego County, and its cities are collaborating on their housing element updates by sharing resources, successful strategies and best practices. (See http://www.21elements.com.)

\textsuperscript{13} The Yolo County-Davis Pass Through Agreement has provided protection for the City of Davis against disorderly growth in its Sphere of Influence and Planning Area for over a decade. The Agreement requires that Yolo County not approve urban development in the areas surrounding the City. In return, the City has agreed to "pass through" to the County a certain share of the revenue of any development it approves in the area. Yolo County has similar agreements with each of its four cities.
implemented as a condition of development.” (Federation of Hillside & Canyon Ass’ns v. City of Los Angeles, 83 Cal.App.4th 1252, 1261 (2000).)

The General Plan policies and the DEIR’s mitigation measures aimed at addressing climate change impacts use qualifying terms such as “encourage”, “when appropriate”, and “facilitate,” rather than enforceable or mandatory language. Many of the policies in the proposed General Plan propose “promoting” instead of “requiring” actions, and state that certain measures “should” be done instead of stating that they “shall” be done. For example, COS-14.7: “encourage development projects that use energy recovery, photovoltaic, and wind energy”; COS-15.4: “promote and as appropriate, develop standard for retrofit of existing buildings to incorporate design elements that improve environmental sustainability and reduce GHG”; LU-5.4: “undertake planning efforts that promote infill and redevelopment of uses that accommodate walking and biking within communities”; and LU-6.3: “support conservation-oriented project design when appropriate.” Other policies with similar qualifying terms are LU-1.1, COS-4.2, COS-5.4, COS-6.5, COS-16.4, and COS-16.5.

As another example, COS-15.5 states that the County will “encourage energy conservation and efficiency in existing developments through energy efficiency audits and adoption of energy savings measures resulting from the audits.” It is unclear whether this policy actually requires the County to conduct energy efficiency audits. The General Plan should include policies to conduct energy and water efficiency audits of water and drainage infrastructure, and implement necessary conservation measures.

C. Additional Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measures

While the EIR does include some measures that may mitigate the impacts of GHG emissions from the proposed General Plan, there are a number of additional measures that the County has not considered and that would appear to be feasible. Such measures are set forth in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association’s (“CAPCOA”) “GHG Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans” (available at http://www.capcoa.org) and the California Office of the Attorney General’s Sustainability and General Plans: Examples of Policies to Address Climate Change (available shortly at http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/ceqa/generalplans.php) There are numerous additional measures the County might consider, including some set forth below.

i. Infill and Transit-Oriented Development

The Inventory states that “50% of the GHG emissions in the County are a result from on-road transportation.” General Plan Policy COS-14.1 “require[s] that development be located and designated to reduce vehicular trips by utilizing compact regional and community-level development patterns while maintaining community character.” However, it is unclear what is actually required by this policy. Given the importance of reducing VMT discussed in the
General Plan, Inventory and DEIR, the DEIR should fully explore feasible measures to reduce VMT, including land uses, policies and implementation measures.

There are numerous measures the County might consider to promote mixed-use and transit-oriented development, including rezoning commercial properties to residential and/or mixed use; expanded zoning for multifamily housing; flexible parking and building height limitations; density bonus programs; design guidelines for private and public spaces; and incentives for redevelopment of underutilized areas. The County could also consider differential fees that provide fee relief for high quality infill and higher fees for greenfield/low density development. (See Stockton Agreement, ¶¶ 6.c., 7.c.), and requiring new development to be sufficiently dense to support transit and designed to be internally accessible to all modes of transit and transportation. (See Stockton Agreement, ¶¶ 5.b., 5.d.)

Finally, creating and maintaining a jobs-housing balance has been determined to be a key factor in reducing VMT and emissions. The County could consider a jobs-housing policy such as Yolo County’s Draft Policy, Policy CC-3.3, designed to ensure that jobs are created concurrent with housing to the greatest extent feasible.14

ii. Green Building Ordinance

General Plan Policy 15.3 “require[s] all new county facilities and the renovation and expansion of existing county buildings to meet identified ‘green building’ programs that demonstrate energy efficiency, energy conservation, and renewable technologies.” It is unclear what is required under the “green building” programs. The County has a Green Building Program on its website, but it appears to be limited to incentives. The County could consider adopting at the same time it adopts the General Plan a mandatory green building ordinance that applies to all development above a certain threshold size, not just county buildings. Many jurisdictions have already adopted such ordinances.15

iii. More Specific and Enforceable CAP Policies

Although the DEIR includes a mitigation measure to prepare a County Climate Change Action Plan (CAP) with enforceable GHG emissions reduction measures (COS- 20.1; General Plan, at p. 2.17-29), we have several questions about the proposed CAP. For example, we are uncertain about the schedule for completion and implementation of the proposed CAP, and funding for CAP activities and reduction measures. Currently, there is very little detail about

---

14 Policy CC-3.3 reads as follows: “Ensure that jobs are created concurrent with housing to the greatest extent feasible. Include requirements to ensure a reasonable ongoing balance housing and jobs and/or other mechanisms to constrain housing to stay balanced with job creation through buildout of the area. Each phase of housing shall be required to be accompanied by job-generating development. Strive to match overall wages to home prices. (Available at http://www.yolocounty.org/Index.aspx?page=1689).
what the CAP will contain and, moreover, it is unclear whether the CAP will be integrated into the General Plan. In addition, the DEIR does not provide specifics about the reduction measures that will be part of the CAP. As such, the mitigation is inadequate because it has been deferred to the future without sufficient assurances it will be implemented and that it will mitigate climate change impacts. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15126.4, subd. (a)(1)(B).)

We recognize that it may not be possible for the County immediately to adopt a fully realized CAP as described in the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s proposed CEQA Guidelines (see § 15183.5, subd. (b)(1)) and in the Attorney General’s Frequently Asked Questions (attached). However, we encourage the County to (1) commit in the General Plan to adopt by a date certain a CAP with defined attributes (targets, enforceable measures to meet those targets, monitoring and reporting, and mechanisms to revise the CAP as necessary) that will be integrated into the General Plan; (2) incorporate into the General Plan interim policies to ensure that any projects considered before completion of the CAP will not undermine the objectives of the CAP, and (3) for all GHG impacts the County has designated as significant, adopt feasible mitigation measures that can be identified today and that do not require further analysis. These actions will help the County avoid an argument that it is deferring climate change-related mitigation. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4, subd. (a)(1)(B).)

IV. Failure to Fully and Adequate Describe Potential Development

The proposed General Plan land use map does not include projects that are in the approval process, or have recently been approved. The DEIR refers to 148 of these projects, but because they appear only in the cumulative analysis section of the DEIR, the direct impacts flowing from these projects are treated as though their impacts are in addition to those of the General Plan. These projects involve thousands of acres, and the approvals under which they will be constructed could very well be inconsistent with the policies of the General Plan. The County should include these projects to ensure accuracy in its description of General Plan Update and to comply with CEQA.

---

17 See, e.g., Stockton Agreement, ¶ 9.
CONCLUSION

The Attorney General appreciates the number of steps the County has taken to combat climate change. In their current state, however, the General Plan and DEIR are unlikely to achieve the County's objectives, and likely will not provide the CEQA streamlining benefits that an adequate and thorough programmatic document can deliver. Consistent with the purposes of CEQA, our comments are intended to assist the County in improving its General Plan and DEIR. We would be happy to discuss this matter further with staff, and look forward to assisting the County in achieving its GHG reduction goals.

Sincerely,

/ s /

BRIAN HEMBACHER
SARAH E. MORRISON
Deputy Attorneys General

For EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General
I-5 South Multimodal Corridor Study

September 2009

Project Study Area

I-5 South Multimodal Corridor Study
State Route 54 to Main Street
Study Participants

- Collaborative effort among Caltrans, City of Chula Vista, and SANDAG
- Ad Hoc Technical Working Group
  - Traffic Working Group
  - Rail Working Group

Modes Evaluated within Corridor

- Highway (single occupant vehicles and high occupant vehicles)
- Local roadway (arterials)
- Rail transit (trolley)
- Bus transit (bus rapid transit, local bus, arterial rapid transit)
- Rail freight
- Bicycle
- Pedestrian
- High Speed Rail/High Speed Commuter Rail
I-5 South Corridor Study Limits: Main Street to SR 54

Issues within I-5 South Corridor

- Anticipated growth
- Increasing demand for Trolley service
- Multiple at-grade rail crossings
- Close proximity between highway and rail
- Capacity constraints for goods movement
- Insufficient interchange spacing
- Lack of pedestrian and bicycle mobility
- Nearby environmental resources
- Updates to regional planning documents and land use planning
I-5 South Corridor Project Purpose

- Improve movement of people and goods in corridor
- Accommodate RTP goals
- Promote intermodal connections within corridor
- Minimize conflicts between transportation modes and land uses
- Promote economic growth
- Maintain or improve future traffic LOS
- Maintain or improve travel times within the corridor

Concept Alternatives Evaluated

- 7 conceptual alternatives developed containing various roadway, rail, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian improvements
- 7 concept alternatives and the no-build evaluated
- 3 concept alternatives identified that best meet the need and purpose of the study
Evaluation Criteria

- Serves peak period trips
- Provides congestion relief
- Provides travel time savings
- Provides alternatives to SOV’s
- Serves goods movement
- Compatible with regional smart growth planning
- Minimizes environmental impacts
- Capital and operating/maintenance costs

Evaluation Results

- 3 alternatives identified as best meeting need and purpose:
  - Alternative 1
    (reasonably expected RTP-modified)
  - Alternative 2
    (interchange improvements on I-5)
  - Alternative 4
    (enhanced transit with 3rd mainline track)
Braided Ramp System

Concept Alternative 2
Concept Alternative 4

Other Considerations: High Speed Rail Concept Alternative 7
Study Alternative Meetings

- Managers Meeting: July 22, 2009
- Ad Hoc Working Group: August 3, 2009
- Chula Vista City Council Information Item: August 11, 2009
- Public Outreach Meeting in Chula Vista: August 25, 2009

Next Steps

- Proceed with alternative development and refined screening of the three alternatives
- Develop a Project Study Report/Project Development Support (PSR/PDS) report to address highway components of the three alternatives (Caltrans)
- Develop a Project Study Report/Project Development Support (PSR/PDS) report to address rail and transit components of the three alternatives (Chula Vista/SANDAG)
- Recommend Improvements for evaluation in the SANDAG 2050 RTP
Action Requested:

- The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the three recommended transportation alternatives for additional study.
Item 7
Transportation Development Act
Amendments

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to:

Approve Resolution No. 2010-02, in substantially the same form as Attachment 1, revising TDA claims.
Item 8
Amendment to MOU with NCTD
Additional SPRINTER Assistance

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to:

1) Authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment 4 to Addendum 2 to the Master MOU with NCTD for $25,000 and

2) Add the SPRINTER Project Manager Assistance Project to the FY 2010 Program Budget.
Item 9
Capital Improvement Program
Budget Transfers

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to:

1) Authorize the Executive Director to execute a memorandum of understanding with Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), in substantially the same form as attached, allowing the transfer of $195,000 from MTS Substation Transformer Rehabilitation project to SANDAG Substation Standardization project and

2) Approve the transfer of an additional $195,000 from completed capital projects to the Substation Standardization as shown in Table 1 and

3) Approve an increase of $390,000 to the Substation Standardization project budget.
Item 10
Proposed Fund Exchange with NCTD
To Provide Operating Support

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to:
Recommend that the Board of Directors approve the request by the NCTD Board of Directors for an exchange of FTA Section 5307 funding in the amount of $1,313,000 with a like amount of TransNet funds.
Item 11
I-15 Corridor Lanes:
SR 78 - Nordahl Road Bridge Replacement

Recommendation

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

1) Execute an agreement with the cities of Escondido and San Marcos that provides that the cities will collectively commit to a $10 million contribution to the Nordahl Road bridge project, and that SANDAG will transfer $2 million in savings from favorable bids received on the I-15 North segment to the design of the proposed Nordahl Road bridge replacement project; and
Recommendation (cont.)

2) Execute a transfer with Caltrans for an additional $1 million in TransNet funds under a separate existing agreement from the I-15 North segment budget to fund the design of a westbound auxiliary lane on SR 78 between I-15 and Nordahl Road.
SR 11/Otay Mesa East
Port of Entry (POE)

Study Area

Proposed State Route 11

POE

East Otay Mesa

Proposed Port of Entry

Otay Mesa
Project Progress

- Scoping Document: Project Study Report
- Exchange of Diplomatic Notes
- Financial Feasibility Study
- POE Feasibility Study
- SANDAG Sponsored Toll Legislation Approved – SB 1486 (Ducheny)
- Tier I Program EIS/EIR, Approved – October 2008
- U.S. Presidential Permit – Approved by State Department – December 2008
- Worked with GSA to Select Consultant for Enhanced Program Development Study for POE

Project Support

- Transportation Border Congestion Relief Program (TBCRP):
  - SR-11/Otay Mesa East project was selected by U.S. DOT/FHWA on September 18, 2008
  - One of three binational projects selected
  - Federal government will provide technical assistance and support to expedite project
Estimated Project Budget: $615-$715 Million

Programmed Funding Available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State (STIP)</td>
<td>Tier II Env./Eng.</td>
<td>$13.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>Tier II Env./Eng.</td>
<td>$0.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Prop. 1B TCIF)</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$75.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$88.8 M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remaining Funds Needed:
(Toll Funds/Other): $526.2 - 626.2 M

Project Schedule

- Develop Financial Strategy: 2009
- Tier II Environmental Doc.: 2010
- Design/Right of Way: 2011
- Begin Construction: 2012-13
- End Construction: 2014-15
Financial Strategy and Approach

• Unique Project
  – Toll road revenues
• Challenges/Solutions
  – Early project costs prior to construction phase
  – Due diligence
    • Interviewed over 20 firms and advisors
    • Key findings to help shape financial strategy and approach

Key Findings

• High Level of Private Sector Interest in Project
• Federal TIFIA Loans: Attractive Borrowing Option
• Toll Revenue Key to Project Success
• Early Engagement of Financial Team
  – Proven model for the Alameda Corridor
  – Places financial expert on team in critical design phase
  – Success-based fees – paid upon financial close
Next Steps

- Borders Committee September 25, 2009
- Transportation Committee and Board of Directors - October
- SANDAG - Continue Process to Develop Financial Team/ Strategy
- Caltrans – Continue Work on Tier II Environmental Document

SR 11/Otay Mesa East
Port of Entry (POE)