BORDERS COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, April 24, 2009
12:30 to 2:30 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• REQUEST FROM SCAG TO BECOME ADVISORY MEMBER OF THE BORDERS COMMITTEE

• OVERVIEW OF I-15 IRP: PHASE III

• PHASE III TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES

• INITIAL WESTERN RIVERSIDE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

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

MISSION STATEMENT

The Borders Committee provides oversight for planning activities that impact the borders of the San Diego region (Orange, Riverside and Imperial Counties, and the Republic of Mexico) as well as government-to-government relations with tribal nations in San Diego County. The preparation and implementation of SANDAG’s Binational, Interregional, and Tribal Liaison Planning programs are included under this purview. It advises the SANDAG Board of Directors on major interregional planning policy-level matters. Recommendations of the Committee are forwarded to the Board of Directors for action.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Borders 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 Borders 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 Borders Committee meeting.

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
+1. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 27, 2009, MEETING MINUTES | APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

CONSENT ITEM (#3)

+3. UPDATE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE 2009 BINATIONAL SEMINAR “CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CROSSBORDER CLIMATE CHANGE COLLABORATION” (Hector Vanegas, SANDAG) | INFORMATION

The 2009 SANDAG annual binational event is scheduled for June 2, 2009. The attached report provides an overview of the agenda for this binational seminar.

CHAIR’S REPORT (#4)

4. REQUEST FROM THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG) TO BECOME ADVISORY MEMBER OF THE BORDERS COMMITTEE (Chair Patricia McCoy) | INFORMATION

At its April 24, 2009 meeting, the Board of Directors will consider the request from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to become an Advisory Member of the Borders Committee. Chair McCoy will provide an update on the Board of Director’s April 24th action.
ITEM #  RECOMMENDATION

REPORT ITEMS (#5 through #9)

+5. OVERVIEW OF I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (I-15 IRP): PHASE III (Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG; Kevin Viera, WRCOG)

FORMED IN 2001, THE I-15 IRP IS A VOLUNTARY COMPACT BETWEEN LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS REPRESENTING THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SANDAG), THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (WRCOG), THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (RCTC), AND THE RIVERSIDE TRANSIT AGENCY (RTA) TO FOSTER COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIES IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING THAT WILL IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF RESIDENTS IN BOTH COUNTIES. IN 2007, WRCOG AND SANDAG WERE AWARDED A CALTRANS PLANNING GRANT TO IMPLEMENT PHASE III OF THE PARTNERSHIP TO PURSUE ACTIVITIES IN EACH OF THE THREE FOCUS AREAS. SANDAG STAFF WILL PROVIDE A BRIEF CONTEXT FOR THE FOLLOWING AGENDA ITEMS 6a AND 6b, BY PRESENTING AN OVERVIEW OF THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF PHASE III.

+6. PHASE III TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES

+a) I-15 Interregional Transit, Buspool, and Vanpool Study Draft Report (Barrow Emerson and Kim Weinstein SANDAG)

SANDAG IS CONDUCTING AN INTERREGIONAL TRANSIT, BUSPOOL, AND VANPOOL STUDY IN COLLABORATION WITH THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (RCTC). STAFF WILL PRESENT THE MAIN FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THIS STUDY.

+b) Update on the I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) Strategic Transportation Implementation Plan (Tanya Love, RCTC; Heather Werdick, SANDAG)

+7. **INITIAL WESTERN RIVERSIDE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP** (Carolina Gregor, SANDAG; and Kevin Viera, WRCOG)

Staff will brief the Committee on progress achieved toward development of a Smart Growth Map for selected Western Riverside cities, one of the major work elements of the Phase III Housing Strategy. This initial mapping effort, modeled after SANDAG’s Smart Growth Concept Map for the San Diego region, will focus on three pilot cities: Temecula, Murrieta, and Lake Elsinore. Staff will also provide an update on discussions between the IRP partner agencies and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to continue the project following the end of Phase III, with the goal of developing an expanded Smart Growth Map and Transit Development Plan for a larger area of the Western Riverside region.

+8. **UPDATE ON I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (I-15 IRP) WORKFORCE HOUSING PROJECT** (Susan Baldwin, SANDAG)

The second major element of the Phase III Housing Strategy is development of an I-15 Workforce Housing Project, which will make substantial progress in facilitating the development of moderate income/workforce housing in northern San Diego County. The project will identify and analyze three to five potential sites for workforce housing development; select one preferred site from this group and conduct further site analysis; and prepare a range of development scenarios detailing financial feasibility, key potential funding sources to help implement the project, and a recommended approach to the developer selection process. Staff will provide an update on the consultant selected for this project and next steps.

+9. **UPDATE ON THE I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (I-15 IRP) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIC PLAN** (Kevin Viera, WRCOG; and Carolyn Alkire, SANDAG)

As part of the I-15 IRP Phase III, an Economic Development Task Force was formed to develop an Interregional Strategic Action Plan, based on the recommendations from the Phase II Employment Cluster Study. Kevin Viera, Program Manager from WRCOG, will brief the Committee on the status of this component and planned activities.
ITEM #

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

   The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, May 22, 2009, at 12:30 p.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an item indicates an attachment


**San Diego Association of Governments**

**BORDERS COMMITTEE**

April 24, 2009

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 1

Action Requested: APPROVE

**BORDERS COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS**
**MEETING OF MARCH 27, 2009**

The meeting of the Borders Committee was called to order by Chair Patricia McCoy (South County) at 12:33 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Borders Committee member attendance.

1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

   **Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember John Minto (East County) and a second by Vice Chairwoman Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego), the Borders Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the February 27, 2009, meeting.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

   Chair McCoy welcomed Deputy Consul General Martha Rosas (Republic of Mexico) and informed the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has asked to join the Borders Committee as an advisory member. Staff will work with SCAG to tentatively present its request to the Board of Directors for consideration at the April 24th meeting.

   Chair McCoy reported Art Brown, Mayor Pro Tem of the City of Buena Park, was appointed to represent the Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG) as an advisory member. She commented this is a big step forward because they are actually asking to belong. The Borders Committee has done such great work, such as the San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan which serves as a blueprint for the region. We also can shape the things that go to the Board.

   Chair McCoy reminded Committee members to save the date of Tuesday, June 2, 2009, for the Challenges and Opportunities for Crossborder Climate Change Collaboration Conference from 1:00 – 5:00 p.m., which will take place at Caltrans.

   **CONSENT ITEM (Item #3)**

3. **FINAL SAN DIEGO – IMPERIAL COUNTY I-8 CORRIDOR STRATEGIC PLAN (ACCEPT)**

   **Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Crystal Crawford (North County Coastal) and a second by County Vice Chairwoman Slater-Price, the Borders Committee unanimously accepted the Final San Diego – Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan.
REPORT ITEMS (#4 through #7)

4. UPDATE ON THE U.S. GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (GSA) SAN YSIDRO PORT OF ENTRY (POE) RECONFIGURATION AND EXPANSION PROJECT (INFORMATION)

Chair McCoy reported a meeting was held on March 23, 2009, with GSA officials, which included herself, Mayor Crawford, Supervisor Greg Cox (County of San Diego), City of Imperial Beach Mayor Jim Janney, and SANDAG staff. They discussed concerns related to the border crossing reconfiguration including pedestrian and transit issues. She said Mr. Daniel Voll from GSA, along with two representatives from the San Francisco office were in attendance.

Rachel Kennedy, Senior Planner (SANDAG), stated that the agenda item contains four attached letters: a letter sent by SANDAG to GSA in December 2009, GSA’s response in February 2009, and two subsequent letters sent to the GSA Acting Administrator; one, which was signed by the Board and Borders Committee Chairs; and another which was signed by the San Diego region congressional delegation. Ms. Kennedy presented the responses contained in GSA’s letter to SANDAG. GSA states that the global warming issues raised in SANDAG’s letter have been addressed in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Ms. Kennedy stated that the RTP does not provide greenhouse gas analysis for specific projects. GSA estimates that the expanded land POE’s carbon footprint will only marginally affect the region’s total carbon budget; however, SANDAG believes that a comprehensive analysis is needed. Ms. Kennedy stated GSA is revising the pedestrian bridge design to move the eastern bridge landing south of the I-5/San Ysidro Boulevard on-ramp in response to safety concerns raised by the community; however, the new proposed bridge will still result in a longer walk for thousands of daily users. The project will also eliminate the majority of Camiones Way, which currently serves as a drop-off location for private vehicles, taxis, jitneys, and contains stops and island spaces for MTS bus routes 929 and 932. GSA’s letter said an area at the intersection of Camiones Way and Camino de la Plaza has been identified for a west side vehicle, taxi, and jitney pick-up and drop-off location. Additionally, the project site area was downsized to accommodate MTS waiting areas on the west side of the land POE. To date, this location has not been delineated to SANDAG, and to SANDAG’s knowledge, is not included as part of the GSA project. The letter also states that Congress has authorized GSA to reconfigure the San Ysidro POE; however, none of the funds are legally available for off-site improvements or related transportation projects regardless of how worthy some projects may be.

Regarding the meeting with GSA officials on March 23, Ms. Kennedy stated they were informed that Mexico has issued a Diplomatic Note regarding the southbound entry point on the eastern side of the POE. Mexico has also requested a new southbound pedestrian entry point on the western side of the POE at Virginia Avenue/El Chaparral. She presented the GSA map which showed the new southbound eastern pedestrian gate and the Virginia Avenue/El Chaparral area where the new western southbound pedestrian gate would be located. She said Mexico is proposing to close the existing southbound pedestrian gate once the two other facilities are opened. Additionally, it was learned that Phase I of the project is fully funded; however, funding is still needed for Phases II and III. SANDAG plans to continue dialogue with GSA, and GSA will continue to provide SANDAG with project updates and follow-up on issues raised at the meeting. Next steps include reviewing
Chair McCoy asked Vice Chair Cox and Supervisor Victor Carrillo (Imperial County) if they had additional information as they recently met with GSA officials in Washington D.C.

Vice Chair Cox informed that he and Supervisor Victor Carrillo (Imperial County) were in Washington D.C. attending meetings with the National Association of Counties, the U.S./Mexico Border Counties Coalition, and Mr. Paul Prouty, GSA’s Acting Administrator. Mr. Prouty was called away at the last minute; however, they were able to meet with five policy advisors and other GSA representatives from San Francisco and Fort Worth. While meeting with GSA, they had the opportunity to present both the congressional letter and the letter signed by Chairs McCoy and Pfeiler. They also expressed the concerns and frustration regarding issues related to pedestrians. Vice Chair Cox stated he thought things look like they are very well on line in regards to vehicular access; but, obviously pedestrian access is not acceptable the way it was presented. He thanked Supervisor Carrillo for his assistance and strong advocacy.

Supervisor Carrillo stated the important thing was they were able to meet with GSA and strongly convey the sentiments of SANDAG, the Borders Committee, and stakeholders that are going to be negatively impacted by the current plans for the San Ysidro/Puerta Mexico border crossing. Supervisor Carrillo said GSA made clear their position was to address property security and what Customs and Border Protection (CBP) wanted in that facility; not so much facilitation of commerce, trade, or people crossing, whether it’s by vehicle or on foot. He thought they made tremendous headway and were also able to point out issues regarding the Calexico downtown POE as well as addressing the New River and the downscaled project from $330 million to $275 million expected to break ground next spring. He hoped the dialogue from the Border Counties Coalition presentation and meeting was able to be utilized in establishing positive dialogue at the meeting on March 23rd.

Chair McCoy introduced Mr. Daniel Voll, from GSA Region IX.

Mr. Voll complimented Ms. Kennedy on her accurate portrayal of the results of the meeting on March 23. One of the things he learned from the discussion on March 23 was the fact that they had been remiss in emphasizing the project’s pedestrian improvements and benefits. It’s true that a big piece of the project is to expand vehicle throughput which basically involves expanding eventually the number of lanes to 30, with tandem, or double stacked booths which would allow for 60 inspection stations. The vehicle experience is not going to change significantly. People will go through an inspection booth under a canopy and continue north, without a lot of emphasis on the aesthetics. They are, however, drastically changing the pedestrian experience. Right now, people traveling northbound from Mexico pass through a dark tunneled area into a very unwelcoming subterranean cave, are screened and then are out in the street, going from a very dark area out into the sun. Mr. Voll brought renderings showing the new concept in which pedestrians would travel through an area that is very much like a modern airport. They will travel up a very gradual ramp from Mexico onto the second level of the port, to an area with north facing clear story windows that will allow a lot of light into the space. It’s a much larger and more welcoming area. When leaving, they will go down either another gentle ramp or a staircase.
into the pedestrian plaza where they can get on the trolley or continue on. It will be drastically different from what people experience today and they have put a great deal of emphasis on pedestrian traffic. Regarding the bridge, the conceptual drawing showed it starts with a gentle landscaped slope and goes up into a covered area where there are benches and areas to rest and then continues over to the west side. The new bridge is approximately 200 feet longer than the existing bridge, but does not have any where near the number of switchbacks and circular movement. Mexico has now indicated that they are willing to establish a southbound pedestrian crossing on the east side of the port. When that goes into effect, this bridge will not be used by people going into Mexico anymore. It will be there to allow people to get across the port from one side to the other. Eventually, the issue of walking distance will be moot as this is the temporary measure to be built as soon as possible to get people across the port and into Mexico.

Chair McCoy stated the Committee appreciated him staying in San Diego to be present at the meeting.

Council President Ben Hueso (City of San Diego) thanked Mr. Voll for his presentation and expressed frustration with the process. He had hoped that through this group a good working relationship with GSA to cover all the border crossing issues could be forged. He said given the direction the region is moving, the considerable concerns regarding greenhouse gas, and promotion of pedestrian activity and bicycling, more of an emphasis should be placed on accommodating pedestrians. There have been comments regarding the inappropriateness of funding off-site improvements as they do not fall within the purview of this project; however, the San Ysidro community during the highest peak crossing, whether the morning or afternoon is gridlocked. The inability of people to cross the border efficiently causes traffic to back up into neighborhood streets. Not mitigating this part of the project expansion is not consistent with environmental regulations that say every project has to properly mitigate its environmental impacts. It’s not a question of looking at opportunities to fund other projects; but, it’s an opportunity to properly mitigate the impacts of this enormous facility that is to our region’s best interest. He reported he had been meeting with state and federal representatives about ironies at the border, in which neighborhoods such as San Ysidro are some of the poorest neighborhoods in the state. The housing crisis hit San Ysidro first and businesses are struggling and residents have health problems and low wage jobs. Even though everyone has different jurisdictions the best way to accomplish the best services for the constituents is to work together to develop a comprehensive program that will address everybody’s needs. He hoped they were not missing an opportunity in plowing down a path which will solve one problem but create a multitude of others that will be passed on to local, county, and state governments to resolve. He asked that a better pedestrian plan be developed that properly mitigates the impacts of the increased volume which will be pushed through this community.

Mr. Voll stated a lot of outreach work was done with this project with SANDAG, Caltrans, Casa Familiar, the Smart Border Coalition, San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce, and numerous interested parties to receive their input and do the best within their authorities. He said GSA is not finished, and they will continue to work with all parties. He clarified that the scope of this project is limited to the federal property itself. That’s not to say that GSA doesn’t have an interest in what goes on outside the federal property, particularly when what they do creates a situation that makes it worse than it was before. He said they are not the only
potential funding source or the only way this problem can be addressed. Congressman Filner has indicated a strong interest in the project and they have also started a dialogue with the Federal Transit Authority (FTA), which is part of the Department of Transportation, because their role is in providing funding, grants, and other things for transportation issues in local communities. There is still a lot of work to do. It’s going to take more than just GSA to fix this and come up with funding and solutions. It isn’t that GSA can’t do some of this work outside the port; but, the funding will have to come from somewhere beyond the project budget. If Congress comes up with some money and authority, GSA can certainly incorporate that work into what they are doing, but it’s not within the budget so far.

Council President Hueso commented the letter signed by the San Diego congressional representatives presents a good indication of what they hope to see through this process. It is a unanimous argument and interpretation of what they would like this project to accomplish on the pedestrian level, and properly mitigate the impacts of the project. He said he hoped it would be accomplished.

Mr. Voll agreed and said the congressional delegation is probably going to need to do more than just write a letter. They need to look at how they might be able to help fund some of these improvements, if it’s going to be federally funded beyond what they have given GSA to build the project.

Council President Hueso said a plan is necessary as they need to know how much they need to raise. It begins with having a good understanding of what they need to advocate for in Washington.

Mayor Crawford reported the meeting on March 23 was very helpful and one that Mr. Voll attended along with colleagues. She learned about the process with GSA and CBP, who is the “tenant” for the POE that is driving the requirements and planning. Phase I has been fully funded, which includes lanes, inspection stations, a parking structure, and pedestrian bridge. She said there is no money in Phase I funding to resolve the impacts to the existing multimodal or intermodal types of facilities. There was discussion about how phasing could be changed, particularly now that a Diplomatic Note from the Republic of Mexico was received indicating they agreed to move the southbound entry to the east side. Two particularly pertinent items learned were CBP requirements for the facility can be found in a prospectus which Mr. Voll and his staff are helping to get a copy of; and, the master plan for the footprint had additional acreage authorized that would have expanded the footprint of the facility beyond what the federal government currently owns. Through the master planning process, however, the design was revised and uses consolidated so that it is now seven acres smaller. Mayor Crawford asked if the original authorized footprint included the purchase and acquisition of an additional seven acres, now that the seven acres are not necessary, can that money be used to purchase some part which is off the site for some of the facilities being removing as part of Phase I. She said Mr. Voll indicated that GSA is constrained in what they can do by their statutory authority. They feel they are not required to mitigate as they are governed by NEPA, which has different requirements. Mr. Voll will provide the Committee the statutory citation to the federal law that clarifies they are not required to mitigate for the impacts off-site. Mayor Crawford wanted to know how to use the change of circumstance to reconfigure the overall plan to recalibrate Phase I
to have a more user-friendly result and accomplish the results the Committee and community have been seeking over many years.

Executive Director Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) suggested encouraging GSA to look at technology and how it might help improve the pedestrian atmosphere and develop a pedestrian system that works. Amenities could be built as within an airport, such as stairs, escalators, elevators, or moving sidewalks. He stated there are creative and innovative opportunities to improve the pedestrian experience. Even within the constraints, it is still possible to make a much better, much more palatable project that will not only enhance the vehicular piece, but also will enhance the pedestrian and transit piece. He explained the Committee is adamant to get this right because it will probably be used for the next 50 years.

Cindy Gompper-Graves (COBRO) said she is very aware of what GSA is doing with the community and appreciates it. As much as the POE is a security mechanism, it is also a gateway for commerce and the front door to two countries. She challenged GSA to come up with ways to make the POE the most efficient and most beautiful in the world because it is the busiest.

Councilmember Minto asked why spend the money to build the bridge when it is not going to be used much because it will be retired from service in a very short period of time.

Mr. Voll stated assuming things go as expected from Mexico; the new north/south bridge will be deleted from the project as Mexico plans to close the area. The east/west bridge will be built to get pedestrians into Mexico in the short term. Eventually it will become a way to get across the freeway.

Vice Chair Cox thanked Mr. Voll for making himself available on March 23 and at this meeting. He said the Committee’s purpose was not to beat up on him, rather to come up with a better solution. He asked for guidance on what could be done to get the eastbound pedestrian crossing into Phase I. He thought this would address a lot of the concerns expressed by the San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce, SANDAG, and other community groups which have been pretty unanimous about the fact that while the pedestrian portion is certainly an improvement, it is not acceptable; however, if the new eastern southbound entrance to Mexico were included in Phase I, it would be a large improvement.

Mr. Voll agreed. He said in an effort to expedite it, GSA will be having a series of meetings with Mexico to review their plan, determine where the actual crossing point would be, and what their schedule is. If there’s a way for GSA to advance that part of the project and meet up with Mexico’s schedule, they would be very anxious to do that. He said security is not the only driving force behind this project. It may be the primary concern of CBP, but GSA certainly goes beyond that. The designs here are not based only on requirements from CBP; they’re based also on what was heard from the community as to what they would like to see experience in coming through the port.

Councilmember Dave Allan (East County) requested an effort be made to ensure that jobs could stay local once building began.
Chair McCoy reported the Committee will soon have a chance to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and there will be many more informative meetings. She thanked Mr. Voll for his attendance.

Mr. Voll commented he would be glad to come back whenever needed, and not to hesitate to ask.

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

5. **CALIFORNIA - BAJA CALIFORNIA BORDER MASTER PLAN (INFORMATION)**

District 11 Director Pedro Orso Delgado (Caltrans) introduced Elisa Arias, Principal Planner (SANDAG), and Karlo Limón, SIDUE (Secretariat of Infrastructure and Urban Development of Baja California). He said they developed a master plan that would tell what needed to be done on both sides of the border instead of people saying what they wanted done. He also introduced Jorge d’Garay, Special Advisor to the former governor, who was also instrumental in helping put this together.

Ms. Arias informed one of the initial tasks was to understand the planning practices for those agencies responsible for implementing POE and associated transportation planning projects. A key task was to develop evaluation criteria that could be applied to develop rankings for border crossings and associated transportation network. The U.S.–Mexico Joint Working Committee (JWC) proposed the creation of the border-wide compendium of regional plans along the U.S.-Mexico border. The JWC is co-chaired by the U.S. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Secretary of Communication and Transportation (SCT), FHWA’s counterpart in Mexico. It also includes participation from the Department of State, Secretariat of Foreign Relations in Mexico (known as SRE), CBP, Aduanas (Mexican Customs), GSA, and the Instituto Administración y Avalúos de Bienes Nacionales (INDAABIN), GSA’s counterpart.

Caltrans and SIDUE coordinated the California-Baja California project, the first to be developed along the U.S.-Mexico border. The main goals and objectives of the Border Master Plan were to increase the understanding of the planning practices for transportation and border crossing on both sides of the border; develop a workable plan to prioritize and advance both border crossing and transportation projects; develop criteria that could be used to prioritize projects on both sides of the border; and, establish a process to institutionalize the dialogue among local, state, regional, and federal stakeholders in both countries.

The decision-making structure included a policy advisory committee comprised of executive-level staff from agencies from both sides of the border. Their main roles were to establish the parameters for the study, review and approve the evaluation criteria, and approve the rankings that came about after applying the criteria. A technical working group was also created and provided information used to analyze and evaluate this project and also provided recommendations to the policy advisory committee.
The project study area includes a 60-mile boundary to the north and 60-miles to the south of the international border. The focus study area includes a 10-mile bandwidth north and south of the border. The study area was evaluated for transportation projects associated with the border crossings and all data was for a study horizon area year of 2030. Questionnaires were completed by all the stakeholder agencies and some of the key findings were: 1) There is a very complex planning process with multiple stakeholders at all levels of government in both countries; 2) POE planning also relies on a shorter term planning horizon, usually a five-year planning horizon; while the transportation facilities associated with those projects include longer planning horizons, anywhere from 20 – 30 years; 3) Not all planning documents include both the border crossings and the associated transportation networks in the same plans; 4) Stakeholders followed very diverse project evaluation processes ranging from overall qualitative assessment to very detailed quantitative evaluations; and 5) Coordination and communication among stakeholders is taking place, but there are definite opportunities to improve communication.

Key outcomes for the Border Master Plan include binational evaluation criteria that was applied to projects in California and Baja California; a prioritized list of border crossing projects and the associated transportation network was developed; and, recommendations for stakeholders to use as outcomes in planning processes as they compete for funding and to follow a systematic approach for implementing border projects in the California/Baja California area were created. Some recommendations include: Caltrans and SIDUE, in collaboration with the U.S./Mexico Joint Working Committee and the Border Master Plan Policy Advisory Committee, will take the lead in conducting the two types of updates: an annual update, which will be more technical in nature; and comprehensive updates, which will take place every four years.

The Border Master Plan Policy Advisory Committee will meet at least once a year to provide direction and rely on existing forums that already deal with transportation or coordination issues such as the U.S./Mexico Joint Working Committee, the U.S./Mexico Binational Group on Bridges and Border Crossings, and the Border Liaison Mechanism. Also, the Border Governors Conference is a forum to institutionalize this Border Master Plan process. The Border Governors Conference recommended that all states develop similar border master plans as the one developed for California and Baja California.

Chair McCoy remarked this is the first time it has been presented in San Diego and it was presented yesterday for the first time in Tijuana.

Ms. Arias added it was taken to the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities last month.

Chair McCoy stated it is a model for the entire border and sounds as if would be very efficient and save a lot of costs.

Mayor Crawford asked how long it took to produce.

Ms. Arias reported it took almost two years. It was a lot of work with many stakeholders gathering data from both sides of the border and analyzing it.
Supervisor Carrillo thanked and complimented Ms. Arias, her staff, and others. He said it would stand as a model in efficient planning for not only both Imperial and San Diego counties and Baja California, but the remaining 24 counties along the southwest border that border with the Republic of Mexico.

Chair McCoy asked when the next meeting would take place.

Ms. Arias stated the next meeting would take place within the next year. The Policy Advisory Committee approved the Plan in September 2008, the Joint Working Committee approved it in December 2008, and Caltrans and SIDUE are already collaborating to get additional funding for the next update.

Chair McCoy asked if the exponential increase in population was included in the 10-mile bandwidth.

Ms. Arias said the 10-mile bandwidth focuses on transportation projects only. The economic and demographic profile was prepared for the 60-mile study area north and south of the border.

Chair McCoy asked if it addressed water, as it will be a limiting factor.

Ms. Arias replied it did not. It takes water into account only in the sense that the different growth forecasts received from the different jurisdictions take the constraints into account. It was not specifically addressed in the Border Master Plan. It will be reflected in the Border Master Plan as projections are received from the metropolitan planning organizations and the State of Baja California, and as long as those constraints are reflected in those growth forecasts.

Chair McCoy said growth depends on water, and if it’s unavailable, then presumably this would change the structure of this report.

Ms. Arias responded that would be one of the reasons to do a comprehensive update every four years, as new growth forecasts reflect current conditions.

Mayor Crawford asked how the stakeholders are going to use this and what concrete next steps they have said are going to come out of this.

Mr. Gallegos stated we are one of the stakeholders, and this would be an important tool to use to update the RTP in 2011. We would rely on the Border Master Plan to help prioritize some of the investments that we would be proposing to the Board in terms of border dollars and border investments. The Border Master Plan would help us articulate not only the investments we are making, but also how they complement investments that are being made south of the border to make sure things connect and everyone is working on things in the right phase.
Mayor Crawford commented it is very helpful for the public to understand that this planning effort is not something that is going to sit on the shelf. Multiple agencies and multiple branches of government on both sides of the border are going to be better able to be in step as far as planning, financing, and construction.

Mr. Gallegos added one other positive benefit would be with the next federal transportation bill, as the last couple of bills have had border elements. This work will help Caltrans, SANDAG, California, as well as other states advocate for what is needed at the federal program. The same kind of thing should be happening on the Mexican side. The partnership also allows us to advocate together as was seen with the bill to toll the road. The governor’s staff was a little hesitant about signing the bill, so we reached out to our friends in Baja California to weigh in with the Governor’s Office. These things help also advocate for more funding at the national level.

Supervisor Carrillo informed Congressman Silvestre Reyes, representing the El Paso area along the Texas border, is asking for $5 billion over the next five years to support GSA in implementing the restructuring and renovation of existing POEs. The average age of a POE along the southwest border is 42 years and it may be another 50 years before we add to this port or build a new port. We want to make sure that it is not over subscribed or under serving, or, more importantly, outdated before it even opens.

Karlo Limón (SIDUE) commented the State of Baja California’s State Development Plan includes all these projects and the Border Master Plan. More than 40 percent of the projects have already obtained federal funding due to the Border Master Plan.

Chair McCoy stated this shows that it is a living plan, not gathering dust somewhere. This is good because it is a model.

Mr. Orso-Delgado added we started this here and now is part of several of the binational groups that we have. It is going to be done throughout the south border region with all of the other border state pairs. They are moving ahead and the idea is to have it done within the next two years.

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

### 6. INITIATION OF COMPREHENSIVE FREIGHT GATEWAY STUDY (INFORMATION)

Christina Casgar, Goods Movement Policy Manager (SANDAG), said the Comprehensive Freight Gateway Study will provide a forecast of regional freight traffic in San Diego and Imperial counties through the year 2040. It will provide an analysis of intermodal system issues that impact regional goods movement, including commercial movements at the border and how those moves interact with the seaport, air cargo facilities, pipelines, rail, truck, and warehousing networks. The study will serve as a planning tool for SANDAG and the Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG) to help plan for a sustainable freight network. There will be two study deliverables, a comprehensive freight forecast going out to 2040, and a series of subsequent gateway trackers that keep track of policy issues and freight movements in the region.
Southern California is the nation’s largest gateway for international trade. SANDAG was successful in securing $400 million for the San Diego region and IVAG secured $49 million. Projects funded under Prop. 1B include SR 905, SR 11 and the new border crossing at Otay Mesa East, Port of San Diego Freeway Access and terminal improvements, South Line Rail and San Ysidro Rail Yard improvements, improvements to the north rail line on the LOSSAN corridor, and the Brawley Bypass in Imperial County.

The study will provide regular updated traffic forecast information on freight flows that will help with policy decisions, investments, and keep in tune with market conditions that affect goods movement in both counties. It will also serve as a useful planning tool for IVAG, SANDAG, and other local planning agencies and provide a rationale and analytic framework for infrastructure investments. Meetings have been held with stakeholders and some supporters of the study include: SANDAG, IVAG, Caltrans, Port of San Diego, San Diego Regional Airport Authority, Customs, GSA, MTS, NCTD, and Mexican planning agencies. It will also be of benefit to public agencies and commercial agencies such as the San Diego Chamber of Commerce, San Diego World Trade Center, and Otay Mesa Chamber. The study team is comprised of HDR Decision Economics, supported by Global Insight Cambridge Systematics, and Crossborder Group.

Chair McCoy remarked this is important because the lifeblood of our economy depends on goods movement.

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

7. **SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (EDC) AND IMPERIAL VALLEY EDC’S MEGA-REGION INITIATIVE (DISCUSSION)**

Christina Luhn of the San Diego Regional EDC stated the Mega-Region Initiative is a long-term economic development project designed to partner San Diego and Imperial counties with Baja California for global competition. She said the United States has approximately ten emerging mega-regions and San Diego is considered part of the Southern California mega-region. The San Diego Regional EDC received $225,000 in funding from the Department of Commerce’s Economic Development Administration (EDA), with $90,000 in matching funds. An advisory board was made up of the different organizations and companies that provided the matching funds. The partnership between the San Diego Regional EDC and Imperial Valley EDC has been working the last year on how to compete and attract foreign direct investment and other forms of economic development activity on the southern border, including northern Baja California. The proposed mega-region includes Baja California as well as Imperial and San Diego counties that both have very strong economic and cultural ties south of the border. The EDA was supportive, with the caveat that federal dollars could not be spent south of the border. A marketing strategy for the binational mega-region consists of the access that companies have to affluent consumer markets, diversity, intellectual capital, inexpensive lands and labor, and a mature manufacturing base concentrated within 35,000 square miles. One of the goals was to develop an economic strategy and action plan. In developing the strategy, it was found that San Diego and Imperial share clean tech, alternative and renewable energy generation, applied biotech, bioag, biofuels, medical devices, and specialized manufacturing as
important industry clusters. Both counties would like to retain and grow these clusters and improve logistics which are critical to efficient goods movement. One of the most important accomplishments has been the outreach. During the process, over 200 distinct organizations participated ranging from private industry to educational institutions, key utilities, and a variety of government agencies. Accomplishments to date include workforce and infrastructure assessments which were turned into a strategic action plan. A consulting firm has been hired to help with branding and marketing. The new name, logo, and marketing materials should be rolled out next month. A policy and business incentive focus group identified as one of the most important challenges is not just attracting new companies into the region, but also retaining and growing what is there. One of the goals of this focus group will be developing a series of recommendations on how to retain these very important industries. The long-term strategic action plan is a vision of where we would like to see this mega-region in 25 years in terms of workforce needs, educational standards and skills that would allow the region to be very competitive, language, and a quality of life.

The short-term items are designed to significantly move forward in the next five years. Year one is designed to lay the framework for connecting industries and opportunities with resources that people hadn’t thought about. It’s a win/win scenario because the money stays in the region, is spent in the region, and the region grows; thus making the region more competitive. Meetings and workshops have been held with stakeholders in all three regions, and an effort has been made to understand what the real values are. The next steps include unveiling the marketing tools; convening action teams; a final report to the EDA; a template for replication; securing Phase II funding; and, finish developing the marketing plan and implementing it. Next year’s work plan includes facilitating the action teams to help them realize very specific goals, convening workshops, and making presentations to a broader group of stakeholders that still need to be brought into this process. Important research needs to be done to support the marketing and help stakeholders make important decisions about economic development around the high tech industries. Promotional activities are being developed by the three regions to take to a variety of conferences and trade missions to market together in order to develop a communication strategy for greater visibility of this mega-region.

Chair McCoy thanked Ms. Luhn for her report and said she wanted to link the San Diego - Imperial I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan with this study. She said Councilmember Minto, Supervisor Carrillo, and Councilmember Allan have worked closely on the I-8 Corridor and it would join in very nicely with this. She asked Supervisor Carrillo if he had any comments on this plan.

Supervisor Carrillo stated it is an excellent plan. Ms. Luhn has done an outstanding level of work bringing all the stakeholders together. There is a lot of commonality of those that share not only the borders of Southern California with San Diego County and Imperial County, but once again, alluding to our partners in the south and a very important partner to see how this would develop as a mega-region becomes a major player not only inner-nationally, but inter-nationally. Demosthenes, in the fourth century B.C. said, “The foundation of every government is the education of its youth.” It is very important that we bring in the educational institutions like San Diego State University (SDSU) and the University of California in San Diego (UCSD), along with the SDSU branch in the Imperial Valley, Calexico, and Brawley. It is important to develop Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) curriculums and careers, that are already established
south of the border at universities in Baja California. It is good to establish roots on both sides of the border so that it’s a sustainable economic engine that will drive this area for many years into the future.

Chair McCoy added that she thought the level of education in many Latin American countries is something that is often overlooked. She taught in Colombia for several years and was astonished that they not only knew English but also French.

Councilmember Minto stated he wanted to remind everyone that even though they have their particular components, most people forget that economic development and economic development strategies are big especially when looking at master planning. It is important to remind everyone that economic development is huge. The idea of working with another county such as Imperial, which has geothermal energy, is necessary to become better educated because there is nothing like being on the ground floor and getting your feet wet. He thanked Ms. Luhn for her hard work and said he looked forward to hearing more.

Ms. Gompper-Graves complimented Ms. Luhn and the San Diego EDC for taking this on. She reminded the Committee that she made a presentation at the last Borders Committee meeting and talked about the difference between a mega-region effort and the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). She said she wanted to assure everyone these are not diametrically opposed things and they are also not replicated. What they are doing is building it into the CEDS and institutionalizing it so when the San Diego EDC needs to go to the EDA for additional funding, they will have mechanisms to do that. Economic development is huge and touches every single aspect of folks that have anything to do with business all the way down to infrastructure, education, and our quality of life. So it is big, and the more players on the team make for a stronger and better mega-region.

Councilmember Sam Abed (North County Inland) said it is certainly a good effort. The good news is the region over the last several years has produced jobs but the bad news is they are mostly in the lower income level, so having higher income level jobs is critical. He said he hoped that they would coordinate this effort with Gary Knight of the North County Economic Development Council so they would be a part of this effort.

Ms. Luhn informed Mr. Knight has been very involved and all of the EDCs have been contacted. Although this is an incredibly ambitious project, organizations like SANDAG, Caltrans, and committees like this, increase the chances of success because they are not starting from scratch. There are really important existing economic ties and relations throughout the entire region which are critical to this working.

Chairman Chris Devers (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) of the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) stated he liked the idea and thought it intriguing. He asked if there is a component that looks at the regulatory pitfalls that one would encounter using the transportation system or anything else that may be a deterrent to making the mega-region.

Ms. Luhn responded it has been looked at to some degree. Regulation came up in both focus groups as something that has to be addressed when they began discussing policy recommendations, business incentives, and other kinds of ideas.
Chair McCoy said it should probably go in tandem with what they are doing.

Chair McCoy adjourned the meeting informing the next two meetings will be on the I-15 IRP and issues other than the border.

Action: This item was presented for discussion only.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, April 24, 2009, at 12:30 p.m.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair McCoy adjourned the meeting at 2:13 p.m.
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UPDATE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE 2009 BINATIONAL SEMINAR “CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CROSSBORDER CLIMATE CHANGE COLLABORATION”

Introduction

On February 27, 2009, the Borders Committee accepted the recommendation from the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) that the 2009 binational event be held on Tuesday, June 2, 2009, and that it follows up on recommendations from the 2008 Binational Seminar with a focus on “Challenges and Opportunities for Crossborder Climate Change Collaboration.”

Discussion

The 2009 binational seminar “Challenges and Opportunities for Crossborder Climate Change Collaboration” will be held at Caltrans District 11 offices, and will include presentations from the San Diego Foundation on its Regional Focus 2050 study, an overview of SANDAG’s draft Regional Climate Action Plan, and a presentation on the State of Baja California’s efforts on climate change. The event will also provide an opportunity for SANDAG and the City of Tijuana Municipal Planning Institute (Instituto Municipal de Planeación or IMPlan) to share information on port of entry planning activities, as well as other projects that could present opportunities to address climate change in the San Diego and Tijuana region. In addition, a panel of experts from both sides of the border will share their perspectives on the potential challenges and opportunities for crossborder climate change collaboration. Attachment 1 is the flyer announcing the 2009 binational seminar.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Save the Date for the 2009 Binational Seminar

Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas, (619) 699-1972, hva@sandag.org
Challenges and Opportunities for Crossborder Climate Change Collaboration

In 2007, SANDAG and the Tijuana City Council approved the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan. This plan served as the framework for the 2008 binational event that focused on smart growth and sustainability along the region's international border. One of the recommendations that came out of the 2008 event called for evaluating coordination between agencies on both sides of the border on greenhouse gas emissions data. For this reason, the theme of the 2009 Binational Seminar is crossborder collaboration on climate change.

At the 2009 annual event, a panel of experts will discuss the opportunities and challenges for binational climate change collaboration among agencies on both sides of the border. Organizers hope to create opportunities to share information about how Baja California and the San Diego region are approaching climate change planning activities and learn from each other’s experiences.

Tuesday June 2, 2009
Caltrans, District 11
4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, CA 92110
Garcia Conference Room
1 p.m. – 5 p.m.
En 2007, SANDAG y el Ayuntamiento de la Ciudad de Tijuana aprobaron el Plan Estratégico del Corredor Binacional Mesa de Otay-Otay Mesa. Este plan sirvió de marco para los trabajos del seminario binacional de 2008 que se enfocó en el crecimiento inteligente y sustentable en la frontera. Una de las recomendaciones del evento de 2008 fue la de evaluar en coordinación con agencias de ambos lados de la frontera, la información sobre emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero (GEI). Por esta razón, el tema del seminario binacional de 2009 es la colaboración transfronteriza en materia de cambio climático.

En el evento anual de 2009, un panel de expertos discutirá las oportunidades y los retos para la colaboración en material de cambio climático en ambos lados de la frontera. Los organizadores esperan crear las oportunidades para compartir cómo las regiones de Baja California y San Diego abordan las actividades de planeación del cambio climático y aprenden de las experiencias mutuas.

**Martes 2 de junio de 2009**
Caltrans, District 11
4050 Taylor Street. San Diego, CA 92110
Garcia Conference Room
1 p.m. – 5 p.m.
OVERVIEW OF I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (I-15 IRP): PHASE III

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 5

Action Requested: INFORMATION

Introduction

The I-15 IRP was formed in 2001 to address the imbalance of jobs and housing that has developed between the San Diego region and southwestern Riverside County in the past decade and the resulting traffic congestion on the I-15 corridor. The I-15 IRP is a voluntary compact between local elected officials representing the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), and the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA). Caltrans and other affected governmental agencies and private sector organizations also participate in the partnership. Through various grants, the partner agencies have been able to pursue two phases of the partnership. New funding has been secured by WRCOG, SANDAG, and RCTC, to pursue a third phase. The I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee met on November 8, 2007, to review a proposed scope of work for Phase III based on the receipt of additional grants from Caltrans. The purpose of this report is to provide the Borders Committee with an overview of the final Phase III work program before each staff member provides a status report on the individual components of the Phase III work effort. The agenda items today provide an opportunity for the Borders Committee members to give their input on each of the project components in anticipation of the I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee meeting in May.

Background

The primary goal of the I-15 IRP is to foster collaborative strategies in economic development, transportation, and housing that will improve the quality of life for residents in both counties by reducing the impacts of interregional commuting, creating more jobs in housing-rich areas, and more housing in job-rich areas. Centered on I-15, this two-county commute corridor extends from central San Diego to the cities of Lake Elsinore, Perris, and Hemet as shown in Attachment 1.

Phase I Overview and Accomplishments

Phase I of the I-15 IRP was funded by a $400,000 grant from the State Department of Housing and Community Development. The focus of the first phase, based on a three-year work plan, was to: develop a policy structure and mechanism for technical support; explore existing conditions; understand the interregional commute problem; identify current programs to resolve interregional issues; forecast commute conditions; develop strategies to better balance jobs and housing; and establish an implementation and monitoring process. A total of 21 interregional strategies for short-
and long-range implementation were identified (Attachment 2). Eight short-range transportation strategies focused on coordinating existing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) activities were adopted by the Joint Policy Committee and are now being implemented by the local and regional transportation agencies. The long-range strategies identified included development of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along the I-15 Corridor.

Phase II Overview and Accomplishments

In 2004, SANDAG and WRCOG were awarded a $240,000 Caltrans grant to implement the short-term strategies and to lay the foundation to implement several long-term strategies. In the area of economic development, an Economic Development Working Group (EDWG) was established as a structure for pursuing cooperative economic development strategies and a two-county Employment Cluster Study was completed, which provided recommendations for economic prosperity in both regions. The transportation component focused on a cooperative study undertaken by Caltrans to assist San Diego and southwestern Riverside to better understand the multi-modal infrastructure and service needs in the I-15 corridor. The housing component provided a summary of housing and land use programs that could be implemented in the San Diego region and southwestern Riverside. At the end of Phase II, the Committee approved a set of next steps for Phase III.

Scope of Work for Phase III

WRCOG, RCTC, and SANDAG were awarded two additional Caltrans grants to pursue the activities identified at the end of Phase II. The first grant, for $450,000 has allowed WRCOG and SANDAG to continue with activities in all three of the focus areas: economic development, transportation, and housing. The second grant, for $125,000 has enabled SANDAG and RCTC to improve the vanpool programs that the two agencies administer and look at how vanpool/carpool ridership can be shifted into transit options such as Express Bus or Bus Rapid Transit. WRCOG oversees work on the $450,000 grant coordinating with SANDAG and the other partner agencies. The $125,000 transit planning grant is managed by SANDAG in partnership with RCTC. Phase III activities are being coordinated through an overall work program, which incorporates the objectives of the two grants (Attachment 3). The staff leads for each of the three components will present updates in all three areas for the Border Committee’s consideration and feedback in anticipation of the next I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee meeting to be held May 27, 2009, at Temecula City Hall from 1-3 p.m.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. I-15 Interregional Partnership Phase III - Draft Overall Study Area Map
2. I-15 Interregional Partnership Strategies Developed in Phase I
3. I-15 Interregional Partnership Phase III Work Program Descriptions

Key Staff Contacts: Kevin Viera (WRCOG Program Manager), (951) 955-8305, viera@wrcog.cog.ca.us
Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909, jcl@sandag.org
## I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) Strategies Developed in Phase I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES BY CATEGORY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Support/sponsor legislation that addresses jobs-housing balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Actively engage in community outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED1</td>
<td>Facilitate greater collaboration between regional economic development entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>Improve job growth through the promotion of new employment opportunities in the cluster industries that drive the bi-regional economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>Interregional coordination of vanpool and carpool programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>Expand park-and-ride lots and improve rideshare information signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3</td>
<td>Joint outreach and marketing for transit, vanpool, and ridesharing programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4</td>
<td>Implement interregional public transit commuter services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5</td>
<td>Collaboration among transit providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6</td>
<td>Advocate for employer-subsidized transit passes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7</td>
<td>Encourage the adoption of alternative work schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST8</td>
<td>Encourage telework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT9</td>
<td>Support high-speed rail transit service in the I-15 corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT10</td>
<td>Implement transit shuttle services to interregional transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT11</td>
<td>Preserve transportation rights-of-way and implement priority measures through the development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT12</td>
<td>Implement the I-15 high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Provide a range of housing affordability and housing types in all communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Support fiscal reform to encourage housing construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Provide incentives for the construction of moderate-cost family housing near employment centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Require the construction of moderate-cost family housing in new development near employment centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Encourage infill development in older residential neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (I-15 IRP)**
**PHASE III WORK PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy and Major Tasks</th>
<th>Responsible Agencies</th>
<th>Deliverables/Outcomes</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. COORDINATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain interregional planning structure to pursue collaborative goals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Convene I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee (two times/yr)</td>
<td>Primary: WRCOG/SANDAG and Caltrans District 8</td>
<td>» Meeting agendas</td>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Convene executive staff (minimum of three meetings)</td>
<td>Secondary: Caltrans District 11 and RCTC</td>
<td>» Policy meeting minutes and meeting notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Convene project staff (as needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>» Progress reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>» List of policy committee approved actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop collaborative economic development strategy between regional economic entities:</td>
<td>Primary: WRCOG/SANDAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Expand Interregional Economic Development Working Group to include San Diego agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>» Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Working Group will develop a strategic action plan among select cluster industries through a series of three workshops</td>
<td>Secondary: Stakeholders</td>
<td>» Business data for regional Web portal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Join existing regional Web portal to add Riverside business data</td>
<td></td>
<td>» Outreach materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3. TRANSPORTATION

Develop Strategic Transportation Implementation Plan\(^1\) including:

- a. Document existing Project Status Reports (PSRs) and highlight agency 5-, 10-, and 15-year short-term strategies, including the development of cost-effectiveness analysis and overall funding strategy
- b. Interregional Vanpool/Carpool program coordination strategy which includes an O&D survey of vanpool riders*
- c. Interregional express bus and bus rapid transit implementation options*
- d. Analysis of transit priority treatments and transit lane infrastructure development;
- e. Analysis of existing and potential park-and-ride facilities; and
- f. Development of short-term goods movement analysis\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy and Major Tasks</th>
<th>Responsible Agencies</th>
<th>Deliverables/Outcomes</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary: RCTC/SANDAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary: Caltrans District 8 and District 11, RTA, and WRCOG</td>
<td>Strategic Transportation Implementation document to include preferred Vanpool, transit priority measures, and lane development, Park-and-ride facilities and goods movement strategies with supporting studies including overall transportation cost-effectives study and funding strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Report and maps of potential park-and-ride sites and improvements to existing sites
- Heavy truck data\(^3\)
- Overall short-term goods movement strategies

---

1. This task is supported by: $110,662 – in a Caltrans Transit Planning Grant and $14,338 in matching funds.
2. Item 3f: Development of Short-Term Goods Movement Analysis should be considered for omission from Phase III. Staff recommends that two options be presented to the Policy Committee for their approval. Option 1 would be to pursue additional funding from other sources, or Option 2 could be to include in Phase IV of the IRP. If this task is left in, staff believes that at the current budget for Task 3 there would not be adequate funding to produce quality products for the other subtasks.
3. Available from Caltrans.
### 4. HOUSING

Collaborate on smart growth development near transit applicable to both regions:

- Partner with employers, developers, and local jurisdictions to develop pilot workforce housing project(s) in northern San Diego County.
- Develop a pilot Smart Growth Corridor Analysis for select southwestern Riverside County cities as a foundation for future work funded by SCAG’s Compass Blueprint Demonstration Project grant program.
- Convene the Western Riverside Smart Growth Corridor Analysis Working Group as needed to facilitate development of pilot and expanded work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy and Major Tasks</th>
<th>Responsible Agencies</th>
<th>Deliverables/Outcomes</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary: SANDAG/WRCOG and Caltrans District 8</td>
<td>Pilot Workforce Housing Project</td>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary: Local Jurisdictions and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Pilot Smart Growth Corridor Analysis identifying place types, target land uses, and potential smart growth opportunity areas along transportation corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting agendas, materials, and summaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pilot Workforce Housing Project**

- Pilot Smart Growth Corridor Analysis identifying place types, target land uses, and potential smart growth opportunity areas along transportation corridors
- Meeting agendas, materials, and summaries

**Pilot Smart Growth Corridor Analysis**

- Meeting agendas, materials, and summaries

---

### 5. FINAL PHASE III REPORT

Primary: SANDAG/WRCOG and Caltrans District 8

- Comprehensive final report

Secondary: Caltrans District 11, RCTC, and RTA

- Comprehensive final report

**Comprehensive final report**

Feb 2010

---

4 The pilot work would lead to an expanded Smart Growth Corridor Analysis and Transit Development Plan for a larger portion of the WRCOG sub-region, administered by SCAG and a qualified firm procured through the Compass Blueprint Demonstration Project Program.
I-15 INTERREGIONAL TRANSIT, BUSPOOL, AND VANPOOL
STUDY DRAFT REPORT

Introduction

As part of inter-regional planning by Riverside and San Diego Counties, a significant demand for work trips from southwestern Riverside to San Diego County destinations was identified. SANDAG received a Caltrans transit planning grant to conduct an Interregional Transit, Buspool, and Vanpool Study in collaboration with the Riverside County Transportation Commission, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and Riverside Transportation Agency (RTA). The goal was to evaluate the market, operational, and financial viability of providing additional fixed-route transit and/or van/buspool services as alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle commutes between the two counties.

Discussion

Vanpools, buspools, and fixed-route transit services are products on a continuum of services offered to attract driving-alone commuters. Vanpools are generally a solution where there is relatively low demand between specific origin-destination pairs, but where sufficient demand exists to group 10-15 passengers together. SANDAG currently uses federal funds to provide an ongoing monthly subsidy to encourage vanpools. Buspools are a potential option to group larger groups of passengers together on to a 35-50 passenger vehicle that could be more cost-effective than a vanpool. While not currently used in the San Diego region, buspools would have one of the passengers serve as driver similar to vanpools, and could potentially receive the same federal funds from SANDAG to help offset the cost to passengers. For high demand commutes, fixed-route transit is an option that can provide the greatest flexibility to the passenger since it can offer numerous departures/arrivals over the commute period (versus having to commit to a specific vanpool/buspool departure/arrival) and gives the passenger more flexibility on how the service is used (e.g., could use transit three times a week and drive the other two days).

Because of its increased convenience, a quality fixed-route transit service provided by a public transit agency has the potential to attract a higher proportion (typically 10 to 30 percent) of total peak travel demand, versus less than five percent attraction rate for vanpools. Efficiently moving patrons from vanpools into buspools or fixed-route transit has the added benefit of freeing up vanpool resources and the accompanying subsidy to use for origin-destination combinations which have less total demand, potentially resulting in lower costs to the passenger.
Demand for Fixed-Route Transit Service

In 2012, upon completion of the 20+ miles of Managed Lanes facility along I-15 between State Route (SR) 78 and SR 163, SANDAG, in conjunction with MTS, will be implementing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service in the I-15 corridor between Escondido and downtown San Diego and between Escondido and Sorrento Mesa/University Town Center (UTC)/University of California – San Diego (UCSD) (Attachment 1).

Approximately 29,000 commuters per day cross the county line into San Diego County and BRT planning identified a significant transit demand of 1000+ originating from southwestern Riverside County and traveling the I-15 corridor to employment in downtown San Diego (600+) and the Sorrento Mesa/UTC/UCSD (400+) areas were fixed-route transit services to be extended from Escondido to southwest Riverside County.

Estimated total travel and transit demand for 2015 is shown in Table 1. The demand primarily (over 60 percent) originates from southwestern Riverside County communities Temecula and Murrieta, with a much lesser number (less than 40 percent) from communities such as Perris, Hemet, San Jacinto, and Lake Elsinore.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego County Destination</th>
<th>Estimated Travel Demand 2015</th>
<th>Estimated Transit Demand 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Downtown</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSU</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>3,192</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downtown SD Corridor Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,593</strong></td>
<td><strong>633</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Mesa/Miramar</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sorrento Mesa/UTC/UCSD Corridor Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,122</strong></td>
<td><strong>433</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, the potential transit demand for services to downtown San Diego and Sorrento Mesa/UTC/UCSD represents about a 3.7 percent share of the estimated 29,000 existing commuters traveling to San Diego County from Riverside County, and 8.3 percent of the 2015 demand to the these two employment centers.

Commute Distances. There are other examples today in Southern California of public transit agency provided and subsidized long distances commutes of up to 60 miles, such as Metrolink rail from Riverside and San Bernardino to downtown Los Angeles, along with over-the-road coaches from Antelope Valley (Lancaster/Palmdale) and Santa Clarita to downtown Los Angeles. One-way travel times on these services are upwards of 90 minutes; the estimated travel time for a service from Temecula to downtown San Diego or Sorrento Mesa/UTC/UCSD are in line with these examples of commuter services.
**Trip Loads.** Based on a 15 minute service frequency for the three morning and three afternoon peak hours, patronage to downtown San Diego would average 53 passengers per trip and 36 passengers per trip to Sorrento Mesa/UTC/UCSD.

**Future Growth.** This transit demand from southwestern Riverside County to San Diego County destinations can be expected to grow significantly over the next two decades. Temecula and Murrieta current populations (already 100,000) are expected to exceed 120,000 by 2030.

**Summary.** The conclusion from this study is that fixed-route transit service provided by public transit agency(s) between southwestern Riverside County to downtown San Diego and Sorrento Mesa/UTC/UCSD appears to be feasible in terms of potential patronage and operating costs. This conclusion is based on the following assumptions:

- The BRT service to Riverside County would involve an extension of the planned I-15 BRT service northward from Escondido to Temecula.
- Adequate park-and-ride facilities would be available in Riverside County for access to the BRT services.
- Depending on the specific operating plan, the total operating costs for a 15 minute peak-period only BRT service provided by a public transit agency (three hours in the morning, three hours in the afternoon) between Temecula and downtown San Diego would be approximately $2 million annually.
- Assuming a 50 percent farebox recovery rate (similar to performance of existing MTS commuter bus services in the I-15 corridor), the annual subsidy requirement would be about $1 million per year.
- Under the above subsidy scenario, per trip fare levels and passenger subsidy could be in a range in line with comparable existing commuter bus services, including the current I-15 Commuter Express services.

Assuming a decision is made to further pursue the concept of extension the planned I-15 BRT services to Riverside County, a number of next step actions would be needed in conjunction with the partner agencies (MTS, RCTC, and RTA):

- Develop a specific operating plan, including Riverside County station locations/park-and-ride facility needs and additional fleet requirements.
- Outline which agency(s) would be responsible for service delivery and vehicle storage/maintenance.
- Explore funding partnership options between the various agencies.
- Outline implementation plan and schedule.
Opportunity for Consolidation of Vanpools into Buspools

As of January 2009, there were over 240 vanpools operating daily between southwestern Riverside County and San Diego County serving approximately 1,600 Riverside County commuters. Many of these existing vanpools travel to common destinations that could be served by using more efficient and higher capacity modes, such as buspools or fixed-route transit, thereby freeing up vans for reallocation to meet future vanpool needs as the population continues to grow.

Origins and Destinations Fifty percent of the vans, serve military-related demand centers with destinations outside of the I-15 corridor, including downtown San Diego. Military employment schedules are typically well structured, which could fit a regular daily schedule of a buspool. Fixed-route transit proposals would generally not compete for these same markets, and the different services would complement each other well.

Vanpools originate in 14 southwestern Riverside County communities, with four accounting for 75 percent of the vanpoolers. Those four communities are:

1. Temecula
2. Murrieta
3. Menifee
4. Hemet

There are 36 current San Diego County vanpool destinations with the top five destinations as follows:

1. Camp Pendleton
2. Naval Base San Diego
3. Naval Air Station North Island
4. Rancho Bernardo
5. San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station

There are a number of origin-destination pairs which suggest some potential for vanpool consolidation to the large number of existing riders. Many vans in these pairs have matching or similar work hours.

The highest origin-destination pairs for the vanpools are:

- Murrieta/Camp Pendleton: 12 vans, 94 riders
- Temecula/downtown San Diego: 11 vans, 71 riders
- Temecula/NASNI (North Island): 11 vans, 70 riders
- Temecula/Rancho Bernardo: 8 vans, 65 riders

Conclusion

The study concluded that there appear to be a number of opportunities for conversion of some number of vanpools originating from Riverside County into buspools. A final task in the study is investigating leasing options for buspool services.
Assuming a decision is made to further pursue the concept of converting some vanpools into buspools for trips originating in Riverside County, a number of next step actions would be needed:

- **Confirmation of Market Demand.** Surveys of existing Riverside County to San Diego County vanpoolers as to their interest in buspool options, including the importance of various service features (vehicle comfort and amenity, pick-up locations and routing, and cost) would be valuable to the Ridelink Program in promoting and marketing these commuter options.

- **Vehicle Selection.** The current fleet of vanpools serving Riverside County to San Diego County commute trips is primarily seven passenger vans, with a smaller number of 14 passenger vans. These vehicles are able to run comfortably at highway speeds, and are offered in two levels of comfort (primarily bench versus individual seating).

Using larger vehicles for buspools offering the opportunity to merge existing van pools with close origins and matched destinations/trip times can free up van resources. However, the selected bus would need to operate comfortably at highway speed and with equivalent seating and amenities to be competitive.

SANDAG’s vanpool vehicle providers, VSPI and Enterprise, currently do not lease vehicles large enough to operate buspools. Other lease options are being investigated.

- **Drivers.** One of the key issues with converting vanpools to larger buspools is providing suitably trained and licensed drivers from amongst the existing pool participants. California vehicle code states that anyone transporting 15 or more passengers in a vehicle must obtain a Commercial Driver’s License. Since no vanpool currently carries more than 15 passengers this has not been an issue for the existing program. In a recent survey of interregional vanpool drivers, over 70 percent indicated they would be willing to drive a larger vehicle and obtain the necessary license.

Due to the added restriction of requiring a Commercial Driver’s License, as well as higher insurance requirements, many buspool and subscription bus services across the country utilize a paid driver (often through a bus company which also provides fleet). Military staff may represent a group more likely to act as volunteer bus drivers compared to general vanpools, as many such staff are familiar with heavy vehicle operation.

Using a paid driver will add to a buspool’s operating costs, and that may negate any savings to the existing vanpool riders. Exceptions where paid drivers may be possible are for military destinations, where a federal transportation incentive (subsidy) of $230 per month is provided to riders, and other companies which offer the transportation commute subsidy.
Next Steps

This draft report is provided for information and input as the final technical details are being completed. This report will be presented to the Inter-Regional Partnership Policy Committee at its meeting on May 27 for the same purpose. Upon completion of the report, proposals for fixed-route transit and van/buspool initiatives could be developed for formal endorsement by the appropriate San Diego and Riverside agencies.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. I-15 Interregional Partnership Phase III - Draft Bus Rapid Transit Map

Key Staff Contact: Barrow Emerson, (619) 699-1961, bem@sandag.org
UPDATE ON THE I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (I-15 IRP) STRATEGIC TRANSPORTATION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

File Number 3005100

Introduction

In the area of transportation, the focus of Phase III of the I-15 IRP is the development of a Strategic Transportation Implementation Plan. This work will build upon previous Phases I and II efforts and will incorporate the results of the I-15 Interregional Transit, Buspool, and Vanpool Study. The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) is the primary agency responsible for transportation activities as part of Phase III and staff will provide an update on the status of the activities underway.

Discussion

The primary goal of the I-15 IRP is to develop collaborative, interregional strategies in transportation, economic development, and housing that will improve the quality of life of residents in Riverside and San Diego counties. RCTC, acting as a primary agency for transportation activities as part of Phase III and partnering with the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) acting as the lead agency, will coordinate and administer the necessary work to complete the transportation tasks and deliverables for this project. Other I-15 IRP partners include the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Caltrans Districts 8 and 11, and the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA). The I-15 IRP Technical Project Team consisting of staff from all participating agencies will serve as a resource to the Consultant for existing data.

In the area of transportation planning, the centerpiece for Phase III of the I-15 IRP is the development of a Strategic Implementation Plan (SIP) that will concentrate on short- and long-term multimodal strategies for the I-15 corridor. This work will build on the Cooperative County Line Study completed during Phase II of the I-15 IRP by Caltrans Districts 8 and 11. RCTC has selected Wilbur Smith Associates to conduct the work. Key tasks of the SIP are to develop and/or refine future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and/or commuter express transit plans in the I-15 and I-215 corridors and include analysis of transit priority treatments and transit infrastructure development. Additional tasks include a goods movement data summary and a cost-effectiveness analysis and overall funding strategy. This will provide Caltrans, RCTC, and SANDAG with the planning level cost estimates for short-term project deliveries and funding strategies as well as allow each region to incorporate multimodal strategies in the long-range transportation plan updates. The scope of work is attached.
**Next Steps**

The Borders Committee will receive periodic updates as the development of the SIP progresses.

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) Phase III - Scope of Work for Transportation Activities

Key Staff Contacts: Tanya Love (RCTC), (951) 787-7141, tlove@rctc.org  
Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967, hwe@sandag.org
I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) Phase III
Scope of Work for Transportation Activities

Task 1: Compilation of Project Study Reports (PSR)

- The Consultant shall confirm and refine, if needed, the I-15 Corridor Concept given the adopted long-range transportation plans for RCTC, SANDAG, and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The corridor concept shall be designed to accommodate future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and commuter express transit service.

- The Consultant shall compile a list of existing completed Project Study Reports (PSR) for Riverside and San Diego Counties and selected urbanized counties within California that highlight their short-term strategies. This summary document shall detail how and when various projects within the I-15 County Line area could be implemented. The SIP shall include performance measures that determine the effectiveness of the short-term strategies and the methods used to determine the outcomes. Staff from participating agencies shall provide the Consultant with copies of relevant PSRs within their jurisdictions.

Deliverable: Technical memorandum documenting the I-15 Corridor Concept and summarizing existing PSRs for 5, 10, and 15 year short-term strategies.

Task 2: Goods Movement Data Summary

- The Consultant will include a summary of current Goods Movement data, specifically heavy truck data along the I-15 corridor and major connectors. The data will be provided by RCTC, SANDAG, and Caltrans Districts 8 and 11.


Task 3: Analysis of Transit Priority Treatments and Transit Lane Infrastructure Development

- The Consultant shall develop and/or refine future BRT and/or commuter express transit plans in the I-15 and I-215 corridors to include in updates to each region’s long-range transportation plans, including future stop locations and cost estimates. The Consultant shall incorporate the results from the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG’s) Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Study and the Interregional Transit, Buspool, and Vanpool Study, which is being conducted by SANDAG and is expected to be completed in Spring 2009. Additionally, this work shall coordinate with the smart growth land use planning efforts also underway in the I-15 and I-215 corridors.

- The Consultant shall include an analysis of transit priority treatments and transit lane infrastructure development in the SIP. The Consultant shall develop preliminary phasing options for Express Bus and BRT services given existing and proposed infrastructure. I-15 IRP partners will continue to collaborate among transit providers to continue to
coordinate transit service on the I-15 corridor, such as proposed refinements to the I-15 Express and BRT services.

Meetings/Presentations: Up to one (1) meeting/presentation with project partners after draft deliverable.


**Task 4: Cost-effectiveness Analysis and Overall Funding Strategy**

- The Consultant shall include in the SIP a cost-effectiveness analysis and overall funding strategy. This will provide Caltrans, RCTC, and SANDAG with the planning level cost estimates for short-term project deliveries and funding strategies. The SIP would not be limited to highway projects, but would investigate and analyze multi-modal options for the I-15 corridor, in keeping with the philosophy of the I-15 IRP. Projects shall be presented to the I-15 IRP Policy Committee to determine prioritization of the suite of potential projects and to recommend what specific projects should be developed and determine which projects are appropriate for each agency to implement. In addition to presenting the list of projects to the I-15 IRP Policy Committee, challenges to implementation shall be identified including both infrastructural and service delivery constraints along with institutional constraints such as funding, jurisdictional boundaries, and multiple service providers, including labor/union involvement.

Meetings/Presentations: Up to one (1) meeting/presentation with project partners after draft deliverable.

Deliverable: Technical Memorandum on Cost-Effectiveness, Challenges, and Overall Funding Strategy.

**Task 5: Draft Strategy Implementation Plan Document**

- The Draft SIP shall combine the analysis done for the previous tasks, prioritize the proposed strategies and projects, and present a clear action plan for the agencies to follow in the implementation of short-term projects selected by the I-15 IRP Policy Committee.

- The Draft SIP shall incorporate the analysis of existing and potential Park-and-Ride facilities that evaluated possible short-term strategies to accommodate the increasing need for Park-and-Ride spaces and lots due to an increasing number of vanpool and carpool riders. This evaluation will be conducted by RCTC staff and provided to the Consultant.

- The Draft SIP shall incorporate the results of the Interregional Transit, Buspool, and Vanpool Study.

Meetings/Presentations: Up to two (2) meetings/presentations with project partners after draft deliverable.

**Task 6: Final Strategic Implementation Plan**

- The Consultant shall incorporate the comments from the I-15 partners and I-15 IRP Policy Committee into the Final SIP.

Meetings/Presentations: Up to two (2) presentations with project partners to present final SIP.

Deliverable: Final SIP Report.
INTRODUCTION

The I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) Phase III Housing Strategy calls for the development of a Smart Growth Map for selected Western Riverside cities, modeled after SANDAG’s Smart Growth Concept Map for the San Diego region. This initial mapping effort will focus on three pilot cities: Temecula, Murrieta, and Lake Elsinore. The purpose of this report is to provide a status update on the initial map, and to inform the Committee on discussions between the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to expand the project area boundaries following the end of grant funding from Phase III.

DISCUSSION

Development of the Western Riverside Smart Growth Map includes both land use and transit planning components focused on identifying smart growth opportunities centered on the I-15 and I-215 freeway corridors.

The planning effort will ultimately result in a set of specific Smart Growth Place Type categories applicable to the cities of Temecula, Murrieta, and Lake Elsinore; the identification of 1-2 smart growth opportunity areas per city corresponding to these place types; data analysis and general land use site descriptions for those areas; and, an initial Smart Growth Map illustrating those areas and the transportation and transit services connecting them. Attached are two items: (1) a draft “Smart Growth Matrix” describing the preliminary place types identified by the local cities and WRCOG; and, (2) a draft map illustrating the smart growth opportunity areas identified to date by the planning staffs from the cities of Temecula, Murrieta, and Lake Elsinore. While WRCOG and the cities have made significant progress on developing the initial draft map, additional work and analysis remains to be done. A refined map will be presented at the Joint I-15 IRP Policy Committee meeting in May, and the final map for the initial cities will be completed by February 2010.

The Phase III Transportation Strategy will complement this effort through contributions from the Transportation Strategic Implementation Plan (SIP) currently being developed by the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) and consultant firm Wilbur Smith.
During the course of planning for this effort, SCAG (the Metropolitan Planning Organization that receives subregional input from WRCOG) agreed to provide additional funding through its Compass Blueprint Demonstration Project grant program to expand work to a larger subregional study area with the goal of developing an expanded Smart Growth Map and Transit Development Plan to additional areas in the Western Riverside County area. The outcomes of the initial work funded by the I-15 IRP will provide a foundation for the expanded project. It is anticipated that this work could be used as a model for SCAG and its subregions as they develop their Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for the next update of the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments:  1. Draft Preliminary Matrix of Smart Growth Place Types for Western Riverside  
               2. I-15 Interregional Partnership Phase III - Draft Smart Growth Map

Key Staff Contacts:  Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org  
                    Kevin Viera (WRCOG), (951) 955-7985, viera@wrcog.cog.ca.us
PRELIMINARY MATRIX OF SMART GROWTH PLACE TYPES
FOR WESTERN RIVERSIDE

SMART GROWTH DESIGN PRINCIPLES

The following design principles apply to all categories and are critical to the success of smart growth.

- Human-scale built environment that creates uniqueness and identity
- Vertically and horizontally mixed use development, with vertical mixed use located near transit stations
- Robust transportation choices that compliment the intensity of development within the Smart Growth Opportunity Area (SGOA)
  - Strong pedestrian orientation: network of streets & pedestrian paths, narrower street scales, special designs to facilitate pedestrian crossings at intersections, and the walker having precedence
  - Bike access/locker facilities and park-n-ride facilities woven in the human-scale design
  - Transit station(s) located centrally within main activity area(s); transit user amenities located adjacent to stations (e.g., child care facilities, coffee bars, dry cleaning drop-off)
- Nearby recreational facilities and public plazas

PRELIMINARY SMART GROWTH PLACE TYPES
(identified by the Western Riverside Smart Growth Map Working Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smart Growth Place Type</th>
<th>Minimum Residential Target</th>
<th>Minimum Employment Target</th>
<th>Minimum Transit Service Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>30 du/ac</td>
<td>45 emp/ac</td>
<td>BRT, Regional, Express, Local Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>20 du/ac</td>
<td>30 emp/ac</td>
<td>Regional, Local Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>20 du/ac</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Local Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Transit Corridor</td>
<td>25 du/ac</td>
<td>30 emp/ac</td>
<td>Regional, Local Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Center (e.g., educational and medical facilities)</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>45 emp/ac</td>
<td>Regional, Express, Local, Trolley Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50 emp/ac</td>
<td>Regional, Express, Local, Trolley Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY/ LAND USE TYPE CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>LAND USE INTENSITY TARGETS</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Employment draws from throughout region, while other uses draw mainly from subregional area  
  • Mixed use employment  
  • Civic/cultural facilities | • Desired Building Types: Mid-to high-rise residential and office/commercial  
  • 30-65+ dwelling units/average net residential acre  
  • 25+ dwelling unit/acre for mixed use sites  
  • 45+ employees/average net employment acre | • Freeway connections with multiple access points  
  • Served by several regional and local transit lines  
  • Possible shuttle/trolley routes for internal trips  
  • Minimal park-and-ride facilities; access should be handled by internal shuttle system | • Served by BRT, several regional, express, and local transit lines  
  • High to very high frequency service (minimum of 30 min, 15 min during peak) on all corridor/regional services  
  • Key transit center, along with multiple major transfer locations  
  • Possible internal shuttle/trolley system |
| **Town Center**                        |                           |                                       |                                        |
| • Draws mainly from immediate subregional area  
  • Residential and office/commercial, including mixed use  
  • Civic/cultural facilities | • Desired Building Types: Low- to mid-rise  
  • 20-45+ dwelling units/average net acre  
  • 30-50 employees/average net acre | • Served by one or more regional and several local transit lines  
  • May also be served by regional arterials | • Served by 1 to 2 regional lines and local lines  
  • High frequency service (30 min service) on regional and local transit lines  
  • High frequency throughout the day on most lines  
  • Access to key transit center, multiple major transfer locations  
  • Shared-use parking or dedicated park-and-ride facilities for regional transit services |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY/ LAND USE TYPE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>LAND USE INTENSITY TARGETS</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draws from nearby community/ neighborhoods</td>
<td>▪ Desired Building Types: Low- to mid-rise</td>
<td>▪ Served by arterials and/or collector streets</td>
<td>▪ Served by at least one high frequency local transit service route (30 min in peak, minimum of 60 minutes in non-peak hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residential and commercial, including mixed use</td>
<td>▪ 20-45+ dwelling units/average net acre</td>
<td>▪ May also be served by rural service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible community-serving civic uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use Transit Corridor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draws mainly from several nearby communities</td>
<td>▪ Desired Building Types: Variety of low-, mid-, and high-rise</td>
<td>▪ Located along a major arterial</td>
<td>▪ Generally served by regional and/or local transit lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residential and office/commercial, including mixed use</td>
<td>▪ 25-75+ dwelling unit/ average net acre along transit corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ High frequency service (30 min service) throughout the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linear size with width extending 1 to 2 blocks outward from corridor</td>
<td>▪ Employment: Commercial and retail supportive uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Multiple station locations, with one or more on-street transfer locations with intersecting services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 30+ employees/ average net acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY/LAND USE TYPE CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>LAND USE INTENSITY TARGETS</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Use Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment draws from throughout region, with other uses being community serving</td>
<td>Desired Building Types: Variety of low-, mid-, and high-rise</td>
<td>Nearby freeway access</td>
<td>Generally served by one or more regional, express, and local transit lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominated by one non-residential land use, i.e., university or hospital</td>
<td>45+ employees/ average net acre</td>
<td>Served by one or more regional and local transit lines</td>
<td>High frequency service (30 min service) on regional and local transit lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail support services</td>
<td>Optional residential: 50+ dwelling units/ average net residential acre</td>
<td>May be served by shuttle/trolley service for internal trips</td>
<td>Moderate to high frequency throughout the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential residential element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum of peak hour service for express lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very high frequency service (15 min service) for shuttle/trolley service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to key transit center, multiple major transfer locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment draws from throughout region, with other uses being community serving</td>
<td>Desired Building Types: Variety of low-, mid-, and high-rise</td>
<td>Nearby freeway access</td>
<td>Generally served by one or more regional and local transit lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominated by non-residential land uses</td>
<td>50+ employees/ average net acre</td>
<td>Served by one or more regional and local transit lines</td>
<td>High frequency service (30 min service) on regional and local transit lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail support services</td>
<td></td>
<td>May be served by shuttle/trolley service for internal trips</td>
<td>Moderate to high frequency throughout the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum of peak hour service on express lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very high frequency service (15 min service) for shuttle/trolley service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to key transit center, multiple major transfer locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES:

Computing Land Use Intensity Measurements per Net Acre:

**Residential:** Total dwelling units divided by built or planned residential acreage net of public right-of-way

**Employment:** Total employees divided by built or planned office, commercial, and retail acreage net of public right-of-way

**Mixed Use:** Total dwelling units divided by built or planned residential acreage net of public right-of-way and any other non-residential uses (e.g., commercial, retail, etc.)

Land Use Building Type Definitions:

- **Low Rise** = 2-3 stories
- **Mid-Rise** = 4-6 stories
- **High Rise** = 7+ stories

Rural Villages:

For additional detail, see the County of Riverside’s General Plan Update. The Rural Village place type category will be further developed with Riverside County staff as part of the Expanded Western Riverside Smart Growth Map.
**Riverside Transportation Authority (RTA) Route Classifications:**

Route Classifications help to define the type of service to operate based on the density of the area in which the service is routed. RTA service can be classified into five fixed-route categories – regional, local, rural, express, and trolley (or special). Complimentary to the fixed-route service is paratransit service, also known as Dial-a-Ride (DAR).

**Regional Services:**
Regional route service is the backbone of the network as it operates between urbanized areas on primary corridors and may utilize the freeway system to travel between communities. It is not uncommon for regional service to travel through non-urban areas to link two urban areas. Within an urbanized area stops are spaced at intervals of about \(\frac{3}{4}\) mile, or as development permits.

**Local Services:**
Local routes supplement regional routes by circulating through various neighborhoods and serving secondary corridors. A local route also serves as feeder routes to regional and express routes and transports customers within a community on shorter trips. Bus stop spacing is at urban service intervals. Local service is further defined by routes that are operated directly by RTA and those that are contracted to private sector service providers. Routes operated directly account for about three-quarters of the system-wide ridership.

**Rural Services:**
An exclusive Rural route serves as lifeline service that feeds regional service. The service is for the most part limited in operation and serves secondary roadways within non-urbanized areas. Given the growth of western Riverside County, rural route service is primarily limited to portions of Regional route service and areas between cities.

**Express Services:**
Express routes provide limited stop service designed to transport commuters to and from employment sites and provide connections to service outside western Riverside County. Labeled as CommuterLink, these buses use the freeway system to provide faster service.

**Trolley/Special Services:**
Trolley routes and Special service are designed to meet the needs of a specific market or community and often are designed as a circulator to serve a targeted group with common travel patterns.

**Paratransit Services:**
Dial-A-Ride (paratransit) service compliments fixed-route service for customers who are physically challenged and are unable to navigate their way to a bus stop. DAR service is offered curb to curb within three-quarters of a mile of fixed-route service, excluding express routes. Passengers eligible for the service are seniors and those qualified under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) law.
UPDATE ON THE I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (I-15 IRP) WORKFORCE HOUSING PROJECT

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the I-15 IRP Workforce Housing Project. In addition to the development of a Western Riverside Smart Growth Concept Map, the housing component of Phase III of the I-15 calls for the development of a proposal for a workforce housing project that will help reduce the strain on the interregional transportation system by providing more affordable housing opportunities for employees who work in the San Diego region, particularly those who work in the North County area. The project goals are to:

1. Identify potential sites for moderate income/workforce housing projects in Northern San Diego County in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas along the SPRINTER line;
2. Foster the involvement of one or more large regional employers toward a proposal for a workforce housing project at one or more of the identified sites;
3. Identify specific development and financing components for a successful project;
4. Generate needed support from regional and local partners to facilitate a successful project;
5. Advance the project as much as possible toward achieving the actual construction of a workforce housing project; and
6. Build a foundation for a workforce housing project that could be emulated elsewhere along the SPRINTER line and in other areas of the region.

Discussion

For this component of the I-15 IRP Housing Program SANDAG sought proposals from qualified firms for professional services to provide assistance in the Workforce Housing Project. A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued and SANDAG has selected Keyser Marston Associates (KMA) to undertake the scope of work for the project. Work is scheduled to begin this month and conclude in November. The final draft scope of work includes the following tasks/deliverables:

Task/Deliverable 1 – Initiation and Identification of Potential Sites

- Develop an e-mail questionnaire regarding potential sites to be forwarded to the cities of Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, Escondido, and the County of San Diego planning and redevelopment officials, as well as California State University San Marcos, North County Transit District (NCTD), and Palomar Pomerado Health; and
• Conduct an independent review of available land for sale using third-party data sources.

Based on the input of the various jurisdictions and organizations, KMA will recommend to SANDAG for further review three to five candidate sites for workforce housing development in Northern San Diego County, specifically for households with income levels between 80 to 120 percent Area Median Income (AMI) and targeting the following areas:

1. The areas identified for potential residential development in the Oceanside and Escondido Station Area Master Plans recently completed by NCTD; and
2. Vacant and redevelopment/infill land within the smart growth opportunity areas along the SPRINTER line designated on the Smart Growth Concept Map.

**Task/Deliverable 2 – Site Analysis**

Evaluate the sites identified in Task 1 to select one preferred site for further study/analysis.

A. **Site Analysis** - KMA will create an evaluation matrix of the three to five candidate sites from Task 1. The matrix will include:
   a) Ownership, size (square feet), existing uses, surrounding uses, land use and zoning;
   b) Whether the site is in a Redevelopment Project Area;
   c) City policies and/or inclusionary requirements; and
   d) Potential local support and/or opposition to moderate/workforce housing development.

B. **Stakeholder Interviews** - KMA will interview three developers regarding approaches to development of workforce housing and opportunities to partner with public agencies and/or institutional employers.

C. **Project Description(s)** - KMA will prepare project descriptions for possible development scenarios for three to five candidate sites that are consistent with site conditions and land use/zoning, including range of land uses, densities, parking solutions, etc. For illustrative purposes, KMA will also provide photographic examples of comparable developments.

D. **Meeting** - KMA will participate in one meeting of a maximum of two hours with SANDAG staff to review draft findings from Task 2. Following this meeting, SANDAG staff will provide direction regarding the preferred site (maximum of one) and the preferred development options (maximum of three).

**Task/Deliverable 3 – Financial Feasibility, Implementation Strategy, and RFP Approach**

Following review and input from SANDAG staff, KMA will draft a proposal for a workforce housing project at the preferred site identified in Task 2. The draft proposal shall be broadly representative of near-term development opportunities within the jurisdiction where the site is located, and shall include but not be limited to the following components:

A. **Financial Feasibility** - KMA will prepare financial pro formas to test the viability of the development economics for each development scenario (maximum of three). Each financial pro forma will include estimates of development costs, sales prices, or rental rates for households making between 80 – 120 percent of Area Median Income, developer return,
and supportable land value. KMA will use order-of-magnitude industry standards and our own experience with other developments to estimate these costs.

KMA will conclude on the relative financial feasibility of each development scenario based on a comparison of the supportable land value derived from the pro forma analyses and the potential acquisition costs determined during Task 1.

B. Implementation Strategy - KMA will review methods of implementation appropriate for the preferred alternative. Further, KMA will prepare a menu of potential funding sources and/or mechanisms available to help implement the workforce housing project. KMA will identify specific methods or programs, provide a brief definition, and assess the applicability of each approach to the project. Potential sources and/or mechanisms may include:

- Tax increment financing and associated bonding capacity (where applicable)
- Infrastructure Financing District (where applicable)
- Developer exactions and/or developer impact fees
- Community Facilities District (CFD) or Special Assessment District
- State general obligation bonds authorized by voters
- Partnerships with institutional employers or other large employers that may provide development incentives
- Other incentives, such as deferral of development impact fees, reduction in parking ratios, modified comparability of units, etc.

C. RFP Approach - KMA will recommend an approach to the developer selection process. This approach will include a checklist of the key components and submittal requirements of a developer solicitation document such as a RFP. (The actual RFP will be prepared by SANDAG in conjunction with the local jurisdiction.

Task 4 – Final Proposal

SANDAG will create a Final Proposal for a workforce housing project at the preferred site identified in Task 2 based on review and input from stakeholders involved in the project.

Task/Deliverable 5 – Presentation Materials

During the course of this work, SANDAG will prepare materials to be presented to two SANDAG working groups, the SPRINTER Smart Growth Working Group and the Regional Housing Working Group, whose members will provide input into the study. Materials will cover:

a) Status updates and/or draft products for Tasks/Deliverables 1 – 4; and
b) Possible approaches to generating potential financial support toward a workforce housing project.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. I-15 Interregional Partnership Phase III - Draft Workforce Housing Map

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org
UPDATE ON THE I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (I-15 IRP) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIC PLAN

Introduction

Economic Development has been a key element of the I-15 IRP effort from the outset. Two of the interregional strategies that were developed in Phase I fell into the Economic Development realm: to facilitate greater collaboration between regional economic development entities and to improve job growth through the promotion of new employment opportunities in the cluster industries that drive the bi-regional economies. Phase II implemented those strategies through the completion of a two-county Employment Cluster Study that identified key clusters shared by both economies and provided recommendations on how to pursue economic prosperity in both regions.

The scope of work for Phase III calls for facilitating the development of a collaborative strategic action plan between regional economic entities to encourage greater cooperation between the industry clusters identified in Phase II. In particular, the cluster study recommended that cooperative initiatives be undertaken to 1) provide employment opportunities that would ensure a rising standard of living, 2) identify ways to develop, shape, and expand traded clusters, 3) to develop and support shared infrastructure investment, and 4) to develop workforce training and education programs targeting the labor force requirements of selected traded clusters.

Discussion

To implement the recommendations from the Phase II cluster study, an Economic Development Task Force will be formed as part of Phase III, and will consist of business and economic development representatives from Riverside and San Diego counties. To help establish this Task Force, a core group of economic development representatives have been asked to guide the development of this work. This group consists of two representatives from the Riverside and San Diego regions. Currently, this group has been working with SANDAG and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) staffs to select a consultant that will perform the analysis to identify specific trade clusters in Riverside County that were listed in the Cluster Study. Four consulting firms were interviewed on April 17, 2009. Staff anticipates that the selected consultant will be under contract by the end of May.

A second task for Economic Development in the IRP is to create a business database that can be posted to a web portal in an effort to connect local business together. The objective for this task is to encourage local businesses to use other local businesses to supply goods and services. WRCOG
staff is working with the Connectory, located in San Diego, along with the Southwest California Economic Development Corporation (EDC), representing the cities in the Temecula Valley, to determine: 1) how the IRP can establish a portal, 2) how the Connectory and the Southwest California EDC can maintain the portal, 3) resources for collecting business data, and 4) the best method for populating the business database. Once the database is created it will be uploaded to the web portal. WRCOG staff is working on coordinating our initial meeting between the two organizations.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contacts:  Kevin Viera (WRCOG), (951) 955-8305, viera@wrcog.cog.ca.us
Carolyn Alkire, (619) 699-5759, cal@sandag.org
I-15 Interregional Partnership

Overview of the I-15 IRP

Borders Committee - April 24, 2009
I-15 Interregional Partnership

• Phase I
  - Objective - Address Job/Housing Imbalance
  - Existing Conditions Report
  - Commuter Survey
    • Information Collected to Develop Project Objectives
    • The Who, Where and Why
  - Developed Strategic Plan
    • Transportation
    • Economic
    • Housing

• Phase II
  - Objective - Implement Recommendations from Phase I
  - Program Areas & Strategies
    • Economic - Cluster Study
    • Transportation - County Line Study
    • Housing - Workforce Housing
I-15 Interregional Partnership
Phase III

- Funding Source
  - Caltrans District 8
- Overall Coordination
  - Policy
  - Executive
  - Staff
- Economic Development
  - Convene a core group of economic representatives
  - Economic Workshops
  - Develop outreach materials
- Housing
  - Workforce Housing
  - Smart Growth Concept
- Transportation
  - Strategic Implementation Plan
    - Short-term goals
    - Cost Effective Analysis
    - Park and Ride Analysis
    - Heavy Truck Traffic Documentation
  - Transit
  - Vanpool/Carpool Study

I-15 Interregional Partnership
Overview of the I-15 IRP
Borders Committee - April 24, 2009
Introduction

- Southwestern Riverside to San Diego County - significant demand for work trips.
- Caltrans Transit Planning grant received to further study in collaboration with:
  - Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)
  - Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC)
  - Riverside Transit Agency (RTA)
- Goal:
  - Evaluate the market, operational, and financial viability of providing additional fixed-route transit, and/or vanpools or buspools
Commute Options to Driving Alone

- Vanpools - solution for trips lacking significant demand between origin-destination pairs to provide fixed-route transit cost-effectively
- Buspools - viable where demand exceeds vanpools, but not enough for fixed route transit
- Fixed Route Transit Service - frequent regularly scheduled service provided by public transit agency

Demand for Fixed-Route Transit Service

- BRT service will commence in 2012 between:
  - Escondido and downtown San Diego; and
  - Escondido and Sorrento Mesa/UTC/UCSD
- 29,000 daily commuters from Riverside County
  - Transit demand:
    - 600+ to downtown San Diego
    - 400+ to Sorrento Mesa/UTC/UCSD
  - 60% of demand from Temecula and Murrieta
Demand for Fixed-Route Transit Service

Demand for Fixed-Route Transit Service: Factors

- Commute Distance and Travel Time
  - Similar distance (60 Miles) and travel time (90 minutes) for Metrolink rail (Riverside to LA), over-the-road coaches (Antelope Valley and Santa Clarita to downtown LA)

- Trip Loads
  - Average passengers per trip based on 3 hour span, 15 minute service frequency
    - To downtown: 53
    - To Sorrento Mesa/UTC/UCSD: 36

- Future Growth
  - Temecula and Murrieta populations to grow 20% by year 2030
Summary

- Providing a fixed-route transit service between Riverside and San Diego Counties is feasible in terms of patronage and cost.
- Based on patronage forecasts, initial service should be implemented between Temecula and downtown San Diego.
  - Operating cost - $2 million per annum.
  - Assuming 50% farebox recovery, $1 million annual operating subsidy required.
  - Per trip fare levels and passenger subsidy comparable with existing commuter bus services.

Issues to be Resolved

- Operating plan including which transit agency(s) operate service.
- Station stopping patterns.
- Station location(s) in southwestern Riverside County, including Park and Ride.
- Fleet requirements and operating and maintenance base.
- Funding partnership among agencies.
Opportunity for Consolidation of Vanpools into Buspools

Background

• 240 vanpools (1,600 commuters) operate between southwest Riverside and San Diego County
• Existing vanpools travel to common destinations that could benefit from higher capacity modes (Buspools or fixed-route transit)
Origins and Destinations

- 50% of vans serve military destinations outside of the I-15 to downtown San Diego corridor
- Military schedules compatible with buspools
- Fixed-route transit proposals do not generally compete for the same markets, making for a convenient complement

Vanpool Originations

- 75% of southwestern Riverside County vanpools originate from the following communities
  - Temecula
  - Murrieta
  - Menifee
  - Hemet
Vanpool Destinations

- 36 current San Diego County vanpool destinations
- Top five destinations:
  - Camp Pendleton
  - Naval Base San Diego
  - Naval Air Station North Island
  - Rancho Bernardo
  - San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station

Highest Origin – Destination Pairs

- Murrieta/Camp Pendleton
  - 12 vans, 94 riders
- Temecula/Downtown San Diego
  - 11 vans, 71 riders
- Temecula/NASNI (North Island)
  - 11 vans, 70 riders
- Temecula/Rancho Bernardo
  - 8 vans, 65 riders
Summary

• Conversion of vanpools originating from Riverside County into buspools is feasible in terms of patronage and cost, particularly to military destinations.

Issues to be Resolved

• Market Demand
• Bus Leasing Options
• Vehicle Selection
• Drivers
Next Steps

- Report provided for information and input
- Report will be presented to Inter-Regional Partnership for the same purpose
- Proposals for fixed-route transit and vanpool to buspool conversions will be developed for consideration by appropriate Riverside and San Diego agencies
I-15 IRP - Transportation Strategic Implementation Plan
Initial Western Riverside Smart Growth Concept Map
Borders Committee
April 24, 2009

Collaborative Process

- Staff-to-staff meetings
  - SANDAG, WRCOG,
  - Cities of Temecula, Murrieta, and Lake Elsinore,
  - RCTC, RTA, and
  - County of Riverside

- Additional funding from SCAG
  - Basis for SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and RTP Update
Boundaries for Western Riverside Smart Growth Planning Efforts

Defining Smart Growth

- Compact mixed use development
- Good urban design and walkable
- Near public transit
- More travel and housing choices
- Protected open space and habitat areas
Valley Parkway at the Escondido Transit Center

Existing

Conceptual
Smart Growth Place Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Western Riverside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Center</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Village</td>
<td>(Rural Village)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed Use Transit Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Center</td>
<td>Special Use Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Transit Service Characteristics

- BRT
- Regional Services
- Express Services
- Local Services
- Special/Shuttle Services ("Trolley Routes")
- Rural Services

Refinements through I-15 IRP
Strategic Transportation Implementation Plan (SIP)
and SCAG Expanded Scope of Work
Preliminary Smart Growth Areas Identified by Western Riverside Local Jurisdictions

Temecula Smart Growth Areas
Murrieta Smart Growth Areas

Lake Elsinore Smart Growth Areas
Scope for Additional Work Funded by SCAG

- Expanded Western Riverside Transit Network focused on connecting identified smart growth opportunity areas; ridership, capital costs; and operating costs
- Expanded geographic area for smart growth opportunity areas; Final Smart Growth Maps, Place Types, Site Descriptions, GIS Tables
- Basis for developing Western Riverside SCS for RTP Update

Comments by Western Riverside Planners

- Very exciting process
- Great collaboration
- Helpful to view from regional perspective
- Coordinate with High Speed Rail planning efforts
Next Steps and Timeline

- “Site Descriptions” in May
- Refined Smart Growth Concept Map at I-15 Joint Policy Committee Meeting in June
- Outreach to local city councils this summer
- Draft Final Maps this winter; final products by February 2010

Initial Western Riverside Smart Growth Concept Map
Borders Committee
April 24, 2009