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

San Diego Association of Governments  • 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900  •  Fax (619) 699-1905  •  www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Board of Directors may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under Meetings on the SANDAG Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Board of Directors meeting. **Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Board of Directors meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the 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.**
BOARD OF DIRECTORS AGENDA
Friday, December 17, 2010

ITEM #  RECOMMENDATION

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES  APPROVE

   +A. NOVEMBER 5, 2010, BOARD POLICY MEETING MINUTES
   +B. NOVEMBER 19, 2010, BOARD BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

   +3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES  APPROVE

   This item summarizes the actions taken by the Borders Committee on November 19, the Executive and Regional Planning Committees on December 3, and the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on December 10, 2010.

   CONSENT (4 through 9)

   +4. EXTENSION REQUESTS FOR FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT AUDITS (Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin)  APPROVE

   The Cities of Chula Vista and San Diego, and SANDAG have requested an extension for their FY 2010 Transportation Development Act (TDA) audits. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve TDA audit extension requests for the Cities of Chula Vista and San Diego, and SANDAG, until March 27, 2011, as permitted by the California Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations.

   +5. FY 2011 BUDGET AMENDMENT: REGIONAL eWATCH APPLICATION (Pam Scanlon)  APPROVE

   The Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) has received an additional $74,366 in federal Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) funding to develop a regional eWatch application, which will allow members of the public throughout the county to subscribe to a no-cost service to receive notifications of crimes, arrests, and/or traffic incidents occurring around specific addresses. The Public Safety Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2011 Budget (including the Overall Work Program) to accept an additional $74,366 in UASI funds for the ARJIS Interregional Justice Data-Sharing work element (3400800), which would bring the total funding to $1,367,368.
+6. **REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (Lauren Warrem)**

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

+7. **REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG (Kim Kawada)**

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

+8. **TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: ANNUAL STATUS REPORT (Keith Greer)**

This report presents an update on the implementation of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program, including the current status of land acquisition for mitigation, funding for regional land management and monitoring, and planning efforts for the current fiscal year.

+9. **RELEASE OF STATE ROUTE 11 AND OTAY MESA EAST PORT OF ENTRY DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT (Marney Cox and Tina Casgar, SANDAG; Mario Orso, Caltrans)**

This report provides an update on Caltrans’ release of the draft environmental document for the State Route 11 and Otay Mesa East Port of Entry project.

**CHAIR’S REPORT (10 through 11)**

+10. **ELECTION OF 2011 SANDAG BOARD OFFICERS (National City Mayor Ron Morrison, Nominating Committee Chair)**

The Nominating Committee recommends the attached slate of candidates for SANDAG Chair, First Vice Chair, and Second Vice Chair for calendar year 2011. Additional nominations for any officer position may be made by Board members at the December meeting. The Board of Directors is asked to elect SANDAG Board Officers for the upcoming year.

+11. **UPDATE ON 2011 ANNUAL SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS SUMMIT (Colleen Windsor)**

The SANDAG Board of Directors Annual Summit is scheduled to start on Wednesday, February 2, and conclude on Friday morning, February 4, 2011. This item provides an update on the preliminary Summit agenda for information.
REPORTS (12 through 13)

+12. COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK: PROPOSED GRANT PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS (Imperial Beach Mayor Jim Janney, Regional Planning Committee Chair; Vikrant Sood)  

APPROVE

The Regional Planning Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the proposed grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, and evaluation process for the Healthy Communities Campaign and Safe Routes to School grant programs, two initiatives under the Communities Putting Prevention to Work program, in substantially the same form as attached to the report.

+13. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: PREFERRED REVENUE CONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK SCENARIO (Second Vice Chair Jack Dale, Transportation Committee Chair; Heather Adamson and Dave Schumacher)*

ACCEPT

During the past few months, the Board of Directors has reviewed four initial Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenarios that were developed for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). These Scenarios attempt to build and operate as much of the Unconstrained Transportation Network as possible, given revenue availability and flexibility, and project priorities. In response to direction from the Board, a Hybrid Scenario also has been prepared. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors accept the Hybrid Scenario as the preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario for development of the Draft 2050 RTP. The Transportation Committee further recommends that the Unconstrained Transportation Network be modified to include Interstate 15 between Centre City Parkway and State Route 78 with a configuration of ten general purpose lanes and four Managed Lanes. Also recommends modifications to the Unconstrained Transportation Network to include improvements to the Interstate 15 corridor from State 78 north to the San Diego-Riverside County line.

This item was not ready at the time of mailout and will be sent out under separate cover when completed.

14. UPCOMING MEETINGS  

INFORMATION

The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 14, 2011, at 10 a.m. The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 28, 2011, at 9 a.m.

15. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

* next to an agenda item indicates a San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission item
Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (Escondido) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 10:11 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Pfeiler noted that Caltrans District 11, received an Onion award for the Interstate 5 (I-5) North Coast expansion project at the recent Orchids and Onions event, and Laurie Berman, District Director, was presented with the Onion award.

Chair Pfeiler welcomed Carlsbad Mayor Bud Lewis and recognized his 40 years of service. Mayor Jim Wood (Oceanside) asked for a standing ovation to honor Mayor Lewis's years of leadership in North County.

Duncan McFetridge, representing Save Our Forests and Ranchlands (SOFAR), expressed his concern about a public records request made by SOFAR for modeling data and assumptions used by SANDAG for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Mike Bullock, a member of the public, commented about a postcard notification of the I-5 North Coast expansion project. He said that there is nothing on the postcard about widening, expansion, adding lanes, or construction. He discussed several I-5 town hall meetings, and noted that there is no public support for this project.

Sara Honadle, Cleveland National Forest Foundation and Coast Law Group, representing SOFAR, reiterated SOFAR's requests for RTP modeling data and assumptions under the Public Records Act and Senate Bill 375 (SB 375). She acknowledged that there is some conflicting case law whether there might be an argument for withholding the information they are requesting, but stated that this would not apply to the express mandates of SB 375.

Clive Richard, a member of the public, congratulated those elected officials who were reelected.

Elyse Lowe, Executive Director, Move San Diego, said that they made a Public Records Act request for the release of the regional travel model for independent evaluation by their consultant, and they were given many components of the model, but were denied the model as a whole.

Susan Tinsky, Sustainable San Diego, said that it is really difficult in the absence of data to evaluate the RTP alternatives, and hoped the Board would assist with this request to release the modeling data.
Julie Wiley, General Counsel, responded that there have been a number of public records requests for modeling information, and SANDAG has responded with many records. She clarified what records were provided and what is considered proprietary information that would not have to be produced under the Public Records Act. She has reviewed the allegations related to provisions of SB 375, and it is her opinion that it does not require the release of proprietary information. She has requested information from attorneys of other metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) in the state about their actions regarding the release of proprietary data.

Councilmember Crystal Crawford (Del Mar) requested that this issue come back to the Board.

**REPORTS (2 through 4)**

2. **2050 RTP: PUBLIC INPUT QUESTIONNAIRE (INFORMATION)**

Anne Steinberger, Communications Manager, stated that as part of the public outreach effort for the 2050 RTP and the Sustainable Communities Strategy, staff developed a questionnaire to secure input on the public’s priorities for transportation infrastructure. The public input questionnaire was posted online and distributed at public meetings and community events from June to September 2010. The questions were similar to those asked in the June 2010 telephone public opinion survey.

Kristen Rohanna, Senior Analyst, presented the public input questionnaire results for the Board of Directors.

Chair Pfeiler indicated there was one request to speak on this item.

Michael Bullock, a member of the public, presented a PowerPoint show that was presented at the Carlsbad Citizens I-5 Town Hall meeting. He noted that the San Diego Voter Preference slide indicated that 55 percent supported expanding public transit, including buses and rail; 32 percent supported expanding roads and highways; and 13 percent said both, neither, or don’t know.

3. **2050 RTP: REVENUE CONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK SCENARIOS (DISCUSSION)**

Second Vice Chair and Transportation Committee Chair Jack Dale (Santee) introduced this item.

Heather Adamson, Senior Planner, reported that during the past few months, staff presented the initial draft Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenarios to the Board of Directors, Policy Advisory Committees (PACs), various SANDAG working groups, and at other public meetings for input. The four Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenarios attempt to build and operate as much of the Unconstrained Transportation Network as possible, given revenue availability and flexibility, and project priorities. Based on feedback from working groups, PACs, and the Board of Directors, staff has refined the Scenarios and continues to evaluate their performance. The Board of
Directors will be asked to select a preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario in December for inclusion in the Draft 2050 RTP.

Chair Pfeiler noted there were a number of requests to speak on this item.

Cindy Gompper-Graves, South County Economic Development Corporation, requested that SANDAG explore a bayside option as an alternative to the downtown San Diego trolley tunnel to accommodate more passengers and avoid the bottleneck congestion in downtown San Diego. She voiced support for grade separations along major arterial roads, east-west connections in South County, and planning proactively to connect employees with large job centers. She also asked that SANDAG consider commuter rail south of downtown. She thought SANDAG should rethink some of the performance measures regarding vehicle miles and commute times; she noted that these measurements may encourage investment in outlying areas and discourage smart growth.

Jay Powell, City Heights Community Development Corporation, stated his appreciation for the incorporation of many Mid-City components. He stated his support for I-805 improvements and better connections between the Mid-City area and job centers.

Robert Cotton, representing Citizens Against Freeway Expansion, spoke against the proposed expansion of I-5 and the project alternatives. He asked that SANDAG take public opinion into account when deciding on future projects.

Leigh Plesniak, Residents for Torrey Pines Safety, spoke in favor of the $2.5 billion proposed for “Active Transportation.” She noted that she has been involved in planning efforts to devise a bicycle and pedestrian friendly corridor on Torrey Pines Road.

Dori Robbins, Residents for Torrey Pines Safety, pointed out that San Diego spends only 33 cents per capita per year on pedestrian safety. This is our main concern—pedestrian and bicycle safety, especially on Torrey Pines Road. Any collaboration you can give to the City of San Diego Department of Engineering for the Torrey Pines Road project would be appreciated.

Sherry Nooravi, Residents for Torrey Pines Safety, received an e-mail from Walk San Diego about the possibility that the City of San Diego could get $2.5 billion to create more walkable and safe communities. She urged the Board to vote for improved pedestrian/bicycling safety throughout San Diego.

Mike Bullock, San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club, said that the Transit Emphasis Scenario has extensive freeway widenings, and the Sierra Club is opposed to that. He stated the California Transportation Commission RTP Guidelines indicate that MPOs “must consider congestion pricing, toll roads, and parking strategies.” He said that newly priced lanes should come from existing freeway lanes, not expanded freeways. He asked that SANDAG seek state legislation that will unbundle the cost of driving and parking. He noted that Sierra Club policy calls for the elimination of all subsidies to driving and parking.

Kathy Keehan, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, thanked SANDAG for its commitment to include funding in the 2050 RTP for Active Transportation. The Active Transportation piece includes regional bike plans, local bike plans, safe routes to schools, safe routes to transit, and pedestrian improvements. The Coalition supports the staff recommendation to include
the Active Transportation piece in all four Scenarios, and expressed support for the issues contained in the Move San Diego and Sustainable San Diego platforms.

Myles Pomeroy, Sustainable San Diego and San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, also thanked SANDAG for including funding for pedestrian/bicycling improvements in the 2050 RTP. He urged the Board to adopt this as a provision of the RTP, evaluate all projects for consistency with the objectives of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and to defer those projects that are inconsistent with those SCS objectives. He encouraged the Board to place greater alliance on bus rapid transit (BRT) projects versus light rail transit (LRT) because BRT is less expensive and more flexible. He also asked that the Board look at an innovative parking policy to incentivize alternative transportation modes.

Susan Tinsky, Sustainable San Diego, stated their belief that the only way to achieve a sustainable future is to create a transit centric funding model, which focuses uncommitted funds to building transportation infrastructure that connects dense residential populations with key employment. Sustainable San Diego also supports the investment in local pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure that allows residents to safely travel within their communities and provides connectivity between communities. They generally support the proposed Transit Emphasis Scenario in concept. She said that we have creative opportunities to work with federal and state government to dramatically shift our funding priorities. She voiced support for shifting highway funding to transit.

Elyse Lowe, Executive Director of Move San Diego, expressed concern that this discussion is completely lacking the greenhouse gas component, which is required by SB 375. She congratulated staff on including the Active Transportation element in all four Scenarios. In order to have a true Sustainable Communities Strategy, she supported putting more money into the smart growth incentive program and ensuring the region meets its transit mode share goals.

Kathleen Ferrier, representing Walk San Diego, expressed her pleasure at seeing funding included for bicycle/pedestrian projects. She urged the Board to support the funding for Active Transportation.

Nicole Burgess, a member of the public, voiced support for alternative transportation and bike routes.

Board discussion ensued.

First Vice Chair Jerome Stocks (Encinitas) requested that staff be directed to come back with a SANDAG letter supporting a preferred alternative for the I-5 North Coast Corridor, which would include eight general purpose lanes, plus four Managed Lanes, all built within existing right-of-way, and constructed in phases.

Councilmember Crawford thought that the letter also should include language to preserve coastal views, minimize impacts to coastal lagoons, and improve air quality as well as outline regional goals and objectives.
4. **2050 RTP: DRAFT POLICY OPTIONS TO SUPPORT THE TRANSIT NETWORK (DISCUSSION)**

This item was postponed to next Board meeting.

Renée Wasmund, Chief Deputy Executive Director, provided an update on the recent TransNet bond sale efforts.

5. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 19, 2010, at 9 a.m. (third Friday of the month due to the Thanksgiving holiday schedule). The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 3, 2010, at 10 a.m. (first Friday of the month due to the Christmas holiday schedule).

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:23 p.m.

DGunn/M/DGU
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Bud Lewis (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cheryl Cox (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Carrie Downey (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Crystal Crawford (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Jillian Hanson-Cox (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Jerome Stocks, 1st Vice Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>James Wood (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Don Higginson (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Anthony Young (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Marti Emerald (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jim Desmond (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale (2nd Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price (Primary, Seat A)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Bill Horn (Primary, Seat B)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Laurie Berman (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Bob Campbell (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Sup. Louis Fuentes (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>CAPT Keith Hamilton (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Unified Port District</td>
<td>Scott Peters (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD County Water Authority</td>
<td>Mark Muir (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California/Mexico</td>
<td>Remedios Gómez-Arnau (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association</td>
<td>Allen Lawson (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin Romero (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD OF DIRECTORS DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
NOVEMBER 19, 2010

Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (Escondido) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:03 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Jim Wood (Oceanside), and a second by Mayor Jim Janney (Imperial Beach), the Board of Directors approved the minutes from the October 8, 2010, Board Policy and the October 22, 2010, Board Business meetings.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, expressed concern about the lack of public transit service to Kaiser Permanente Hospital on Blueridge Avenue in San Diego.

Marco Gonzalez, representing the Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation (CERF), spoke about the difficulties in obtaining SANDAG modeling data with regard to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Adam Gosney, a student at the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), and California Public Interest Group (CALPIRG), requested to speak on Item No. 13; Chair Pfeiler said she would call him back for public testimony as part of that item.

Duncan McFetridge, representing Save Our Forests and Ranchlands (SOFAR) and the Cleveland National Forest Foundation (CNFF), stated that the Board and public do not have adequate information to analyze the 2050 RTP.

Mayor Janney recognized Imperial Beach Councilmember Patricia McCoy for her service to the City of Imperial Beach and to SANDAG as Chair of the Borders Committee.

Chair Pfeiler recognized Executive Director Gary Gallegos for his 50th birthday.

First Vice Chair Jerome Stocks (Encinitas) recognized Vista Councilmember Bob Campbell’s elected service in the North County as well as Chair of the North County Transit District (NCTD).
3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (APPROVE)

This item summarized the actions taken by the Executive Committee on November 5 and the Transportation Committee on November 12, 2010.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Carrie Downey (Coronado) and second by Mayor Wood, the Board of Directors approved the actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committees at the meetings noted above. Yes – 17 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – La Mesa and National City.

CONSENT ITEMS (4 through 10)

4. QUARTERLY INVESTMENT REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2010 (INFORMATION)

The SANDAG Investment Policy requires that the Board of Directors be provided a quarterly report of investments held by SANDAG. This report included all money under the direction or care of SANDAG as of September 30, 2010.

5. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS - JULY TO SEPTEMBER 2010 (INFORMATION)

This quarterly report summarized the current status of major highway, transit, arterial, traffic management, and transportation demand management (TDM) projects in the SANDAG five-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program for the period July to September 2010.

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

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

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

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

8. 2010 SAN DIEGO REGIONAL TRIBAL SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS (ACCEPT)

The Board of Directors and the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association held a regional policy summit on April 9, 2010. The Board of Directors was asked to accept the 2010 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit Proceedings for distribution.
9. **ANNUAL REVIEW AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BOARD POLICIES AND BYLAWS (APPROVE)**

The draft of amendments to current Board Policies proposed by staff over the past year or that are appropriate for updating purposes were presented. The Executive Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the proposed amendments and renew the delegation of authority to the Executive Director pursuant to Board Policy No. 003: Investment Policy. Additionally, an annual review by the Board is required of Board Policy Nos. 003: Investment Policy, and 032: San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission Interest Rate Swap Policy.

10. **PROPOSED 2011 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM (APPROVE)**

Each year, the Executive Committee recommends a legislative program in a priority order to the Board of Directors for the next calendar year. Consistent with past programs, the draft Legislative Program includes policies and proposals for possible federal and state legislation, and local activities. The Executive Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the 2011 Legislative Program.

For Agenda Item No. 9, Mayor Cheryl Cox (Chula Vista) asked staff to reevaluate the TransNet 30 percent fund balance rule in Board Policy No. 031.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Wood, and a second by First Vice Chair Stocks, the Board of Directors approved Consent Items Nos. 4 through 10. Yes – 17. No – 0. Abstain – 0. Absent – La Mesa and National City.

**REPORTS (12 through 21)**

Chair Pfeiler took item No. 17 out of order at this time.

17. **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2010 BINATIONAL SEMINAR (APPROVE)**

Borders Committee Chair Patricia McCoy presented highlights from the 2010 binational seminar on Crossborder Climate Change Strategies and recommendations from the Borders Committee on possible next steps. The Borders Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the recommendations from the 2010 binational seminar.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Downey and second by Mayor Janney, the Board of Directors approved the recommendations from the 2010 binational seminar. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – La Mesa.
CHAIR’S REPORT (11)

11.  REPORT FROM NOMINATING COMMITTEE ON SLATE OF BOARD OFFICERS FOR 2011 
(INFORMATION)

In September, Chair Pfeiler appointed a six-person Nominating Committee for Board 
officers, with Mayor Ron Morrison (National City) as Chair.

Mayor Morrison reported that after consideration of the applications, the Nominating 
Committee recommended the following slate of nominees for 2011 SANDAG Board Officers: 
Encinitas Councilmember Jerome Stocks, Chair; Santee Councilmember Jack Dale, First Vice 
Chair, and Imperial Beach Mayor Jim Janney, Second Vice Chair.

He noted that in accordance with SANDAG Bylaws, the election of officers is scheduled for 
the December Board meeting. Additional nominations from the floor also may be made at 
the December meeting.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

REPORTS (12 through 21) (Continued)

12.  2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: PROPOSED METHODOLOGY FOR 
CONDUCTING THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION (APPROVE)

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

Rachel Kennedy, Senior Planner, reported that SANDAG is currently developing the 2050 
RTP along with its air quality conformity determination. Both the current version of the 
emissions model approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EMFAC 2007) and 
the new version of the model (EMFAC 2010), currently under development by the California 
Air Resources Board, only contain emissions factors to 2040, earlier than the 2050 RTP 
horizon year. The draft methodology for conducting the air quality conformity 
determination for the 2050 RTP was released for a 30-day public comment period on 
September 17, 2010, and a public hearing was held on October 15, 2010. The Transportation 
Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve shortening the timeframe 
and the proposed methodology for conducting the regional emissions analysis for the 2050 
RTP.

Action: Upon a motion by Second Vice Chair Dale and second by Mayor Morrison, the 
Board of Directors approved shortening the timeframe and the proposed methodology for 
conducting the regional emissions analysis for the 2050 RTP. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 
100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – La Mesa.
Second Vice Chair Dale introduced this item.

Heather Adamson, Senior Planner, reviewed the four Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenarios (Scenarios) developed for the 2050 RTP. Staff summarized input received on the four Scenarios and draft performance results, including preliminary greenhouse gas emissions targets. The Board of Directors was asked to discuss the four Scenarios and provide input and feedback for a preferred Revenue Constrained Scenario. The Board of Directors will be asked to select a preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario at its December 17, 2010, meeting for use in the Draft 2050 RTP.

Marney Cox, Chief Economist, provided the preliminary results of the Economic Impact Analysis, including the cost-benefit ratio for each of the four scenarios.

Heather Adamson, Senior Planner, reviewed the greenhouse gas preliminary results, reiterated comments received from prior Board input, and reviewed next steps.

Board discussion ensued.

Chair Pfeiler noted there are several requests to speak on this item.

Adam Gosney, UCSD student and CALPIRG, expressed concern about our economy and indicated how public transportation can help; asked that the Board invest in transit, and better bicycle and pedestrian options; and expressed support for extension of the Trolley line from downtown San Diego to University Towne Centre.

Pamela Epstein, Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter, spoke in support of mass transit. She stated that the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) will be attainable if we are willing to do the work.

Elyse Lowe, Executive Director, Move San Diego, stated that we need to shift our dependence from automobiles to public transportation, expressed support for the Transit Emphasis Scenario, asked for more information about trip times for corridors for specific projects, and requested a focus on reducing transit trip times.

Kathy Keehan, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, spoke in favor of the Transit Emphasis Scenario, especially the bicycle and pedestrian projects. She thanked SANDAG for including maximum funding for Active Transportation in all four Scenarios. She asked the Board to make a policy decision to push the Active Transportation projects first.

Duncan McFetridge, SOFAR, said that the conclusions in the different Scenarios are based on information we are not sure about. He stated that what are missing are a “no-highway build-out” scenario and a “full transit build-out” scenario. He stated that the Scenarios have transit routes but do not have a transit network. He said that highways don’t produce higher economic results than transit.

Jaafar Rizui, CALPIRG, spoke in favor of the Transit Emphasis scenario. He said that public transit needs to serve people where they live, work, and learn.
Tanja Herrera, CALPIRG, urged the Board to approve the Transit Emphasis Scenario. She provided a personal story with regard to using public transit to get to/from school and an internship.

Steve Goetsch, Citizens Against Freeway Expansion, stated that we should reduce the demand for highways, take trucks off the road during peak periods, build an intermodal freight facility at San Ysidro, and charge a user fee to commuters originating outside of San Diego County.

Hannah Cohen, Sustainable San Diego, stated that we need supporting details to share with the public, and the list of projects that will be implemented by 2020 and 2035 with vehicle miles traveled data, and data from other transportation modes such as bicycle and pedestrian. She also asked about data for telecommuting assumptions and other TDM strategies. She asked staff to come back with a scenario that will provide us with what we want to achieve.

Nicole Burgess, a member of the public, commented that tourism is a huge impact on San Diego, so sustainability is a huge issue. Highways are not the answer. She suggested providing cars to bicyclers for when they get off of transit to get to their final destination. She supported more bicycle/pedestrian improvements.

Jim Schmidt, a member of the public, said that he is a public transit supporter but he also supported local roads. He suggested that we need to stop eliminating local connecting roads.

Marco Gonzalez, a member of the public, questioned why staff did not present a preferred scenario to the Board. He thought that the lack of data prevents the Board from making an informed decision. The social equity presentation should have provided information on how to serve various categories of people. There are evolving social considerations regarding density in our urban centers. The allocation of dollars in TransNet should be changed to fund transit.

Board discussion continued and provided input to staff on aspects of the various scenarios.

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

14. **2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT POLICY OPTIONS TO SUPPORT THE TRANSIT NETWORK (DISCUSSION)**

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

Carolina Gregor, Senior Planner, stated that at a joint meeting on October 15, 2010, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees provided input on draft policy options to support the transit network. The Committees reached a general consensus that the policy options be considered in the future update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Staff summarized the policy options, which focused on potential parking, land use, and funding policies.

Chair Pfeiler noted that there were several requests to speak on this item.
Duncan McFetridge, SOFAR, wondered if this plan is a policy for cars or people. If we are going to get out of our cars we have to have a new plan. He stated that funding is not a problem, leadership is a problem.

Dan Allan, Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group member, stated that there is no consideration of remote parking for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

Bob Campbell, NCTD Chair, acknowledged that there is an issue with parking at transit stations. We need to do a better job of managing parking for transit users.

Mayor Mary Sessom (Lemon Grove) stated that this item rates a full discussion, and asked that it be placed on a future agenda to allow further discussion.

The Board agreed to continue this item to the December 3, 2010, Board meeting.

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

15. PROPOSED SANDAG COMMENTS ON INTERSTATE 5 NORTH COAST CORRIDOR PROJECT DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (APPROVE)

First Vice Chair Stocks stated that at the November 5, 2010, Board of Directors meeting, staff was directed to develop a letter with proposed SANDAG comments on the Caltrans Interstate 5 (I-5) North Coast Corridor Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/DEIS). The public comment period on the project’s environmental document closes on November 22, 2010. The Board of Directors was asked to consider approval of the draft comment letter on the I-5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/DEIS for submittal to Caltrans prior to the close of the public comment period. He said that the first question to be addressed is whether SANDAG should submit comments.

Chair Pfeiler indicated that there were several requests to speak on this item.

Marion Dodson, a member of the public, opposed the taking of private property for the I-5 expansion. She was not in favor adding any lanes other than the high occupancy vehicle lanes.

Pamela Epstein, Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter, stated that not sending a letter is problematic. SANDAG needs to take an active stance on this project.

Duncan McFetridge, SOFAR, said that by investing in transit we could take advantage of population mode shifts to solve traffic problems.

Linda Woolcott, a member of the public, spoke in favor of SANDAG taking a stand. She expressed concern that mitigation measures will only partially mitigate the impacts of this project. She urged the Board to adopt a “no build” scenario.

Elizabeth Rudee, San Diego Audubon Society, expressed concern about the air quality impact of any I-5 expansion project. She said that this project will permanently degrade our coastal communities.
Gordon Lutes, San Diego Highway Development Association, urged the Board to support a “10+4” lane proposal.

Robert Cotton, a member of the public, stated that this project fails to comply with the environmental requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Protection Act.

**Motion Made:** Second Vice Chair Dale moved and Mayor Sessom seconded a motion that the Board of Directors not send the draft comment letter on the I-5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/DEIS for submittal to Caltrans prior to the close of the public comment period.

**Substitute Motion Made:** Deputy Mayor Lesa Heebner (Solana Beach) moved and Councilmember Crystal Crawford (Del Mar) seconded a substitute motion to submit comments on the I-5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/DEIS prior to the close of the public comment period.

**Action Taken on the Substitute Motion:** Yes – 4 (weighted vote, 49%). No – 11 (weighted vote, 51%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – El Cajon, La Mesa, Oceanside, and Poway. The motion failed.

16. **2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND OUTREACH UPDATE (INFORMATION)**

This item was continued.

18. **ANNUAL UPDATE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH AND CLEARINGHOUSE (INFORMATION)**

This item was continued.

19. **FINANCIAL MARKET STATUS (INFORMATION)**

This item was continued.

20. **QUALITY OF LIFE FUNDING STRATEGY UPDATE (INFORMATION)**

This item was continued.

21. **CLOSED SESSION-CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL IN ANTICIPATION OF LITIGATION - PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9(B) - ONE POTENTIAL CASE**

This item was continued.
22. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Board of Directors meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 3, 2010, at 10 a.m. The next Board of Directors Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 17, 2010, at 9 a.m. Please note that the December Board meetings will be held respectively on the first and third Fridays of the month due to the holiday schedule.

23. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:16 p.m.
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ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (November 19, 2010)

No actions were taken at this meeting.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (December 3, 2010)

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

- Approved revisions to the FY 2010 and FY 2011 Program Budgets (including the Overall Work Program) to carry over $142,654 in funding for the contractual obligations budgeted for the Urban Area Transit Strategy.

- Approved the agenda for the December 17, 2010, SANDAG Board of Directors meeting, as amended.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (December 3, 2010)

- Recommended that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the updated Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategic Plan, the proposed management and monitoring activities and budget for FY 2011 totaling $4 million, and, subject to Board Policy No. 017, authorize staff to solicit proposals and enter into contracts or amend existing contracts accordingly; and (2) adopt the modifications to the eligibility and evaluation criteria for land management grants for FY 2011 as described in the agenda report.

- Recommended that the Board of Directors approve the proposed grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, and process for the Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) program, which promotes health principles in planning, active transportation, and safe routes to schools.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (December 10, 2010)

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

- Recommend that the Board of Directors approve Transportation Development Act audit extension requests for the Cities of Chula Vista and San Diego, and SANDAG, until March 27, 2011, as permitted by the California Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations.
• Adopt Resolution No. 2011-09, approving Amendment No. 2 to the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, subject to federal approval of the 2011 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

• Adopt the final Mitigated Negative Declaration for the San Ysidro Freight Rail Yard Improvement Project in substantially the same form as attached to the agenda report.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors accept the Hybrid Scenario as the preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario for development of the draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan.

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING (December 10, 2010)
The Public Safety Committee is scheduled to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

• Approve an amendment to the FY 2011 Program Budget (including the Overall Work Program) to accept one-year funding in the amount of $257,853 to complete evaluation objectives associated with the Community Assessment Team “Reducing the Risk” project, an evidence-based teen pregnancy prevention intervention.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2011 Program Budget (including the Overall Work Program) to accept $74,366 in additional Urban Area Security Initiative funds to develop a regional eWatch application (work element 3400800), bringing the overall budget for this work element to $1,367,368.

Staff will update the Board of Directors if the actual actions taken by the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on December 10, 2010, differ from those described in this report.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
EXTENSION REQUESTS FOR FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT AUDITS

Introduction

In accordance with California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99245, each Transportation Development Act (TDA) claimant must submit an audit within 180 days after the end of the fiscal year. SANDAG may grant a 90-day extension, bringing the deadline to March 27, 2011. No further extensions are permitted.

The TDA audit fieldwork for most of the claimants is complete; however, there are a few claimants that may not be completed within the required timeframe. The TDA audit requirements are governed by the California PUC and the California Code of Regulations, which specifically prohibit approval of the FY 2012 TDA allocations until the FY 2010 TDA audits are submitted to the State Controller’s Office.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve Transportation Development Act audit extension requests for the Cities of Chula Vista and San Diego, and SANDAG, until March 27, 2011, as permitted by the California Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations.

Background

SANDAG, acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), is to receive the annual fiscal compliance audit report from each claimant within 180 days of the fiscal year end. The RTPA may grant a 90-day extension as it deems necessary. While every effort is made to complete all audits within the 180 days, there are certain situations in which an extension request may be appropriate. The Cities of Chula Vista and San Diego are requesting an extension to allow sufficient time to provide final documentation for the draft audit review process. SANDAG is requesting an extension since it is the last TDA recipient to be audited, and additional time is required to complete the audit process.

All three claimant agencies requesting an extension are expected to issue the audit reports no later than March 27, 2011.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, (619) 699-1942, lko@sandag.org
Introduction

The Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) Interregional Justice Data-Sharing work element (3400800) utilizes grant funding to develop and implement interagency information sharing projects. ARJIS has been awarded an additional $74,366 from the federal Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI), to develop a regional eWatch application. The goal of this project is the development of a no-cost subscription service that allows members of the public to register up to three addresses within San Diego County and receive notifications of crimes, arrests, and/or traffic incidents occurring around those locations. At its October 15, 2010, meeting, the Public Safety Committee approved amending the FY 2011 Budget and Overall Work Program to include a carryover of $486,000 in UASI funding budgeted for the Sheriff’s NetRMS interface project not spent in FY 2010, to the ARJIS Interregional Justice Data-Sharing work element. This additional amendment of $74,366 would bring the cumulative amendments to the FY 2011 Budget for this project to $560,366, requiring Board of Directors approval. The overall budget for this work element would be increased to $1,367,368.

Recommendation

The Public Safety Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2011 Budget (including the Overall Work Program) to accept an additional $74,366 in Urban Area Security Initiative funds for the Automated Regional Justice Information System Interregional Justice Data-Sharing work element (3400800), which would bring the total funding to $1,367,368.

Discussion

The City of San Diego has deployed an eWATCH application that allows its residents to register for a daily e-mail notification of crimes that have occurred around addresses of interest within the City of San Diego. The data is provided by the San Diego Police Department (SDPD) via ARJIS to more than 18,000 unique e-mail addresses registered to receive notifications. The goal of eWatch is to bolster crime prevention efforts and empower the public with knowledge. The long-term plan has been to expand this functionality to all other jurisdictions in the region and interface with the public Crime MAPS application accessible via the ARJIS public Web site (www.arjis.org). Utilizing UASI grant funds, ARJIS will partner with the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department to expand the eWatch subscription to the entire County with data that are updated daily for the entire region.

This new regional subscription service leverages the efforts already completed on the new ARJIS law enforcement-only mapping system, as well as existing hardware, software, and secure network infrastructure. The San Diego County Sheriff’s Department is the pilot site for the project and has successfully implemented an initial application with select crime incident data from the Sheriff’s
contract cities. This pilot project is limited to notifications on property crimes (e.g., vehicle break-ins). The pilot augments ongoing crime prevention efforts by the Sheriff’s Department through enhancing the delivery of timely crime information that supports community decision-making.

The additional UASI funding would be utilized to enhance the Sheriff’s pilot application by including all crimes into the subscription service, integrating the City of San Diego’s eWatch application into the new regional application, and deploying a link to a user-friendly publically accessible map with additional features enabling new search capabilities.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1 Work Element 34008.2 ARJIS Interregional Justice Data-Sharing

Key Staff Contact: Pam Scanlon, (619) 533-4204, pscanlon@arjis.org
WORK ELEMENT: 34008.12  ARJIS: Interregional Justice Data-Sharing

FY 2011 BUDGET: $1,293,002 $1,367,368

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Expenses</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits, Indirect</td>
<td>Dept. of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$76,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>Dept. of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,291,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,216,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Total Project Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,367,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,293,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this work element is to coordinate, develop, and implement applications that enhance public safety throughout the San Diego region. The emphasis in FY 2011 will be to strengthen collaboration with justice agencies and entities in an interregional context, as well as coordinate with the Borders Committee, the Public Safety Committee, and the criminal justice agencies in the neighboring counties; this includes expanding COPLINK to other neighboring regions, and expansion of data-sharing of license plate reader (LPR) data.

PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Facilitated incorporation of ARJIS specific technologies directly into Law Enforcement Integration Framework (LEIF) administrator tool.

JUSTIFICATION

The cross-jurisdictional sharing of critically needed justice data enhances both officer and public safety. ARJIS was recently named the first regional member of the state-owned National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System (Nlets) network, and provided with the opportunity to expand its data-sharing capabilities. The Department of Homeland Security and the U.S. Department of Justice have stressed the criticality of this cross-jurisdictional information-sharing, now requiring these types of collaborations in their grant solicitations. Continued collaboration and information-sharing among these counties will greatly enhance public safety and the quality of life in all regions.

PROJECT MANAGER: Pam Scanlon, Technical Services Department
COMMITTEE(S): Borders Committee, Public Safety Committee
WORKING GROUPS(S): ARJIS Business Working Group, ARJIS Technical Working Group
### PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>% of Effort</th>
<th>Task Description / Product / Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | 20%         | Task Description: Roll out smartphones to terrorism liaison officers (includes contracted services).  
Product: Enhanced information to the field  
Completion Date: 6/30/2011 |
| 2        | 10%         | Task Description: Expand COPLINK to Imperial County.  
Product: Memorandum of understanding (MOU) and computer interface for data transfer  
Completion Date: 6/30/2011 |
| 3        | 20%         | Task Description: Manage implementation of mobile and fixed LPR cameras (includes contracted services).  
Product: LPR data for member agencies  
Completion Date: 6/30/2011 |
| 4        | 20%         | Task Description: Enhance the regional LPR server to allow additional data feeds (includes contracted services).  
Product: Regional database of LPR data  
Completion Date: 6/30/2011 |
| 5        | 20%         | Task Description: Enhance the interface between San Diego Sherriff Office’s NetRMS system and ARJIS.  
Product: Customized reporting source code  
Completion Date: 4/30/2011 |
| 6        | 10%         | Task Description: Expand eWatch regionally and optional online crime mapping system.  
Product: eWatch notification system for all region’s citizens  
Completion Date: 4/30/2011 |

### FUTURE ACTIVITIES

- Continue to explore areas for sharing justice information and executing sharing agreements where appropriate.

Note: This amendment is due to an additional grant offer from Department of Homeland Security to expand the regional eWatch alert system. This grant and corresponding contracted services will be added to existing Department of Homeland Security and federal Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grants as a subproject 3400803 under the Interregional Justice Data-Sharing project (34008). Due to the ongoing nature of these incremental grants, ARJIS intends to convert 34008 back to a Multi-Year project with the FY 2012 Program Budget.
REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS
TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

File Number 8000100

Introduction

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

Discussion

Board Policy No. 003

Board Policy No. 003, “Investment Policy,” requires the submittal of a monthly report of investment transactions to the Board. Attachment 1 contains the reportable investment transactions for October 2010.

Board Policy No. 017

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

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

Section 4.4 of the policy authorizes the Executive Director to direct payment to persons for right-of-way property so long as the payment amount does not exceed 110 percent of the appraised value or $100,000 above the appraised value, whichever is greater. Possession of a piece of property known as “Parcel 33140 – Parrott” was obtained in February 2010 by Caltrans for construction of the State Route 76 project being funded by SANDAG. Agreement could not be reached on the property's value between Caltrans and the property owner, so a formal condemnation process was instituted in Superior Court. In November 2010, the jury awarded the amount of $692,714 to the property owner, which constitutes a determination of the fair market value of the property. Adding statutory interest owed, court costs, and reimbursement cost for the property owner's appraisal, the total amount of the judgment is expected to be $712,567.25. Pursuant to Board Policy No. 017, and based on the new property value amount determine by the jury, the Executive Director will be authorizing payment to Caltrans for the property in the amount of the judgment. Caltrans must use the funds provided by SANDAG to pay the judgment within 30 days from the judgment filing date, which is expected in December 2010.
Board Policy No. 024

Board Policy No. 024, “Procurement and Contracting-Construction,” requires the Executive Director to report to the Board the granting of (1) Relief from Maintenance and Responsibility over $25,000, and (2) Acceptance of Work for construction contracts over $25,000.

- In a letter dated November 8, 2010, HMS Construction, Inc. was granted Acceptance for the San Altos Feeder Cable Replacement, effective October 18, 2010 (JOC1338-08, CIP 1142100, Contract No. 5001338). The contract value was $131,649.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Reportable Investment Transactions for October 2010
               2. Budget Transfers and Amendments

Key Staff Contact: Lauren Warrem, (619) 699-6931, lwa@sandag.org
### MONTHLY ACTIVITY FOR INVESTMENT SECURITIES TRANSACTIONS FOR OCTOBER 1 THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Original Cost</th>
<th>Principal Proceeds</th>
<th>Yield to Maturity on Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOUGHT</td>
<td>10/4/2010</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$4,475,000.00</td>
<td>$4,494,053.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/4/2010</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP GLOBAL REFERENCE NOTES</td>
<td>$4,555,000.00</td>
<td>$4,994,010.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/4/2010</td>
<td>BERKSHIRE HATHAWAY FIN CORP</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,101,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/6/2010</td>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CR BKS CONS</td>
<td>$3,000,000.00</td>
<td>$3,001,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/21/2010</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN</td>
<td>$3,000,000.00</td>
<td>$3,007,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/25/2010</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP GLOBAL REFERENCE NOTES</td>
<td>$804,000.00</td>
<td>$871,230.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/29/2010</td>
<td>US BANCORP</td>
<td>$3,000,000.00</td>
<td>$3,082,440.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL BOUGHT:</strong></td>
<td>$19,834,000.00</td>
<td>$20,552,025.09</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.98%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLD</td>
<td>10/4/2010</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP GLOBAL NOTES</td>
<td>$4,500,000.00</td>
<td>$4,514,310.00</td>
<td>$4,534,200.00</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/4/2010</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$5,000,000.00</td>
<td>$5,033,789.06</td>
<td>$5,030,273.44</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL SOLD:</strong></td>
<td>$9,500,000.00</td>
<td>$9,548,099.06</td>
<td>$9,564,473.44</td>
<td><strong>0.97%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATURERED</td>
<td>10/27/2010</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP MTN</td>
<td>$863,000.00</td>
<td>$864,622.44</td>
<td>$863,000.00</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL MATURERED:</strong></td>
<td>$863,000.00</td>
<td>$864,622.44</td>
<td>$863,000.00</td>
<td><strong>3.01%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT NUMBER</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>CURRENT BUDGET (in '000s)</td>
<td>NEW BUDGET (in '000s)</td>
<td>CHANGE (in '000s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7500000</td>
<td>Service Bureau - Main Project FY 2011</td>
<td>$251.1</td>
<td>$200.5</td>
<td>($50.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7550100</td>
<td>Service Bureau JOC Project Support</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$30.0</td>
<td>$30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7215200</td>
<td>SourcePoint - Business Incentive Report and Mapping System</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$20.6</td>
<td>$20.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transferred funds from the Main Service Bureau project (#7500000) to establish two new projects (#7550100) for the Job Order Contracts project management support and the administrative fee for the management consultant in order for other government agencies to leverage our existing procurements; and (#7215200) for the Business Incentive Report and Mapping system.
REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG

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

November 8-11, 2010: San Diego Economic Development Corporation Best Practices Leadership Trip
Vancouver, Canada

- Former Chair Lori Pfeiler and Second Vice Chair Jack Dale attended this meeting. Various sessions were attended on the following topics: economic development strategy overview, innovation industry clusters, the development of a vibrant urban core, urban transportation, facility investments, and multimodal transportation infrastructure investments. Board members learned that Vancouver has a population base of about 1.1 million and an average density of nearly 13,000 persons per square mile, compared a population of 3.1 million and approximate 4,000 persons per square mile density for the San Diego region. Vancouver prioritizes its transportation modes to provide improved access for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit. The development standards coincide with transportation priorities, with buildings oriented to serve a walking environment first.

November 30, 2010: Mexican Inauguration Ceremonies
Baja California, Mexico

- Second Vice Chair Dale and Chula Vista Deputy Mayor Rudy Ramirez attended the inauguration ceremonies for the new municipal administration of the cities of Playas de Rosarito, Tecate, and Tijuana, Baja California. The new mayors and city councils will serve for the 2010-2013 term.
TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: ANNUAL STATUS REPORT

Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, approved countywide by voters in November 2004, includes an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), which is a funding allocation category for the cost to “create a reliable approach for funding required mitigation for future transportation improvements thereby reducing costs and accelerating project delivery” (TransNet Extension Ordinance Section D). The EMP established two funds: (1) the Biological Mitigation Fund for direct mitigation, management, and monitoring for transportation-related impacts; and (2) the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund for efforts related to regional land acquisition, management, and monitoring for implementation of the regional habitat conservation plans.

On February 22, 2008, the Board of Directors authorized a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Caltrans, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to establish the process to implement the goals of the TransNet EMP over a ten-year period. The MOA, executed on March 19, 2008, memorialized a Plan of Finance (POF) strategy of $440 million over the 10 years for the Biological Mitigation Fund and $40 million for the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund. The MOA is consistent with the TransNet EMP Implementation Guidelines adopted by the Board of Directors on September 24, 2004.

This report provides an annual status update on the implementation of the EMP.

Discussion

Attachment 1 summarizes the progress of the Biological Mitigation Fund. The purpose of the Biological Mitigation Fund is to provide funds for the acquisition, restoration, and management of mitigation for regional transportation projects included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and local street and road projects. The following are some key achievements:

- Since January 2008, 15 properties totaling 1,241 acres have been acquired at a cost of approximately $60 million.

- Acquisition costs are 20.7 percent lower than the 2002 budget established under the TransNet Extension Ordinance. The EMP program has enabled SANDAG to acquire land at a reduced cost due to the generally reduced real estate prices as a result of the recent recession.
• One of the properties was acquired jointly with the County of San Diego, and one was acquired jointly with both the County and State of California. These partnerships leveraged $5.4 million of non-TransNet acquisition and management funds, allowing more of the regional habitat preserves to be acquired.

• Mitigation has been secured for 16 RTP projects, and 119 acres have been secured for local street and road projects. The EMP has enabled SANDAG to successfully acquire all of the uplands mitigation for the Board-approved TransNet Early Action Program. The EMP is currently focusing on the wetlands mitigation requirements.

• Forty-eight percent of all the mitigation needs for the RTP projects estimated under the TransNet Extension Ordinance has been secured since January 2008.

Attachment 2 summarizes the progress of the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund. The purpose of the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund is to provide funding for regional habitat management and monitoring necessary to implement habitat conservation planning throughout the region. These funds help maintain the current condition of the regional habitat preserve system, thereby reducing the likelihood that this system will degrade and reducing the need for listing of new species as endangered by the federal and state governments. The following are some key achievements:

• A total of $7,365,600 of land management grants have been provided to more than 40 applicants through a competitive grant program. Some of the grant-funded activities have included weed removal in vernal pool habitat, resulting in increased populations of endangered species; restoration of cactus wren habitat burned by wildfires; removal of invasive species to promote endangered species habitat throughout the region; and installation of fencing, signage, and controlled recreational access to open space lands. Matching funds from the grant recipients have totaled $4,411,050, a 60 percent match of non-TransNet funds.

• Completion of a regional population assessment of the California gnatcatcher (one of the flagship species for conservation planning in Southern California) covering the periods pre- and post-2007 wildfires. This assessment will allow the region to track the status and trend of this species over time and determine the success of management actions.

• Completion of a multi-year effort to review the impacts and recovery of habitat and species from the 2003 and 2007 wildfires. This is the largest and most comprehensive study conducted to date in Southern California. It will allow the region to track recovery from future fires and focus management on those species struggling to come back from past fires.

• Establishment of South and North County land manager’s forums to share best management practices, strategize on key gaps in existing knowledge, leverage funding and resources, and dissolve institutional barriers among land management entities.

• Completion of a regional assessment of the monitoring that has occurred for the endangered species within the region covered by the regional habitat conservation planning efforts. This assessment will be used to focus future monitoring and land management activities, as well as future grant funding.
Challenges

The TransNet EMP is a unique approach that is being discussed as a framework for other parts of California and the United States. The EMP was featured at a recent Transportation Research Board meeting on large-scale solutions for transportation development. Below is a discussion of several challenges that have been identified and current actions to address these challenges:

- Both the public and SANDAG leadership have requested a transparent, up-to-date system to depict the status of the EMP and to be able to track expenditures. Staff will be working on integrating the EMP into the SANDAG Keep San Diego Moving Web site to provide the public with real-time information on the progress of the program.

- Securing opportunities for wetlands remains a challenge due to the arid nature of the San Diego region. SANDAG staff is currently conducting a Request for Proposals process to identify willing participants to enter into public-private and public-public partnerships to secure wetland mitigation lands. These negotiations are scheduled to be completed this fiscal year.

Next Steps

This report is intended to be an annual status update on the TransNet EMP as of December 2010. Staff will return with subsequent annual reports and the progress of wetland mitigation at future meetings.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. TransNet EMP Biological Mitigation Fund (CIP 1200200)
2. TransNet EMP Regional Habitat Conservation Fund (CIP 1200300)

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org
**TransNet EMP Biological Mitigation Fund (CIP 1200200)**

**Purpose:** TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), Biological Mitigation Fund. To secure mitigation for projects in the Regional Transportation Plan and local street and road projects pursuant to the TransNet Extension Ordinance and the subsequent TransNet Implementation Memorandum of Agreement (approved February 22, 2008).

### TransNet EMP Acquisitions (acres) by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Remaining Mitigation Needs:

- **Regional Transportation Plan Projects as of Sept 2010**
  - Coastal Wetlands (53 ac.): 172
  - Non-Coastal Wetlands (226 ac.): 269
  - Uplands (843 ac.): 755
  - Remaining RTP Mitigation (1196 ac): 172
  - Regional Transportation Plan Projects (1122 ac): 269

* Plus 119 acres for local street and road projects

### Status:

As of December 2010, 1,241 acres of land have been acquired for mitigation under the TransNet EMP. The focus has been on properties for the TransNet Early Action Program projects, including the State Route 76 expansion and the Interstate 5 corridor. Several properties will require the future restoration of habitat. The identification and acquisition of wetland mitigation opportunities is a key challenge, which staff is actively working to resolve.
**TransNet EMP Regional Habitat Conservation Fund (CIP 1200300)**

**Purpose:** TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program, Regional Habitat Conservation Fund. In March 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors authorized funding pursuant to the TransNet Extension Ordinance to maintain and enhance the habitat values of the regional conservation preserve system pursuant to a five-year funding strategy.

**Conservation Fund Encumbrances by Category as of September 2010**

- Coordination: $8,935,000
- Management: $4,475,000
- Monitoring: $1,590,000

**Encumbrance by Fiscal Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status:** Currently SANDAG has funded 40 projects for land management activities, and has contracts for nine monitoring projects ranging from post wildfire recovery to status monitoring of endangered species. This year concluded a five-year effort to assess recovery from the past wildfires, a report on the current status of biological monitoring of sensitive species in the region, and coordination among the various land managers.
Introduction

State Route 11 (SR 11) will be a 2.5-mile, four-lane state highway that will connect SR 125 and SR 905 in the United States to a new Port of Entry (POE) along the U.S.-Mexico border at Otay Mesa East. In Mexico, the corridor will connect the new POE to the Tijuana-Tecate and Tijuana-Ensenada free and toll roads. The project also includes a new Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facility in the United States. Together, SR 11 and the new Otay Mesa East POE will improve the efficient movement of people, goods, and services between the United States and Mexico.

Caltrans has been conducting the environmental studies for the development of the proposed project. On December 3, 2010, Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) released the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Report/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/DEIS) for a 60-day public comment period through February 1, 2011. The DEIR/DEIS document is available at www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/envir.

Discussion

The DEIR/DEIS examines the potential environmental impacts of the alternatives and variations being considered for the proposed project. It describes the reason the project is being proposed; the alternatives being considered; the project’s effects to the existing environment; the potential impacts of each of the alternatives and variations; and the proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.

The proposed facilities are being studied under a two-tier process. As part of the Tier I process, a Program Environmental Impact Report/Phase I Environmental Impact Statement was prepared and approved/certified by Caltrans and FHWA in August 2008. The DEIR/DEIS constitutes Tier II of the planning and environmental clearance for the development of the new Otay Mesa East POE, the associated SR 11 highway, and the new California Highway Patrol Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facility for the inspection of trucks entering California from Mexico.

An open forum public meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 19, 2011, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the Ocean View Hills Elementary School, located at 4919 Del Sol Boulevard, San Diego, CA 92154. Caltrans and SANDAG staffs along with representatives from the federal General Services Administration will be on hand to provide information and to answer questions regarding the proposed project. A certified court reporter also will be available to take public comments for the record, or if preferred, comments may be submitted in writing to Caltrans until February 1, 2011.
Next Steps

At the January 14, 2011, Board Policy meeting, SANDAG and Caltrans staffs and our Mexican project partners will provide a progress report on the SR 11 and Otay Mesa East POE project, including work underway to procure consultants for the traffic and revenue study, the Intelligent Transportation System predeployment study, and outside legal counsel, as well as progress being made on the connecting roads in Mexico.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contacts:  Marney Cox, (619) 699-1930, mco@sandag.org;
Tina Casgar, (619) 699-1982, cca@sandag.org;
Mario Orso, (619) 688-2561, Mario.Orso@dot.ca.gov
ELECTION OF 2011 SANDAG BOARD OFFICERS

Introduction

Consistent with SANDAG Bylaws, in September 2010, the SANDAG Chair appointed the following Nominating Committee for SANDAG Board Officers: National City Mayor Ron Morrison (South County), Nominating Committee Chair; San Diego Mayor Jerry Sanders; San Diego County Supervisor Bill Horn; Lemon Grove Mayor Mary Sessom (East County); Poway Mayor Don Higginson (North County Inland); and Carlsbad Mayor Matt Hall (North County Coastal).

The Nominating Committee met on November 5, 2010, to review and discuss the applications for SANDAG Board Officers. At the November 19, 2010, Board meeting, the Committee unanimously recommended a slate of Board officers for 2011. In accordance with SANDAG Bylaws, Board members may make additional nominations for any officer position during the December 17, 2010, Board meeting.

Discussion

Annual Nomination and Election Process

The SANDAG Bylaws set forth the annual nomination and election process for SANDAG Board Officers. The process calls for an application form for the Chair, First Vice Chair, and Second Vice Chair positions to be made available on the SANDAG Web site in or around July. To be considered for one of the officer positions, prospective applicants must provide information about their current status and term of office, SANDAG experience, and other public agency experience. Applicants also must answer the following questions:

- Why do you want to serve as a SANDAG Board Officer?
- What is your vision for SANDAG next year and in five years?
- Describe how you believe that you are in touch with your constituents and give examples of why you have represented them well in the past.
- For First and Second Vice Chair positions only. Is your interest to serve only as a Vice Chair, or do you see yourself wanting to serve as Chair in the future?

Recommendation

The Nominating Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the following slate for 2011 SANDAG Board officers:

- Chair - Encinitas Councilmember Jerome Stocks
- First Vice Chair - Santee Councilmember Jack Dale
- Second Vice Chair – Imperial Beach Mayor Jim Janney
The applications received included Councilmember Stocks for Chair, Councilmember Dale for First Vice Chair, and Mayor Janney for Second Vice Chair. In their discussion, Nominating Committee members recognized that the candidates were individuals who are dedicated to the positions, even with the extra time commitment involved, and they supported advancing the current leadership for the upcoming year.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Kim Kawada, (619) 699-6994, kka@sandag.org
UPDATE ON 2011 ANNUAL SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS SUMMIT

Introduction

The SANDAG Board of Directors annual Summit is scheduled to start on Wednesday, February 2, 2011, and conclude on Friday morning, February 4, 2011. The Summit will be held at the Barona Conference Center in the community of Lakeside.

Following input by the Executive Committee and Board of Directors, the Summit agenda has been finalized. The primary focus of this Summit will be to discuss the development of the Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, including its Sustainable Communities Strategy; the progress made on the Quality of Life funding strategy by the Ad Hoc Steering Committee and the Stakeholders Working Group; and the Regional Comprehensive Plan and how to approach updating this document.

To date, Federal Transit Administration Deputy Administrator Therese McMillan and Deputy Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Ron Sims have been invited to speak at the Summit. San Diego Union-Tribune Vice President and Editor Jeff Light has been confirmed as a speaker.

Discussion

2050 Regional Transportation Plan

After months of Board discussion, a draft of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) will be close to distribution following the Summit. In December, the Board of Directors is scheduled to accept a preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario for use in development of the 2050 RTP. This session will summarize the final details of the accepted Scenario and include discussion of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). An opportunity will be provided for an initial Board discussion of possible policies that may be required to implement portions of the RTP, including Transportation Demand Management measures and Active Transportation projects and programs as part of the SCS.

Quality of Life Funding Strategy

This session will include a presentation of the 2010 work plan, criteria developed by the Quality of Life Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) members to evaluate components, a summary of information presented on each of the four Quality of Life elements being considered (shoreline preservation, habitat conservation, water quality, and public transit), and key discussion themes and feedback provided by the SWG. In addition, information will be provided on research conducted on
potential local and regional revenue sources that could be considered for the Quality of Life funding strategy. The Board will have an opportunity to provide feedback on the discussion items, as well as be asked about policy considerations and desired next steps for the 2011 SWG work plan.

**Regional Comprehensi ve Plan**

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) was adopted by the Board of Directors on July 23, 2004. Staff anticipates initiating the next RCP update in FY 2012. This Summit session will provide background as to how and why this document was developed, and a discussion will be facilitated on how to approach the update. Since approval of the original RCP in 2004, new planning issues, such as public health, climate change, and environmental justice, have emerged. The Board will be asked to discuss how best to engage stakeholders and integrate key issues in the next plan.

**SANDAG Basics**

During past Summits, participants have found it useful to include a primer on the agency’s vision, mission, and functions, and the roles and responsibilities of a Board member (important for new members starting on the Board in 2011 as well as a refresher for veteran Board members). A session will be provided on this topic.

**Legislative Session**

State and federal legislators have been invited for an interactive discussion on how local, state, and federal officials can work together to address and meet the challenges facing all levels of government.

**Format**

The entire Summit will be conducted in one group setting. In addition, speakers have been invited to present at both dinners.

**Conclusion**

A letter of invitation will be mailed to each SANDAG Board member and alternate by mid-December. The final agenda, background materials, and Summit logistics will be mailed to participants by late-January 2011.

---

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Colleen Windsor, (619) 699-1960, cwi@sandag.org
COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK: PROPOSED GRANT PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS

Introduction

In March 2010, the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) received $16.1 million from the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) for the Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) program. The overarching goal of the CPPW program is to expand the use of evidence-based strategies and programs to address obesity rates, physical inactivity, and poor nutrition in the San Diego region.

The SANDAG role as a subcontractor to HHSA is implementing six initiatives that connect public health issues to transportation and land use planning and policy in the San Diego region (Attachment 1). Two of the initiatives will provide pass-through grant programs to local agencies, tribal governments, community programs, and school districts. These initiatives include the Healthy Communities Campaign, and Safe Routes to School Implementation. Both programs are described in the Discussion section below.

Discussion

The Healthy Communities Campaign includes the following two pass-through grant programs:

- Healthy Community Planning Grant Program will provide a total of $700,000 to incorporate public health into local planning efforts. SANDAG will award a minimum of six grants, with at least one in each County of San Diego Board of Supervisors district. Grant awards are expected to range from $50,000 to $75,000 each.

- Active Community Transportation Grant Program will provide a total of $150,000 to promote pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhoods. SANDAG will award a minimum of three grants for this program. Grant awards are expected to range from $30,000 to $50,000 each.

Safe Routes to School Implementation grants includes the following two pass-through grant programs:
Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning Grant Program will provide five grants of approximately $50,000 each, for a total of $250,000, to support comprehensive safe routes to school planning.

Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grant Program will provide five grants of approximately $10,000 each, for a total of $50,000, to fund programs that encourage and educate students, parents, school officials, and other community stakeholders on walking and bicycling to school safely.

**Pass-Through Grants Program Timeline**

Under the terms of the CPPW grant, all projects must be completed by March 2012. The following grant program timeline is proposed in order to meet this requirement:

- Call for Projects Released: December 2010
- Applicant Workshop: January 2011
- Application Due Date: Mid-February 2011
- Final Awards: Mid-March 2011
- Project Start Date: Mid-April 2011
- Project Completion Date: February 1, 2012

On October 19 and 21, 2010, SANDAG staff held two workshops to seek initial input on preliminary draft grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, and process (Attachment 2). Members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Public Health Stakeholder Group were invited to these workshops.

SANDAG staff also has presented the draft evaluation criteria and process at the following meetings for review and feedback: the Joint TWG and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee meeting on October 28; the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group meeting on November 17; and the San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council meeting on November 18, 2010.

The Regional Planning Committee reviewed the draft evaluation criteria and process for the CPPW pass-through grants on December 3, 2010, and recommended approval by the Board of Directors.

**Board Policy No. 033: Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Memorandum**

Board Policy No. 033 broadly applies to discretionary funding that SANDAG allocates to local jurisdictions in the San Diego region. This policy defines discretionary funding as “funds allocated by SANDAG only to local jurisdictions (the cities or County) through a competitive process.” It also states that funds not subject to this provision would include, among others, “funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions.” Eligible recipients of the CPPW pass-through grants include tribal governments, school districts, and community groups, not just the local jurisdictions within the San Diego region. For these reasons, the CPPW pass-through grants would not be subject to Board Policy No. 033.
Next Steps

Following Board of Directors approval of the CPPW grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, and evaluation process, SANDAG staff would release the Call for Projects for the four pass-through grant programs on or around December 23, 2010. The grant programs would then proceed according to the schedule shown above.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Communities Putting Prevention to Work Factsheet  
2. Communities Putting Prevention to Work Pass-Through Grant Programs  
   Draft Evaluation Criteria and Process

Key Staff Contact: Vikrant Sood, (619) 699-6940, vso@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #B300500
Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) is a $372 million nationwide grant program to combat obesity and tobacco use. The County of San Diego’s Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) applied for this grant and was awarded $16.1 million under the obesity control component of the program by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

The County of San Diego HHSA partnered with SANDAG to implement the components of the program related to regional planning, active transportation, and safe routes to school. This work is supported by $3 million in grant funds.

**Program Schedule**

The grant programs are a component of the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act effort to provide economic stimulus funds. As such, the program must be completed within two years under the following proposed schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPPW award notification</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executed contract between County and SANDAG</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG work commences</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through grants awarded</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant funded projects completed</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant program completed</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several opportunities for local agencies to get involved in the program. CPPW will fund four pass-through grant programs to local agencies and non-profits. A public health stakeholder group with local agency staff participation also has been formed to support SANDAG with implementation of the grant programs.

**Grant Funded Projects and Opportunities**

**Health Impact Assessment and Forecasting**

Utilizing consultant assistance and SANDAG staff, this work will:

- Develop a GIS-based regional health impact assessment tool to identify key areas where public health disparities can best be addressed with planning and infrastructure investments;

- Add health outcomes as a component to the SANDAG CommunityViz sketch planning tool; and,

- Provide support for the update of the SANDAG activity-based regional transportation model to better account for and forecast nonmotorized trips.

**Regional Comprehensive Planning Policies**

With the help of planning and public health specialists, this work will:

- Identify the public health impacts of transportation and land use decisions and provide options for integrating public health considerations into regional planning;

(Continued on reverse)
Develop recommendations for public health goals and objectives to be included in the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Regional Transportation Plan; and,
Develop metrics necessary to monitor progress.

**Healthy Communities Campaign**
This component of the grant will develop, implement, and support two pass-through grant programs:

- $700,000 for grants to local agencies to add public health components to local planning efforts, and
- $150,000 for grants to local agencies, school districts, or community-based organizations to develop comprehensive approaches for creating bicycle and pedestrian friendly neighborhoods.

**Safe Routes to School**
This component of the grant will develop a regionwide Safe Routes to School strategic plan. Two pass-through grant programs will be implemented as part of this effort:

- Safe Routes to School capacity building and planning grants will provide five grants of $50,000 for a total of $250,000 to support comprehensive Safe Routes to School planning.
- Safe Routes to School education, encouragement, and enforcement grants will provide five $10,000 grants to fund programs that encourage and educate students, parents, school officials, and other community stakeholders on walking and bicycling to school safely.

**Active Commuter Transportation Campaign**
Through iCommute, the online service assisting commuters with arranging alternate transportation, this project will support efforts to expand Bike to Work Day promotions throughout May 2011. This will include employer outreach and bike commute training. It also will support development of a walking school bus program and bike buddies program that will complement the Safe Routes to School initiative.

**Regional Bicycle Plan Implementation**
This effort will begin implementation of the Regional Bicycle Plan, which was adopted in 2010. It will develop and produce regional bikeway corridor and wayfinding signs, and, in cooperation with local agencies, begin installation of the signs. It also will produce promotional materials about the regional bikeway network.

For more information, contact Stephan Vance at (619) 699-1924, or sva@sandag.org
Healthy Communities Campaign

1. Healthy Community Planning Grants
The Healthy Community Planning Grants will provide a total of $700,000 to incorporate public health into local planning efforts. SANDAG will award a minimum of six (6) grants, with at least one in each County of San Diego Board of Supervisor District. Grant awards are expected to range from $50,000 to $75,000 each.

A. Program Objectives
The Healthy Community Planning Grants will promote public health principles at the local and regional level by funding projects that:

- Integrate and institutionalize public health considerations in the local and regional policies, programs, projects, and decision-making;
- Address health disparities and inequities in lower income and minority communities;
- Promote physical activity by increasing opportunities for walking, bicycling, parks and recreation, and the use of public transit;
- Promote access to healthy, fresh, affordable, and nutritious foods in neighborhoods and schools;
- Establish collaborative working relationships between health and planning agencies; and
- Build consensus in the community around public health needs and priorities through an inclusive process that engages a wide range of stakeholders.

B. Eligibility
Only cities, the County of San Diego, and Tribal Governments are eligible to apply. Nonprofit and community-based organizations may partner with public agencies, but cannot apply directly to the grant program. Grant applicants are encouraged to partner with other public agencies, such as HHSA and local school districts, as well as community-based organizations, where appropriate.

Existing projects are eligible for the grant program as long as the application proposes an expanded scope or additional deliverables. For example, a city that is currently updating its general plan may be eligible to apply for developing a stand-alone health element if it is not already included in the scope of work. Also, a city that is developing a health element for its general plan update may be eligible to apply for developing an implementation plan.
C. Type of Projects
SANDAG encourages grant applicants to be creative and innovative in defining the projects for this grant program. While the proposed projects should strive to meet most if not all the objectives, the type of projects, the approach, and key deliverables and outcomes are best defined by the needs of the community and agencies.

Grant applicants may consider one of two approaches in defining potential projects: a comprehensive approach that addresses multiple health outcomes and built environment determinants; and a targeted approach that drills deeper in specific areas. Projects that adopt a comprehensive approach may include but are not limited to:

- Public health elements for general plans, redevelopment plans, community plans, or specific plans; and
- Zoning codes, street design guidelines or subdivision ordinances that integrate public health principles.

Projects that adopt a targeted approach may include but are not limited to:

- Health impact assessments for transportation and infrastructure projects, redevelopment projects, or corridor studies;
- Urban agriculture or food systems assessments and/or implementation plans;
- “Edible schoolyards”, outdoor learning environments, community gardens and farmer’s markets assessment and implementation strategies; and
- Park master plans or design guidelines that improve access to recreation activities.

Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to attend the application workshop and to contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects.

D. Evaluation Criteria
NOTE: Applications will be evaluated on a 5-point scale for each criterion as follows: 5 = maximum possible benefit, 4 = very high benefit, 3 = good benefit, 2 = adequate benefit, 1 = marginal benefit, and 0 = no benefit.

The evaluation panel will use the following criteria to score and rate the applications. Grant applications will receive higher scores if they can provide evidence that the project will:

1. Address Program Objectives (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)
   The proposed project should strive to address multiple, if not all, program objectives. Points will be awarded proportional to the number of objectives addressed.

2. Implement an Innovative Approach (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)
   Proposed projects that result in a paradigm shift or a new approach to current issues and opportunities are highly encouraged. Applications that propose an innovative and creative approach to incorporating public health considerations in the design of the built environment AND present a model that may be relevant and applicable to other communities and jurisdictions in the region will receive up to five (5) points. Applications that propose EITHER an
innovative and creative approach OR a model that may be relevant to the region will receive up to three (3) points.

3. **Serve High-Need Communities (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)**
The grant program has limited resources and will prioritize support for high-need areas and communities while also distributing funds across the region equitably. Grant applications must define ‘high-need’ communities within the project area that will benefit from the proposed project and provide supporting data on the high-need community, where available. Communities may be defined as high-need based on demographics (such as age, income, education attainment, ethnicity, and disability), physical conditions (such as physical blight, environmental pollution, traffic accidents/collisions, concentration of liquor stores, concentration of fast food restaurants, and lack of grocery stores), social conditions (such as poverty, crime, and violence), and/or health outcomes (such as obesity and asthma rates).

Proposed projects that will address health disparities in areas or communities that are defined as high-need based on existing demographic, physical, social AND health conditions will receive up to five (5) points. Proposed projects that meet three of the four conditions will receive up to four (4) points, those that meet two of the four conditions will receive up to three (3) points, and those that meet one condition will receive up to two (2) points.

4. **Lead to Implementation and Systems Change (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)**
Proposed projects that lead to systems change are highly encouraged. Systems change should address the grant applicant’s decision-making and/or resource-allocation process, and must be related to improving health outcomes. Applicants may propose systems change as part of the proposed project OR commit to addressing systems change as a follow up implementing action. Applications that propose or commit to a systems change that impacts the entire jurisdiction/community planning area will receive up to five (5) points. Applications that propose or commit to a systems change just for the project area will receive up to three (3) points. Examples of systems change include but are not limited to:

- Requiring consideration of public health benefits and impacts in project/plan review and/or approval process;
- Developing ordinances, guidelines, and codes that promote health policies;
- Creating a commission or advisory group that can advise the city council or governing boards on health benefits and impacts of proposed policies, projects, programs, services, or strategies; and
- Formulating guidelines and processes for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of project performance based on public health outcomes in the community or project area, among others.

5. **Build on Local Commitment to Public Health (10 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 2)**
Proposed projects that build on ongoing or existing efforts to improve public health outcomes in the community may be best positioned to succeed. Often for these projects, partner agencies and community groups are already engaged in the process and there is political support for change.
Grant applicants that can cite recent projects, policies, programs, or interventions (however small or large in scale) that address public health in planning AND have dedicated resources to implement the recommendations from those efforts AND can demonstrate recent success will receive up to five (5) points. An applicant who has met two of the three conditions will receive up to three (3) points, and an applicant who has met one of the three conditions will receive one (1) point. Policy efforts that are underway, but have not yet been adopted by a city council or governing board, will count towards this evaluation criterion.

6. Support a Collaborative and Inclusive Process (10 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 2)

Involving key stakeholders, community-based organizations, and community members in developing plan recommendations will help build consensus and ownership, and result in successful implementation of the project. Engaging underrepresented groups in the process will build trust and credibility for proposed recommendations and strategies. For this grant program, a grant applicant’s support for a collaborative and inclusive process may be demonstrated by:

- Committing to develop a comprehensive stakeholder and community outreach and engagement plan/program (as part of the scope of work for the proposed project), especially for underrepresented groups in the community;
- Identifying specific stakeholder and community groups and organizations that will be involved in developing plan recommendations; and
- Providing support letters in the application packet from community groups and organizations for the proposed project.

Applications that can demonstrate evidence for all three actions listed above will receive up to five (5) points. Those that can demonstrate evidence for at least two actions will receive up to three (3) points and for one action will receive one (1) point.

**Bonus Points**

Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Bonus Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 2)

Grant applicants are highly encouraged to leverage multiple sources of funding for the proposed project. Up to 10 percent match or in-kind contribution will receive one (1) point, 11 percent - 20 percent will receive two (2) points, 21 percent – 30 percent will receive three (3) points, 31 percent – 40 percent will receive four (4) points, and 41 percent or more will receive five (5) points. Applications that do not include any matching funds or in-kind contributions will not receive any bonus points.

**E. Selection Process**

The grant applications will be selected on a competitive basis. Each application will be scored and ranked by a selection panel using the evaluation criteria. The panel will consist of the following members:

- Two members of SANDAG staff;
- One member from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG);
- One member from the Public Health Stakeholders Group (PHSG);
- One member of HHSA staff;
- Two health and the built environment experts; and
- One member from the San Diego Council of Design Professionals.
The panel will include individuals with knowledge of health and the built environment principles. Panel members must not represent local jurisdictions that have submitted applications for funding under the grant program. Panel members who are not SANDAG or HHSA staff must not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted applications, nor must they receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future.

2. Active Community Transportation Grants

Active Community Transportation Grants will provide a total of $150,000 to promote pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhoods. SANDAG will award a minimum of three (3) grants for this program. Grants are expected to range from $30,000 to $50,000 each.

A. Program Objectives

The Active Community Transportation Grants will promote pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhoods by funding projects that:

- Integrate and institutionalize public health considerations in the local and regional policies, programs, projects, and decision-making;
- Address health disparities and inequities in lower income and minority communities;
- Promote physical activity by increasing opportunities for walking, bicycling, parks and recreation, and the use of public transit;
- Promote access to neighborhoods destinations such as schools, parks, and retail;
- Establish collaborative working relationships between health and planning agencies; and
- Build consensus in the community around public health needs and priorities through an inclusive process that engages a wide range of stakeholders.

B. Eligibility

Only cities, the County of San Diego and Tribal Governments are eligible to apply. Any department or division within the city or County government may apply. Nonprofit and community-based organizations may partner with public agencies, but cannot apply directly to the grant program. Grant applicants are encouraged to partner with other public agencies, such as HHSA and local school districts, as well as community-based organizations to develop the applications, where appropriate. Existing projects are eligible for the grant program as long as the application proposes an expanded scope or additional deliverables.

C. Type of Projects

This grant program will support active transportation plans for neighborhoods that address pedestrian, bicycle, persons with disabilities, and public transit access and amenities, traffic calming, and Safe Routes to School (SR2S). Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to attend the application workshop and to contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects.

D. Evaluation Criteria

NOTE: Applications will be evaluated on a 5-point scale for each criterion as follows: 5 = maximum possible benefit, 4 = very high benefit, 3 = good benefit, 2 = adequate benefit, 1 = marginal benefit, and 0 = no benefit.
The evaluation panel will use the following criteria to score and rate the applications. Grant applications will receive higher scores if they can provide evidence that the project will:

1. **Address Program Objectives (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)**
   The proposed project should strive to address multiple, if not all, program objectives. Points will be awarded proportional to the number of objectives addressed.

2. **Implement a Comprehensive Approach (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)**
   Proposed projects that prioritize walking and bicycling as the primary mode of travel (over motorized vehicles) along corridors and neighborhoods are highly encouraged. Projects should address multiple aspects of active transportation in the project area including traffic calming, safe routes to local destinations (such as schools, parks, community gardens, and grocery stores), streetscape improvements, and safety, among others. Projects that propose a comprehensive approach that leads to shared thoroughfares and prioritized corridors for pedestrians and bicyclists will receive up to five (5) points. Projects that address safe crosswalks and signage, bulb-outs and sidewalk improvements, and traffic calming measures will receive up to three (3) points. Projects that address safe crosswalks and signage will receive one (1) point.

3. **Serve High-Need Communities (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)**
   The grant program has limited resources and will prioritize support for high-need areas and communities while also distributing funds across the region equitably. Grant applications must define ‘high-need’ communities within the project area that will benefit from the proposed project and provide supporting data on the high-need community, where available. Communities may be defined as high-need based on demographics (such as age, income, education attainment, ethnicity, and disability), physical conditions (such as physical blight, environmental pollution, traffic accidents/collisions, concentration of liquor stores, concentration of fast-food restaurants, and lack of grocery stores), social conditions (such as poverty, crime, and violence), and/or health outcomes (such as obesity and asthma rates).

   Proposed projects that will address health disparities in areas or communities that are defined as high-need based on existing demographic, physical, social AND health conditions will receive up to five (5) points. Proposed projects that meet three of the four conditions will receive up to four (4) points, those that meet two of the four conditions with receive up to three (3) points and those that meet one condition will receive up to two (2) points.

4. **Lead to Implementation and Systems Change (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)**
   Proposed projects that lead to systems change are highly encouraged. Systems change should address the grant applicant’s decision-making and/or resource-allocation process, and must be related to improving health outcomes. Applicants may propose systems change as part of the proposed project OR commit to addressing system change as a follow up implementing action. Applications that propose or commit to a systems change that impacts the entire jurisdiction/community planning area will receive up to five (5) points. Applications that propose or commit to a systems change just for the project area should receive up to three (3) points. Examples of systems change include but are not limited to:
o Requiring consideration of public health benefits and impacts in project/plan review and/or approval process;
o Developing ordinances, guidelines, and codes that promote health policies;
o Creating a commission or advisory group that can advise the city council or governing boards on health benefits and impacts of proposed policies, projects, programs, services, or strategies; and
o Formulating guidelines and processes for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of project performance based on public health outcomes in the community or project area, among others.

5. Build on Local Commitment to Active Transportation (10 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 2)
The proposed project should be supported by existing commitments to active transportation in the jurisdiction. This commitment may be demonstrated through citywide policies or ordinances, existing bicycle and pedestrian plans, SR2S efforts, and programs, projects, or other activities that encourage active transportation. Points will be awarded proportional to the number and type of plans, programs, projects, or activities cited that have a relationship to the project and/or area.

6. Support a Collaborative and Inclusive Process (10 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 2)
Involving key stakeholders, community-based organizations, and community members in developing plan recommendations will help build consensus and ownership, and result in successful implementation of the project. Engaging underrepresented groups in the process will build trust and credibility for proposed recommendations and strategies. For this grant program, a grant applicant’s support for a collaborative and inclusive process may be demonstrated by:

o Committing to develop a comprehensive stakeholder and community outreach and engagement plan/program (as part of the scope of work for the proposed project), especially for underrepresented groups in the community;
o Identifying specific stakeholder and community groups and organizations that will be involved in developing plan recommendations; and
o Providing support letters in the application packet from community groups and organizations for the proposed project.

Applications that can demonstrate evidence for all three actions listed above will receive up to five (5) points. Those that can demonstrate evidence for at least two actions will receive up to three (3) points and for one action will receive one (1) point.

Bonus Points
Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Bonus Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 2)
Grant applicants are highly encouraged to leverage multiple sources of funding for the proposed project. Up to 10 percent match or in-kind contribution will receive one (1) point, 11 percent – 20 percent will receive two (2) points, 21 percent – 30 percent will receive three (3) points, 31 percent – 40 percent will receive four (4) points, and 41 percent or more will receive five (5) points. Applications that do not include any matching funds or in-kind contributions will not receive any bonus points.
E. Selection Process
The grant applications will be selected on a competitive basis. Each application will be scored and ranked by a selection panel using the evaluation criteria. The panel will consist of the following members:

- Four members of SANDAG staff;
- One member from the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG);
- One member from the TWG;
- One professional with Safe Routes to School expertise from a national or statewide organization; and
- One member of HHSA staff.

The panel will include individuals with knowledge of health and the built environment principles. Panel members must not represent local jurisdictions that have submitted applications for funding under the grant program. Panel members who are not SANDAG or HHSA staff must not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted applications, nor must they receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future.

Safe Routes to School Implementation

3. Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning Grants
Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning Grants will provide a total of $150,000 to promote comprehensive Safe Routes to School planning. Under this program, SANDAG will award five (5) grants of $50,000.

A. Program Objectives
The Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning Grants will promote comprehensive local Safe Routes to School efforts by funding plans that aim to:

- Increase rates of children walking and biking to school
- Improve safety conditions for child pedestrians and bicyclists
- Realize the health, community, traffic management, and environmental benefits associated with Safe Routes to School efforts
- Consider all of the 5 E’s (education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering, and evaluation)
- Establish collaborative partnerships with implementing agencies, organizations, and groups
- Contain a systematic evaluation plan that includes collecting data, analyzing findings, and identifying potential program improvements
- Bolster community and public agency support for Safe Routes to School
- Initiate institutional change to support Safe Routes to School

B. Eligibility
Only cities, the County of San Diego, Tribal Governments, and nonprofit organizations are eligible to apply. Any department or division within the city or County government may apply. Lead agencies and organizations are encouraged to partner with other public agencies, non-profit organizations, community organizations, and individual schools.
C. Type of Projects
Potential Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning projects may include but are not limited to citywide, neighborhood, or community-level safe routes to school plans that include the following elements:

- Existing conditions analysis and needs assessment (including walk/bike audits);
- Community and stakeholder input;
- Suggested route and/or deficiency maps;
- Infrastructure improvement plans and concepts;
- Education, encouragement, and enforcement program strategies;
- Summary of funding sources; and
- Evaluation and monitoring plan.

Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to review local, state, and national resources, such as the National Center for Safe Routes to School website (http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/), and contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects. Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to attend the application workshop and to contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects.

D. Evaluation Criteria
NOTE: Applications will be evaluated on a 5-point scale for each criterion as follows: 5 = maximum possible benefit, 4 = very high benefit, 3 = good benefit, 2 = adequate benefit, 1 = marginal benefit, and 0 = no benefit.

The evaluation panel will use the following criteria to score and rate the applications.

1. Commitment to Active Transportation (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)
   The proposed project should be supported by existing commitment to active transportation. This commitment may be demonstrated through existing bicycle and pedestrian plans, programs, projects, or other activities that advance active transportation. Projects in cities with citywide bicycle master plans, pedestrian master plans, or other active transportation plans that have been successful in their implementation of those plans will receive maximum points.

2. Capacity to Implement (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)
   The project should have an established leadership team or commit to establishing a team to oversee the implementation of the project and build capacity. Ideally, partnering public agencies, school districts, parent organizations, or community organizations and elected officials have expressed support for the project and committed to a role in implementing the project.

Proposed projects may receive up to five (5) points for the criteria. Five (5) points may be awarded to applicants who have, in writing, a commitment from at least one partnering agency, organization, or school and, at minimum, at least one letter of support from an external agency, organization, or group. Four (4) points will be awarded to applicants who have, in writing, a commitment from at least one partnering agency, organization, or school. Three (3) points will be awarded to applicants with an identified leadership team and at least one written letter of support from another organization, agency, school, or group. Two
(2) points will be awarded to applicants if they identify a potential leadership team and resources are committed to initiating the project.

3. **Evidence of Need (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)**
   The project should serve a project area with demonstrated need based on current conditions. Descriptions and supportive data should indicate that there are safety issues and/or other barriers to children walking and biking to school. Ideally, the proposed project also would serve a community with poor health indicators. Points will be awarded relative to the number and severity of environmental and social barriers to walking and biking in the project area.

4. **Methodology (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)**
   The scope of work should clearly facilitate opportunities to improve safety, increase child walking and biking rates, raise awareness, reduce traffic congestion, and derive health, environmental, quality of life, and other benefits associated with Safe Routes to School efforts by comprehensively addressing each of the 5 E’s (education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering, and evaluation). A total of five (5) points will be awarded proportionate to adequately addressing each of the 5 E’s.

5. **Community Involvement (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)**
   The proposed scope of work should include significant community outreach and involvement strategies. The scope of work should include elements that will ensure that community involvement efforts are inclusive and contain content that is culturally-appropriate to various groups. Applicants may demonstrate an effective approach by:
   
   o Identifying key stakeholder groups and community organizations that will be contacted and encouraged to participate in the project;
   
   o Defining methods for engaging parents, school officials, teachers, parent organizations, and community members; and
   
   o Listing methods for ensuring that activities and materials are culturally-appropriate and are useful to non-English speakers, for example.

**Bonus Points**

**Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Bonus Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 2)**

Grant applicants are encouraged to leverage multiple sources of funding for the proposed project. Up to 10 percent match or in-kind contribution will receive one (1) point, 11 percent – 20 percent will receive two (2) points, 21 percent – 30 percent will receive three (3) points, 31 percent – 40 percent will receive four (4) points, and 41 percent or more will receive five (5) points. Applications that do not include any matching funds or in-kind contributions will not receive any bonus points.

**E. Selection Process**

Each application will be scored and ranked by a selection panel using the evaluation criteria. The panel will consist of the following members:

- Two members of SANDAG staff;
- One member from the TWG;
- One member from the PHSG;
- One member of HHSA staff; and
• One professional with Safe Routes to School expertise from a national or statewide organization.

The panel will include individuals with knowledge of Safe Routes to School principles. Panel members must not represent grant applicants that have submitted applications. Panel members who are not SANDAG or HHSA staff must not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted applications, nor must they receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future.

4. Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grants

Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grants will provide a total of $50,000 to promote Safe Routes to School programmatic efforts. Under this program, SANDAG will award five (5) grants of $10,000.

A. Program Objectives

The Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grants will promote comprehensive local Safe Routes to School efforts by funding programs that contribute to the following goals:

• Increase rates of children walking and biking to school
• Improve safety conditions for child pedestrians and bicyclists
• Realize the health, community, traffic management, and environmental benefits associated with Safe Routes to School efforts
• Consider all of the 5 E’s (education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering, and evaluation)
• Establish collaborative partnerships with implementing agencies, organizations, and groups
• Contain a systematic evaluation plan that includes collecting data, analyzing findings, and identifying potential program improvements
• Bolster community and public agency support for Safe Routes to School
• Initiate institutional change to support Safe Routes to School

B. Eligibility

Only cities, the County of San Diego, Tribal Governments, non-profit organizations, and school districts are eligible to apply. Any department or division within the city or County government may apply. Lead agencies and organizations are encouraged to partner with other public agencies, non-profit organizations, community organizations, and individual schools.

C. Type of Projects

Potential Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Programs may include but are not limited to:

• Bicycle and pedestrian safety courses, curriculums, and lesson plans
• Events such as bicycle and pedestrian rodeos and school assemblies
• Walk and Bike to School Day/Week/Month programs
• Suggested walking and biking to school route maps
• Incentive programs such as pollution punch cards, mileage clubs, golden sneaker awards, and Walk Across America
• Teen-oriented programs
Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to review local, state, and national resources, such as the National Center for Safe Routes to School website (http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/), and contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects. Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to attend the application workshop and to contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects.

D. Evaluation Criteria
NOTE: Applications will be evaluated on a 5-point scale for each criterion as follows: 5 = maximum possible benefit, 4 = very high benefit, 3 = good benefit, 2 = adequate benefit, 1 = marginal benefit, and 0 = no benefit.

The evaluation panel will use the following criteria to score and rate the applications.

1. Commitment to Active Transportation (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)
The proposed project should be supported by existing commitment to active transportation. This commitment may be demonstrated through existing programs, projects, school wellness policies, bicycle and pedestrian plans, or other activities that advance active transportation. Points will be awarded proportional to the number and type of programs, projects, or activities cited that have a relationship to the project and/or area.

2. Capacity to Implement (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)
The project should have an established leadership team or commit to establishing a team to oversee the implementation of the project and build capacity. Ideally, partnering public agencies, school districts, parent organizations, or community organizations and elected officials have expressed support for the project and committed to a role in implementing the project.

Proposed projects will receive up to five (5) points for the criteria. Five (5) points will be awarded to applicants who have, in writing, a commitment from at least one partnering agency, organization, or school and, at minimum, at least one letter of support from an external agency, organization, or group. Four (4) points will be awarded to applicants who have, in writing, a commitment from at least one partnering agency, organization, or school. Three (3) points will be awarded to applicants with an identified leadership team and at least one written letter of support from another organization, agency, school, or group. Two (2) points will be awarded to applicants if they identify a potential leadership team and resources are committed to initiating the project.

3. Evidence of Need (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)
The project should serve a project area with demonstrated need based on current conditions. Descriptions and supportive data should indicate that there are safety issues and/or other barriers to children walking and biking to school. Ideally, the proposed project also would serve a community with poor health indicators. Points will be awarded relative to the number and severity of environmental and social barriers to walking and biking in the project area.
4. **Methodology (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)**
   The scope of work should clearly facilitate meeting the objectives of the program(s) and consider how the proposed program(s) contribute to an overall comprehensive 5 E’s approach. Up to four (4) points will be awarded based on the method for addressing project objectives. One point may be awarded for clearly demonstrating that the project supports comprehensive existing or future Safe Routes to School efforts.

5. **Community Involvement (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)**
   The proposed scope of work should include significant community outreach and involvement strategies. The scope of work should include elements that will ensure that community involvement efforts are inclusive and contain content that is culturally-appropriate to various groups. Applicants may demonstrate an effective approach by:
   - Identifying key stakeholder groups and community organizations that will be contacted and encouraged to participate in the project;
   - Defining methods for engaging parents, school officials, teachers, parent organizations, and community members; and
   - Listing methods for ensuring that activities and materials are culturally-appropriate and are useful to non-English speakers, for example.

**Bonus Points**
Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Bonus Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 2)
Grant applicants are encouraged to leverage multiple sources of funding for the proposed project. Up to 10 percent match or in-kind contribution will receive one (1) point, 11 percent – 20 percent will receive two (2) points, 21 percent – 30 percent will receive three (3) points, 31 percent – 40 percent will receive four (4) points, and 41 percent or more will receive five (5) points. Applications that do not include any matching funds or in-kind contributions will not receive any bonus points.

**E. Selection Process**
Each application will be scored and ranked by a selection panel using the evaluation criteria. The panel will consist of the following members:

- Two members of SANDAG staff;
- One member from the TWG;
- One member from the PHSG;
- One member of HHSA staff; and
- One professional with Safe Routes to School expertise from a national or statewide organization.

The panel will include individuals with knowledge of Safe Routes to School principles. Panel members must not represent grant applicants that have submitted applications. Panel members who are not SANDAG or HHSA staff must not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted applications, nor must they receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future.
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: PREFERRED REVENUE CONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK SCENARIO

Introduction

During the past few months, staff presented the draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Unconstrained Highway and Transit Networks at meetings of the Board of Directors, the Regional Planning, Transportation, and Borders Committees; various SANDAG working groups; and at other public meetings for input. At its July 23, 2010, meeting, the Board accepted the draft Unconstrained Transportation Network for use in the development of the draft 2050 RTP.

Based on revenue projections through 2050, four initial Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenarios (Scenarios) were developed using prioritized project lists and other factors. The Scenarios attempt to build and operate as much of the Unconstrained Transportation Network as possible, given revenue availability and flexibility, and project priorities. These Scenarios were presented at several Board of Directors meetings during the fall. At its November 19, 2010, meeting, the Board of Directors provided input and direction to staff on the development of a Hybrid Scenario. The Transportation Committee reviewed the proposed Hybrid Scenario at its meeting on December 10, 2010, and recommended Board approval.

This report provides: (1) a summary of feedback received at the November 19, 2010, Board meeting, (2) a description of the Hybrid Scenario and a summary of its performance, including social equity and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions analyses, and (3) input on the proposed Hybrid Scenario received at the December 10, 2010, Transportation Committee meeting, which is outlined on pages 9 and 10 and has been incorporated into this report.

Discussion

Proposed Hybrid Scenario

At its November 19, 2010, meeting, the Board discussed the performance of the initial four Scenarios (Transit Emphasis, Rail/Freight Emphasis, Highway Emphasis, and Fusion) and directed staff to create a revenue constrained Hybrid Scenario merging the Fusion and Highway Emphasis Scenarios. The Board also directed staff to continue working closely with staffs from the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD).
The following summarizes the major input received at that meeting:

- Importance of the Downtown Trolley Tunnel to the regional transit network and of providing express trolley services
- Support for additional funding for regional rail grade separations
- Support for focusing on the existing rail investment in the COASTER and SPRINTER corridors in the North County and for eliminating redundant transit services
- Continued support for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) services, particularly in South County
- Recognition that the University Towne Centre (UTC) COASTER Station and Tunnel are very expensive capital projects, but continued support for providing transit connections in the UTC area
- Support for including higher ranked highway projects in a Hybrid Scenario
- Support for including higher ranked new light rail transit (LRT) routes in a Hybrid Scenario

Description of the Proposed Hybrid Scenario

Based on input from the Board of Directors on November 19, and further feedback from MTS and NCTD staffs, SANDAG staff has developed a proposed Hybrid Scenario. The proposed Hybrid Scenario contains a variety of multimodal projects from the initial alternative Revenue Constrained Scenarios, with a primary focus on the Highway Emphasis and Fusion Scenarios. These projects include improvements to the existing Trolley system as well as a number of new LRT services in other high demand travel corridors. High performing BRT and Rapid Bus routes, along with frequency enhancements to the existing local bus system also have been included. The proposed Hybrid Scenario includes improvements for all of the major freeway and highway corridors. All projects, programs, and services from the TransNet Extension Ordinance through 2048 are included in the new Hybrid Scenario. Attachment 1 includes a list of the transit and highway projects proposed for inclusion in the Hybrid Scenario. Attachments 2 and 3 are maps that illustrate the transit and highway networks for the Hybrid Scenario, respectively. Table 1, on page 4, summarizes the estimated expenditures for the proposed Hybrid Scenario.

Specifically, the Hybrid Scenario includes the following features and key transit projects:

- Double tracking of the COASTER line between Oceanside and Downtown San Diego, including funding for the Leucadia grade separation, two additional grade separations (locations to be determined), and quiet zone improvements
- Double tracking of the SPRINTER line between Oceanside and Escondido, including funding for six grade separations
- Implementation of an express SPRINTER service between Oceanside and Escondido
- Elimination of the north Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route 78 (SR 78) BRT services
- Upgrades to the existing Blue, Orange, and Green Line Trolley routes (including the Downtown Trolley Tunnel and grade separations at key crossings) that will allow higher
service frequencies and implementation of express trolley services on the Blue and Orange Lines

- Implementation of four new LRT projects:
  1. UTC to Mira Mesa via Sorrento Mesa (project was modified to provide COASTER transfer station to facilitate access for COASTER riders to the UTC/University of California, San Diego (UCSD) area, and would be aligned along the future Carroll Canyon Road corridor to take advantage of the transit right-of-way planned along this corridor);
  2. Pacific Beach to El Cajon via Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, and San Diego State University (SDSU);
  3. Downtown to SDSU via El Cajon Boulevard/Mid-City communities (which would be a future upgrade to the Mid-City Rapid Bus project currently under development as part of the TransNet Early Action Program); and
  4. UCSD/UTC to South Bay (project was modified on south end to provide service through National City and western Chula Vista along arterial streets instead of along the I-805 corridor)

- Implementation of BRT services along the north I-15 corridor, south I-805 corridor, and SR 52 corridor

- Modification of the Kearny Mesa Guideway, with new focus on improving transit speeds in Hillcrest and Mission Valley via at-grade transit lanes, transit priority measures, and limited dedicated transit facilities

- Implementation of several Rapid Bus projects along several key regional corridors

- Implementation of the three highest ranked streetcar projects, with the assumption that a significant amount of capital and operating funding would be derived from nontransit funding sources

The High-Speed Rail Commuter Rail Overlay service is not proposed for inclusion in the Hybrid Scenario as it duplicates other rail and BRT services along the north I-15 and I-5 corridors that are included in the Hybrid Scenario (it would continue to be included in the Unconstrained Transportation Network).

The proposed Hybrid Scenario contains the following key highway projects:

- Improvements to Managed Lanes facilities on major corridors, including I-5, I-15, SR 52, SR 54, SR 78, SR 94, SR 125, and I-805

- General purpose lane improvements on segments of I-5, I-8, SR 52, SR 56, SR 67, SR 76, SR 94, SR 125, and SR 905

- Toll lane improvements to I-5, SR 11, I-15, SR 241, and SR 125¹


¹ Toll lane improvements within the franchise agreement period will be made based on travel demand. The franchise agreement is scheduled to expire in 2042.

Enhanced operational improvements to Central I-5, I-8, and SR 76

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050 RTP Proposed Hybrid Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Estimated Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in $2010 millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit/Highway/Goods Movement Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets &amp; Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM/TSM/Active Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rail Grade Separations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hybrid Scenario: Performance Highlights

SANDAG evaluated the proposed Hybrid Scenario using Board-approved plan performance measures. Attachment 4 includes performance measures results for 2008 existing conditions, the 2050 No Build Alternative, and the Hybrid Scenario. Attachment 5 contains projected travel times in key corridors.

Draft results for the four initial Scenarios were presented to the Board on November 19, 2010. For reference purposes, Attachment 6 includes the list of projects common to the initial four Scenarios plus the Hybrid Scenario, and Attachment 7 lists those variable projects that are included in specific Scenarios.

Compared to the 2050 No Build alternative, which includes projects under construction or in advance stages of development, the Hybrid Scenario is projected to improve the performance of the transportation system and conforms to the goals and policy objectives set forth by the Board, as described below.

- The Hybrid Scenario shows modest improvements in reducing projected vehicle collisions per capita. This indicator is calculated using historical accident data, which does not reflect implementation of Intelligent Transportation System initiatives proposed in this Scenario. Currently, there is no accepted methodology for capturing the potential effects of Transportation System Management (TSM) improvements on safety.

---

2 Additional funding for rail grade separations is included in the cost estimates for improvements to the SPRINTER, COASTER, and Blue and Orange Trolley corridors ($1.26 billion).

3 The 2050 No Build Alternative includes the following baseline projects: I-15 from SR 163 to SR 78, SR 52 from SR 125 to SR 67, SR 76 from Melrose to I-15, I-805 HOV lanes from Carroll Canyon Road to the I-5/I-805 Merge, SR 905 from I-805 to Mexico, I-15 BRT to Downtown and UTC, SuperLoop, Mid-City Rapid Bus, South Bay BRT (to downtown San Diego).
Compared to the 2050 No Build alternative, the Hybrid Scenario would result in a strong improvement in the percentage of work and higher education trips that can be made within 30 minutes during peak periods. Three out of four trips would take 30 minutes or less if driving alone or carpooling. Approximately 15 percent of work and higher education trips could be accessed within 30 minutes by transit, compared to 8 percent in the No Build alternative.

The proportion of peak period travel in congested conditions by auto and by transit would be reduced significantly in the Hybrid Scenario. Congested auto travel would drop from 28 percent to 11 percent. Transit travel in congested conditions would go down from 9 percent to 4 percent for local and rapid buses traveling on shared facilities. Similarly, truck delays would be reduced from about 34,000 daily hours to fewer than 13,000 daily hours, or a 64 percent drop in truck delays.

Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita would be reduced by 13 percent and daily travel by transit would more than double in the Hybrid Scenario.

Access to transit also is projected to improve compared to the No Build alternative. The percent of peak period and daily trips within a half-mile of a transit stop would increase by five percentage points for the Hybrid Scenario. More than three out of four trips could access transit within a half-mile.

The Hybrid Scenario multimodal network includes a mix of projects and modal choices with a geographic distribution that results in a substantial increase in carpooling, use of transit, and biking/walking for work trips (both peak period and all day). Mode share for carpooling would increase by half, and it would more than double for both work trips by transit and by bike/walk. Given more robust travel choices, overall, mode share for commuting using alternative modes (carpool, transit, bike/walk) is projected to increase from 18 percent to 31.5 percent. Nearly one out of three commute trips would be made by alternative modes compared to fewer than one out of five trips in the No Build alternative.

The Hybrid Scenario is projected to more than double the share of work trips by bike/walk compared to the No Build alternative (from 2.4 percent to more than 5 percent).

Air quality in the region would continue to improve as pollutants that create smog would be reduced significantly from current conditions due to cleaner fuels and more fuel-efficient vehicles. Modest reductions in smog-forming pollutants also are projected compared to the 2050 No Build alternative.

Carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions per capita for all vehicles (including passenger cars and light trucks) are expected to decline by about 12 percent by 2050 compared to the No Build alternative.

The Social Equity analysis (pages 6 through 8) suggests that the Hybrid Scenario appears to be one of the most beneficial for low income and minority (LIM) populations in terms of the distribution of proposed RTP expenditures per capita. The data for all Social Equity performance measures indicate, however, that none of the Scenarios would create a substantial statistical disparity for LIM populations when compared to non-LIM populations.
• Implementation of the Hybrid Scenario would result in virtually 100 percent access to schools within a 30-minute drive for both LIM and non-LIM populations (98 percent to 99 percent of the population). More than 40 percent of the LIM population also would have access to schools within 30 minutes using transit compared to 30 percent of the non-LIM population.

• The Hybrid Scenario also would provide nearly 100 percent access to healthcare and parks or beaches for LIM populations within a 15-minute drive, with slightly lower accessibility to healthcare for non-LIM populations (95 percent to 96 percent). Access to healthcare via transit within 15 minutes would be substantially lower than by driving (between 14 percent and 18 percent for LIM populations and eight percent for non-LIM populations). About one-third of LIM and non-LIM populations would be able to access parks or beaches within 15 minutes using transit.

Social Equity

The Social Equity performance measures require some elaboration as the data must be evaluated in several ways. As part of the performance evaluation of the Hybrid Scenario, using Board-approved performance measures, social equity analyses have been conducted for all Social Equity indicators, as follows:

1. Average travel time;
2. Percent of work trips accessible in 30 minutes in peak periods by drive alone, carpool, and transit;
3. Percent of homes within a half-mile of a transit stop;
4. Percent of population within 30 minutes of schools (colleges, vocational, and job training);
5. Percent of population within 30 minutes of San Diego International Airport (SDIA);
6. Percent of population within 15 minutes of healthcare (hospitals and clinics);
7. Percent of population within 15 minutes of parks or beaches (excluding neighborhood parks); and
8. Distribution of proposed RTP expenditures per capita.

Attachment 4 shows draft results for these indicators (performance measures 32 through 39 for LIM populations and non-LIM populations). Additional social equity performance indicators for other populations also are included. In some discussion areas of this report, LIM populations are referenced in the aggregate, but in Attachment 4 and certain sections of this report, the low income and minority populations are analyzed and referenced separately since there is not a direct overlap of these populations.

Analyses of the Hybrid Scenario has been conducted to determine whether it would conflict with requirements in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act or other applicable social equity laws, which require that the benefits and burdens of the projects in the proposed Scenario be equitably distributed between the LIM and non-LIM populations. A threshold question is whether the Hybrid Scenario will improve conditions for LIM populations, relative to the 2050 No Build alternative or 2008 existing conditions.

---

4 Schools include colleges, vocational, and job training.
5 Transit travel assumes that the trip includes the time to walk to a transit stop, time on-vehicle, transfer time, and time to walk from the transit stop to the destination. Access by auto represents door-to-door travel times.
2050 No Build Analysis

The modeling results for the performance indicators referenced above show that the Hybrid Scenario will maintain or improve conditions for LIM populations compared to the 2050 No Build alternative. LIM populations would fare better in the mobility and accessibility indicators with the investments proposed in the Hybrid Scenario. RTP investments per capita for LIM populations would more than double for the Hybrid Scenario compared to the 2050 No Build Alternative.

The next question analyzed was whether LIM populations would receive a similar or greater benefit compared to non-LIMs under the Hybrid Scenario relative to the No Build alternative. Key findings are outlined below:

1. The preliminary modeling results show no difference in average travel times between LIM and non-LIM populations for the Hybrid Scenario in 2050.

2. LIM populations would receive slightly greater accessibility gains for drive alone, carpool, and transit peak period work trips (within 30 minutes) compared to non-LIM populations.

3. The percent of homes within a half-mile of a transit stop shows accessibility gains for the LIM populations, but those gains are slightly higher for non-LIM populations.

4. Access to schools within a 30-minute drive would remain virtually constant for both LIM and non-LIM populations, and access via transit improves both for LIM and non-LIM populations, with slightly higher accessibility gains for non-LIM populations.

5. Access to SDIA via auto shows similar levels of accessibility gains for both minority and nonminority populations, and marginally higher gains for non-low income populations. Access to SDIA via transit would remain constant for both LIM and non-LIM populations.

6. Access to healthcare facilities within a 15-minute auto or transit travel time is projected to remain at virtually the same level for both LIM and non-LIM populations.

7. No difference in auto access to parks or beaches is projected for LIM and non-LIM populations. However, there would be considerable improvements in transit access in the Hybrid Scenario compared with the No Build alternative.

8. Distribution of Proposed RTP Expenditures per Capita: The analysis for low income populations shows that the Hybrid Scenario would result in higher increases in RTP investment per capita (122 percent) for low income populations compared with non-low income populations (98 percent).

Conversely, the analysis for minority populations shows that the rate of increase per capita for the Hybrid Scenario is projected to be 101 percent for minority populations compared with 104 percent for nonminority populations.

When the low income and minority populations are combined, the Hybrid Scenario would result in a slightly higher growth in investment per capita for LIM populations compared to non-LIM populations.
2008 Existing Conditions Analysis

In addition, the draft results of the social equity performance measures outlined above for the Hybrid Scenario were compared to 2008 existing conditions to find out how mobility and accessibility indicators would change over time (2050) for LIM populations compared to non-LIM populations. Data for 2008 investment per capita is not available for LIM and non-LIM populations; therefore, an analysis of this performance measure was not possible. Key findings for the other performance measures are outlined below:

1. The modeling results suggest similar levels of mobility (travel time) for both LIM and non-LIM populations.

2. The percent of drive alone and carpool peak period work trips accessible within 30 minutes would decline slightly for LIM populations, while it would remain constant for non-LIM populations. Access using transit would increase for both populations, with slightly higher gains for the LIM populations.

3. The percent of homes within a half-mile of a transit stop shows slightly higher accessibility gains for non-LIM populations when compared to accessibility conditions for LIM populations.

4. The percent of population within a 30-minute drive of schools would remain at similar levels for both LIM and non-LIM populations. Access via transit improves slightly more for LIM than for non-LIM populations.

5. The percent of population within 30 minutes of SDIA would stay at current levels for LIM populations, both for drive and transit access. However, non-LIM populations would experience a decline in auto accessibility to SDIA.

6. The percent of LIM populations within a 15-minute drive time of a healthcare facility would continue at similar levels in 2050 compared with existing conditions, while access via transit would decline slightly.

7. The percent of LIM and non-LIM populations that could access parks or beaches within 15 minutes via auto in 2050 would remain at virtually the same levels as in 2008. Access via transit would improve for both LIM and non-LIM populations.

As described above, even though several accessibility metrics for LIM populations are projected to remain at current levels in the Hybrid Scenario, convenient access to schools, healthcare, and parks or beaches would range between 98 percent and 100 percent for LIM populations for auto access. Transit accessibility to schools and parks/beaches would improve significantly for the Hybrid Scenario.

Based on this initial analysis, the Hybrid Scenario appears to be the most beneficial for LIM populations in terms of the distribution of RTP expenditures. The data for all social equity performance measures indicate that the Hybrid Scenario will not create a substantial statistical disparity for LIM populations compared to non-LIM populations. Although some of the performance measure results for the 2050 No Build and 2008 Existing Conditions analyses show slightly more improvement for non-LIM versus LIM populations, other performance measures result in a higher level of improvement for LIM populations, evidencing overall balance and equity. Furthermore, the investment allocation numbers and geographic locations of the projects establish
that the benefits and burdens of the projects in the Hybrid Scenario are equitably distributed among all populations in the region.

**Sustainable Communities Strategy and Greenhouse Gas Emission Targets**

In accordance with Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), the 2050 RTP must include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) to guide the San Diego region toward meeting GHG emission targets related to cars and light trucks (passenger vehicles) by integrating land use, housing, and transportation planning to create more sustainable, walkable, transit-oriented, compact development patterns and communities that reduce the need to drive. These targets – a 7 percent per capita reduction in passenger vehicle GHG emissions by 2020 from a 2005 baseline, and 13 percent reduction by 2035 – were set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) on September 23, 2010, and are consistent with the recommendation made by the SANDAG Board at its July 23, 2010, meeting.

Preliminary phasing of the Hybrid Scenario indicates that it would meet the GHG emission targets for 2020 and 2035 established by CARB, as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Year</th>
<th>CARB Target</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Hybrid Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hybrid Scenario includes the proposed full implementation of the TDM and TSM programs and projects as well as Active Transportation programs identified through 2050 (see Table 1 on page 4). These programs provide flexible and cost-effective solutions to help reduce GHG emissions in the short-term compared to longer-term capital improvements. There also is an opportunity to consider providing options for advancing the implementation of TDM, TSM, and Active Transportation projects and programs. For example, a funding and financing program that includes borrowing against future TransNet Active Transportation funds is under development as a means of completing the regional network of bicycle corridors as early as possible. The proposed implementation and financing strategy will be presented to the Transportation Committee in the coming months for recommendation to the Board of Directors.

Phasing of the preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario will be refined and used to complete the GHG target analysis required by SB 375 and the air quality conformity analysis of the draft 2050 RTP.

**Feedback on the Proposed Hybrid Scenario**

Input on the proposed Hybrid Scenario provided by the Transportation Committee at its meeting on December 10, 2010, is summarized below. The proposed Hybrid Scenario also was presented to several working groups in early December.
• Modify the assumption regarding operating funding for streetcars to indicate that a significant amount of the operating funding rather than all operating funding would be derived from nontransit funding sources.

• Concern that the UTC COASTER Station and Tunnel are not included in the proposed Hybrid Scenario. NCTD staff indicated that a Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) study, currently underway, will provide a service plan to consider how best to serve underserved markets and increase ridership. This evaluation will look at the timing of future rail investments such as a UTC tunnel.

• MTS Chairman Harry Mathis stated that the MTS Board of Directors had endorsed the proposed Hybrid Scenario at its meeting on December 9, 2010.

• Caltrans will further evaluate the terminus of the proposed additional general purpose lanes on the I-5 North Coast corridor in the City of Carlsbad.

The Transportation Committee also recommended that the Unconstrained Transportation Network be modified to include I-15 between Centre City Parkway and SR 78 with a configuration of ten general purpose lanes and four Managed Lanes.

**Next Steps**

Pending the acceptance of the Board of Directors, staff would use the Hybrid Scenario as the Revenue Constrained Transportation Network for preparing the Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS. The Draft 2050 RTP, including its air quality conformity analysis, and the Draft Environmental Impact Report are anticipated to be released in spring 2011 for public review and comment.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Draft 2050 RTP: Proposed Hybrid Scenario Project List  
2. Draft 2050 RTP Hybrid Scenario: Transit Network Map  
3. Draft 2050 RTP Hybrid Scenario: Highway Network Map  
4. Draft 2050 RTP: Performance Measures Draft Results  
5. Draft 2050 RTP: Projected Travel Times in Key Corridors  
6. Draft 2050 RTP Revenue Constrained Scenarios: Constant Projects List  
7. Draft 2050 RTP Revenue Constrained Scenarios: Variable Projects List

Key Staff Contacts: Heather Adamson, (619) 699-6967, had@sandag.org  
Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906, dsc@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3100500
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr</td>
<td>I-5/I-805 Merge</td>
<td>8F/14F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-5/I-805 Merge</td>
<td>Manchester Ave</td>
<td>8F/14F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Manchester Ave</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>Vandegrift Blvd</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>Vandegrift Blvd</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>6F/8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>Los Coches</td>
<td>4F/6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SR 11</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 15</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR 15</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Viaduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F+2ML(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Centre City Pkwy</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>Mapleview St</td>
<td>Dye Rd</td>
<td>2C/4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>Melrose Drive</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Couser Canyon</td>
<td>2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>College Ave</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>College Ave</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>Avocado Blvd</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>Avocado Blvd</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>4T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>SR 241</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Carroll Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mission Valley Viaduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Carroll Canyon Rd</td>
<td>I-5 (north)</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FREEWAY CONNECTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Intersecting Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>I-805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I-805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSIT PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>High Speed Rail (HSR) Intercity - Temecula to Lindbergh Field ITC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>COASTER - Double Tracking (including Fairgrounds and Convention Center Stations, and grade separations at Leucadia) + two additional grade separations + quiet zone improvements (Rte 398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>COASTER - Tunnel (Del Mar) (Rte 398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>COASTER - Positive Train Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>SPRINTER - Double Tracking (Oceanside-Escondido); (including rail grade separations assumed at El Camino Real, Vista Village, Melrose, and Mission/San Marcos Stations) + 2 additional rail grade separations (Rte 399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>SPRINTER - Branch Extensions to North County Fair (Rte 399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>SPRINTER Express (Rte 588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Trolley - Mid-Coast LRT Extension (Rte 510)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Trolley - Trolley System Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Trolley - Blue Line Frequency Enhancements (rail grade seps at: Taylor, Palomar, 12th St, E St, 32nd St, 28th St, Washington St/Sassafras St + Blue/Orange Track Connection at 12th/Imperial) (Rte 510)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Trolley - Orange Line Frequency Enhancements (rail grade seps at: Allison/University, Severin Dr, Broadway/Lemon Grove Ave, Euclid Ave) (Rte 520)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Trolley - Green Line Frequency Enhancements (Rte 530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Trolley - Downtown Trolley Tunnel betw. Park/Island and Ash to facilitates frequency enhancements for Blue/Orange Lines and Blue/Orange Express (Rtes 510 &amp; 520)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Trolley Express - Blue Line Express - UTC to San Ysidro via Downtown (Rte 540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Trolley Express - Orange Line Express - El Cajon to Downtown via San Diego via Euclid (Rte 522)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Trolley - SDSU to Downtown via El Cajon Blvd/Mid-City (Transition of Mid-City Rapid to LRT) (Rte 560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Trolley - Pacific Beach to El Cajon via Kearny Mesa/Mission Valley, SDSU (Rte 563)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Trolley - UTC to Palomar Trolley Station via Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Mid-City, National City/Chula Vista via Highland Ave/4th Ave (Modified Rte 562)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Trolley - UTC to Mira Mesa via Sorrento Mesa via Carroll Cyn (Modified Rte 561)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Modified Guideway - Hillcrest to Mid-City Valley Transist Priority Measures (facilitates direct access for BRT, Rapid Bus, and local bus - Rtes 120, 610, and 563)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>BRT - North I-15 (Sabre Springs to Mira Mesa PNRs, Mid-City Stations) (Rte 610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>BRT - Escondido-UTC via Mira Mesa Blvd (Rt 470 Project) (Peak only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>BRT - South Bay BRT (Oceanside to Downtown) (Rte 628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>BRT - South Bay Maintenance Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>BRT - Downtown BRT station Relocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>BRT - Otay Mesa via Sorrento Mesa via I-805, Kearny Mesa (Rt 680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>BRT - I-5 - San Ysidro to Kearny Mesa via I-5 Shoulder lanes/HOV lanes, Downtown, Kearny Mesa Guideway (Rte 640) which is eventually replaced by Blue Line Express Route 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>BRT - El Cajon via L. O. Campus Pk via Santee, SR 52, I-805 (Rte 870) (Peak Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>BRT - El Cajon to Sorrento Mesa via SR 52, Kearny Mesa (Rte 890) (Peak Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>BRT - Otay Mesa to Palomar Airport Road via Kearny Mesa/I-805/S-5 (Rte 653) (Peak Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>BRT - East to Palomar Airport Road via Kearny Mesa/I-805/S-5 (Peak Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>BRT - Millenia/Otay Ranch to Sorrento Mesa Express (Rte 688) (Peak Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>BRT - Millenia/Otay Ranch to UTC/Torrey Pines Express (Rte 689) (Peak Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Rapid - Mid-City Rapid - Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Rapid - Mid-City Rapid - Phase 2 Balboa Park (Rte 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Rapid - La Mesa to Ocean Beach via Mid-City, Hillcrest, Old Town (Rte 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Rapid - Point Loma to Kearny Mesa via Old Town, Linda Vista (Rte 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Rapid - Kearny Mesa to Downtown via KM Guideway (Rte 120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Rapid - Escondido to Del Lago via Escondido Blvd &amp; Bear Valley (Rte 350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Rapid - Oceanside to UTC via Hwy 101 Coastal Communities, Carmel Valley (Rte 473)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Rapid - Old Town to Sorrento Mesa via Pacific Beach, La Jolla, UTC (Rte 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Rapid - Coronado to Downtown via Coronado Bridge (Rte 910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Rapid - Spring Valley to SDSU via SE San Diego, Downtown, Hillcrest, Mid-City (Rte 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Rapid - SDSU to Spring Valley via East San Diego, Lemon Grove, Skyline (Rte 636)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Rapid - North Park to 32nd Street Trolley via Golden Hill (Rte 637)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Rapid - Downtown Escondido to East Escondido (Rte 471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSIT PROJECTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 Rapid - Eastlake/EUC to Palomar Trolley via Main Street Corridor (Rte 635)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 Rapid - San Ysidro to Otay Mesa via Otay, SR 905 Corridor (Rte 638)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Rapid - H Street Trolley to Millenia via H Street Corridor, Southwestern College (Rte 709)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Rapid - North Park to Downtown San Diego via 30th St (Rte 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 Rapid - Oceanside to Vista via Mission Ave/Santa Fe Road Corridor (Rte 474)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Streetcar - Hillcrest/Balboa Park/Downtown San Diego Loop (Rte 554)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 Streetcar - 30th St to Downtown San Diego via North Park/Golden Hill (Rte 555)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Streetcar - Downtown San Diego: Little Italy to East Village (Rte 553)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 Shuttles - San Marcos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 Local Bus Routes - 10 min in key corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 Feeder Bus System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Lindbergh Intermodal Transit Center (ITC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 San Ysidro Intermodal Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 Bike/Pedestrian Access Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 Other (Maintenance facilities, transit system rehab, park and ride, ITS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL GOODS MOVEMENT PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123 Vesta Street Bridge - Mobility connector over Harbor Drvie at Naval Base San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 32nd Street - Freeway Access Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 10th Ave Marine Terminal Entrance - Rail Line Grade Separation/Barrio Logan Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 National City Marine Terminal - Bay Marina Drive, Civic Center Freeway Access Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 National City Rail Yard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All Managed Lane facilities will have a HOV-3+ occupancy requirement after 2020. HOV-2 and SOVs will be required to pay a fee to use these facilities.
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SANDAG
DRAFT 2050 RTP: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DRAFT RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and Performance Measures</th>
<th>Existing (2008)</th>
<th>No Build (2050)</th>
<th>Hybrid (2050)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEM PRESERVATION AND SAFETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Annual projected number of vehicle injury/fatal collisions per 1,000 persons</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Annual projected number of bicycle/pedestrian injury/fatal collisions per 1,000 persons</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Percent of transportation investments toward maintenance and rehabilitation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Percent of transportation investments toward operational improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Average work trip travel time (in minutes)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Average work trip travel speed by mode (in m.p.h.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Percent of work and higher education trips accessible in 30 minutes in peak periods by mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Percent of non work-related trips accessible in 15 minutes by mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Out-of-pocket user costs per trip</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.19</td>
<td>$2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Number of interregional transit routes by service type</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Network enhancements by freight mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight capacity acreage</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight capacity mileage</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROSPEROUS ECONOMY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Benefit/Cost Ratio*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Economic impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Impacts (average number per year)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>39,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Impacts (gross regional product in millions - average amount per year)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Impacts (in millions - average amount per year)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELIABILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Congested vehicle miles of travel (VMT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total auto travel in congested conditions (peak periods)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total auto travel in congested conditions (all day)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total transit travel in congested conditions (peak periods)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total transit travel in congested conditions (all day)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Daily vehicle delay per capita (minutes)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Daily truck hours of delay</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>34,200</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Gross acres of constrained lands consumed for transit and highway infrastructure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. On-road fuel consumption (all day) per capita*</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Smog-forming pollutants (pounds/year) per capita*</td>
<td>66.32</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>22.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Systemwide VMT (all day) per capita*</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>26.98</td>
<td>23.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Transit passenger miles (all day) per capita</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Percent of peak-period trips within 1/2 mile of a transit stop</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Percent of daily trips within 1/2 mile of a transit stop</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Work trip mode share (peak periods)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BikeWalk</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Work trip mode share (all day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BikeWalk</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Notes:
12: The No Build Alternative is the base case against which Scenarios are compared. The Benefit/Cost Ratio for the Hybrid Scenario is not available.
20 and 21: Values based on 2050 SANDAG Transportation Model Outputs using 2040 Emission Factors from 2007 EMFAC.
No emission factors are available for 2050 (smog-forming pollutants include reactive organic gases [ROG] and oxides of nitrogen [NOx]).
22 and 31: Includes all vehicle types.
## Goals and Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and Performance Measures</th>
<th>Existing (2008)</th>
<th>No Build (2050)</th>
<th>Hybrid (2050)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Non work trip mode share (peak periods)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Walk</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Non work trip mode share (all day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Walk</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Total bike and walk trips</td>
<td>523,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>1,356,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 CO2 emissions per capita*</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL EQUITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Average travel time per person trip (in minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non low-income population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority population</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non minority population</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility population</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non mobility population</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non community engagement population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Percent of work trips accessible in 30 minutes in peak periods by mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non low-income population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non minority population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non mobility population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non community engagement population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Percent of homes within 1/2 mile of a transit stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income population</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non low-income population</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority population</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non minority population</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility population</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non mobility population</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement population</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non community engagement population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*

22 and 31: Includes all vehicle types.

32 - 39: Mobility (zero-car households, disabled, and 75+) and Community engagement (linguistic isolation and low educational attainment)
### SOCIAL EQUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and Performance Measures</th>
<th>Existing (2008)</th>
<th>No Build (2050)</th>
<th>Hybrid (2050)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>35</strong> Percent of population within 30 minutes of schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non low-income population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non minority population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non mobility population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non community engagement population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

32 - 39: Mobility (zero-car households, disabled, and 75+) and Community engagement (linguistic isolation and low educational attainment)
### Goals and Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and Performance Measures</th>
<th>Existing (2008)</th>
<th>No Build (2050)</th>
<th>Hybrid (2050)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 Percent of population within 15 minutes of parks or beaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non low-income population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non minority population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non mobility population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non community engagement population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Distribution of RTP expenditures per capita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income population</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$14,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non low-income population</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority population</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non minority population</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility population</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non mobility population</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement population</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$14,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non community engagement population</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Notes:
32 - 39: Mobility (zero-car households, disabled, and 75+) and Community engagement (linguistic isolation and low educational attainment)
## DRAFT 2050 RTP: PROJECTED TRAVEL TIMES IN KEY CORRIDORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and Performance Measures</th>
<th>Existing (2008)</th>
<th>No Build (2050)</th>
<th>Hybrid (2050)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average travel time (peak periods) by mode for selected corridors (in minutes door to door)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Oceanside - Downtown San Diego</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Escondido - Downtown San Diego</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 El Cajon - Kearny Mesa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Mid City - UTC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Western Chula Vista - Mission Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Carlsbad - Sorrento Mesa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Oceanside - Escondido</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 San Ysidro - Downtown San Diego</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Otay Ranch - UTC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Pala/Pauma - Oceanside Transit Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 SR 67 (Ramona) - Downtown San Diego</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By auto</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (walk access)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transit (park and ride access)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By carpool</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TransNet Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Unc Cost ($2010)</th>
<th>Project Ranking</th>
<th>Transit Emphasis</th>
<th>Rail/Freight Emphasis</th>
<th>Highway Emphasis</th>
<th>Fusion</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$1,130</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+Operational</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
<td>8F/10F+2ML</td>
<td>$303</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-5/I-805 Merge</td>
<td>8F/14F</td>
<td>8F/14F+2ML</td>
<td>$427</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Manchester Ave</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$2,059</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>Vandegrift Boulevard</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$1,311</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>Los Coches</td>
<td>4F/6F</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SR 15</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Viaduct</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F+2ML(R)</td>
<td>10F+4ML/MB</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Centre City Pkwy</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F+2ML(R)</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2ML</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F+2ML</td>
<td>$221</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>Mapleview St</td>
<td>Dye Rd</td>
<td>2C/4C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>Melrose Drive</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>$404</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2ML/Ops</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>College Ave</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>College Ave</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>Avocado Blvd</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>Avocado Blvd</td>
<td>Steele Canyon Rd</td>
<td>2C/4C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>45, 24</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2ML</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Palomar St</td>
<td>Carroll Canyon Rd</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$2,003</td>
<td>18, 9, 10, 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mission Valley Viaduct</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Carroll Canyon Rd</td>
<td>I-5 (north)</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TransNet Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fwy</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Estimated UNC Cost* ($2010)</th>
<th>Project Ranking</th>
<th>Scenario #1 Transit Emphasis</th>
<th>Scenario #2 Rail/Freight Emphasis</th>
<th>Scenario #3 Highway Emphasis</th>
<th>Scenario #4 Fusion</th>
<th>Scenario #4 Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>West to North</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>South to East</td>
<td>$98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>South to East</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>West to South</td>
<td>$46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>West to North</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>South to East</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREEWAY CONNECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Estimated UNC Cost* ($2010)</th>
<th>Project Ranking</th>
<th>Scenario #1 Transit Emphasis</th>
<th>Scenario #2 Rail/Freight Emphasis</th>
<th>Scenario #3 Highway Emphasis</th>
<th>Scenario #4 Fusion</th>
<th>Scenario #4 Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Vandegrift Boulevard</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>$754</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>SR 11</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>$356</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>SR 15</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>$1,005</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CONSTANT PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREEWAY/HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS</th>
<th>Estimated UNC Cost* ($2010)</th>
<th>Project Ranking</th>
<th>Scenario #1 Transit Emphasis</th>
<th>Scenario #2 Rail/Freight Emphasis</th>
<th>Scenario #3 Highway Emphasis</th>
<th>Scenario #4 Fusion</th>
<th>Scenario #4 Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>$754</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>$356</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>$1,005</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OTHER CONSTANT PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario #1</th>
<th>Scenario #2</th>
<th>Scenario #3</th>
<th>Scenario #4</th>
<th>Scenario #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59 SR 52</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+i2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 SR 125</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 SR 125</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 SR 241</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>4T/6T</td>
<td>$443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 SR 905</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>$595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREEWAY CONNECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fwy Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>I-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOV CONNECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSIT PROJECTS

- **High Speed Rail (HSR) Intercty - Temecula to Lindbergh Field ITC**
  - $0 | N/A | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **COASTER - Tunnel (Del Mar) (Rte 398)**
  - $1,184 | N/A | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **COASTER - Positive Train Control**
  - $108 | N/A | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Trolley - Blue Line Frequency Enhancements (rail grade seps at: Taylor, Palomar St, H St, E St, 32nd St, 28th St, Washington St/Sassafras St + Blue/Orange Track Connection at 12th/Imperial) (Rte 510)**
  - $572 | 1 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Trolley - Orange Line Frequency Enhancements (rail grade seps at: Allison/University, Severin Dr, Broadway/Lemon Grove Ave, Euclid Ave) (Rte 520)**
  - $312 | 11 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Trolley - Green Line Frequency Enhancements (Rte 530)**
  - $0 | 2 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Rapid - La Mesa to Ocean Beach via Mid-City, Hillcrest, Old Town (Rte 10)**
  - $85 | 15 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Rapid - Point Loma to Kearny Mesa via Old Town, Linda Vista (Rte 28)**
  - $48 | 27 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Rapid - Kearny Mesa to Downtown via KM Guidebar (Rte 120)**
  - $0 | 12 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Shuttles - San Marcos**
  - $0 | N/A | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Local Bus Routes - 10 min in key corridors**
  - $0 | N/A | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Feeder Bus System**
  - $0 | N/A | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Lindbergh Intermodal Transit Center (ITC)**
  - $215 | N/A | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Bike/Pedestrian Access Improvements**
  - $500 | N/A | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **Other (Maintenance facilities, transit system rehab, park and ride, ITS)**
  - $3,020 | N/A | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

### ADDITIONAL GOODS MOVEMENT PROJECTS

- **Vesta Street Bridge - Mobility connector over Harbor Drive at Naval Base San Diego**
  - $60 | 1 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **32nd Street - Freeway Access Enhancement**
  - $119 | 3 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **10th Ave Marine Terminal Entrance - Rail Line Grade Separation/Barrio Logan Enhancement**
  - $67 | 3 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **National City Marine Terminal - Bay Marina Drive, Civic Center Freeway Access Improvements**
  - $7 | 6 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
- **National City Rail Yard**
  - $7 | 1 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

**Total**

| $10,582 | $10,582 | $10,582 | $10,582 | $10,582 |

Note: All Managed Lane facilities will have a HOV-3+ occupancy requirement after 2020. HOV-2 and SOVs will be required to pay a fee to use these facilities.

TransNet projects are included in all scenarios with the exception of the I-805 corridor where different improvements are being tested in some scenarios.

N/A - Projects were not ranked using Board-approved project evaluation criteria.

* Capital costs only. Operating costs, which include vehicle and vehicle replacement costs, will be based on phasing.

** Project Rankings was from Temecula to International Border.
### VARIABLE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Add'l Improvement</th>
<th>Transit Emphasis</th>
<th>Rail/Freight Emphasis</th>
<th>Highway Emphasis</th>
<th>Fusion</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>10F+2ML</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>10F+4ML</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>Vandegrift</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>10F+4ML</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+Operational</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
<td>8F/10F+Operational</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>Los Coches</td>
<td>Dunbar Rd</td>
<td>4F/6F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>6F+2ML(R)</td>
<td>6F+3ML/MB</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>6F+2ML</td>
<td>6F/8F+2ML</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2ML</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>Mapleview St</td>
<td>4F/6F</td>
<td>6F/8F</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Melrose Drive</td>
<td>4E</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>Melrose Drive</td>
<td>Mission Rd</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>6C</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Couser Canyon</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C/6C+Ops</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>College Ave</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>10F+2ML</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>Steele Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Melody Rd</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>45, 24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>6F+2ML</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>10F+2ML</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2ML</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Telegraph Canyon Rd</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Telegraph Canyon Rd</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mission Valley Viaduct</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr</td>
<td>8F+10F+2ML</td>
<td>8F/10F+4ML</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Palomar St</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$516</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>Carroll Canyon Rd</td>
<td>8F+10F+2ML</td>
<td>8F/10F+4ML</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Palomar St</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>$426</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREEWAY CONNECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fwy</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Project Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>East to North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>South to West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>North to East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOV CONNECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE PROJECTS</td>
<td>Estimated UNC Cost* ($2010)</td>
<td>Project Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 High Speed Rail (HSR) Commuter Rail Overlay - Temecula to Lindbergh ITC (Rte 598)</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 COASTER - UTC Tunnel and UTC COASTER Station (Rte 398)</td>
<td>$2,989</td>
<td>See Note A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 SPRINT - Branch Extensions to North County Fair (Rte 399)</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>See Note B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 SPRINT Express (Rte 568)</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Trolley - Downtown Trolley Tunnel betw. Park/Island and Ash St (facilitates frequency enhancements for Blue/Orange Lines and Blue/Orange Express) (Rtes 510 &amp; 520)</td>
<td>$2,592</td>
<td>See Note C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 Trolley Express - Blue Line Express - UTC to San Ysidro via Downtown (Rte 540)</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 Trolley Express - Orange Line Express - El Cajon to Downtown San Diego via Euclid (Rte 522)</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 Trolley Express - H St Trolley Station (formerly EUC) to UTC via Mid-City, Kearny Mesa (Rte 566)</td>
<td>$327</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 Trolley - SDSU to Downtown via El Cajon Blvd/Mid-City (transition of Mid-City Rapid to LRT) (Rte 560)</td>
<td>$1,921</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Trolley - Pacific Beach to El Cajon via Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, SDSU (Rte 563)</td>
<td>$1,262</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 Trolley - SDSU to San Ysidro via East San Diego, SE San Diego, National City (Rte 550)</td>
<td>$1,665</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 Trolley - UTC to H St Trolley Station via Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Mid-City, National City (Rte 562)</td>
<td>$1,935</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 Trolley - UTC to Palomar Trolley Station via Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Mid-City, National City/Chula Vista via Highland Ave/4th Ave (Modified Rte 562)</td>
<td>$2,548</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 Trolley - UTC to Mira Mesa via Sorrento Mesa (Rte 561)</td>
<td>$1,408</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 Trolley - UTC to Mira Mesa via Sorrento Mesa/Carroll Cyn (Modified Rte 561)</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 Guideway - Downtown to Kearny Mesa Guideway (facilitates direct access for BRT, Rapid Bus, and local bus - Rtes 120, 610, 640, 652)</td>
<td>$3,302</td>
<td>See Note D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 Modified Guideway - Hillcrest to Mission Valley Transit Priority Measures (facilitates direct access for BRT, Rapid Bus, and local bus - Rtes 120, 610, and 640)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>See Note E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 BRT - I-5 - San Ysidro to Kearny Mesa via I-5 shoulder lanes/HOV lanes, Downtown, Kearny Mesa Guideway (Rte 640) (eventually replaced by Blue Line Express Route 540)</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 BRT - Downtown to UTC via Kearny Mesa Guideway/805 (Rte 652)</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 BRT - El Cajon to UTC/Campus Pt via Santee, SR 52, I-805 (Rte 870) (Peak Only)</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 BRT - Oceanside via SR 78 HOV Lanes (Rte 430)</td>
<td>$234</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 BRT - Chula Vista to Palomar Airport Road Bus Park via I-805/SR 52 (Rte 650) (Peak Only)</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 BRT - El Cajon to Sorrento Mesa via SR 52, Kearny Mesa (Rte 890) (Peak Only)</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 BRT - El Cajon to Otay Mesa via Spring Valley, SR 125, Millenia (Rte 692)</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 BRT - Mid City to Palomar Airport Road via Kearny Mesa/1-805/SR 5 (Rte 653) (Peak Only)</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 BRT - Oceanside to UTC via I-5, Carlsbad, Encinitas (Rte 940) (Peak Only)</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 BRT - Santee/El Cajon Transit Centers to Downtown via SR 94 (Peak Only) (eventually replaced by Orange Line Express Route 522)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 BRT - Millenia/Otay Ranch to Sorrento Mesa Express (Rte 688) (Peak Only)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 BRT - Millenia/Otay Ranch to UTC/Torrey Pines Express (Rte 689) (Peak Only)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VARIABLE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Estimated UNC Cost* ($2010)</th>
<th>Project Ranking</th>
<th>Scenario #1</th>
<th>Scenario #2</th>
<th>Scenario #3</th>
<th>Scenario #4</th>
<th>Scenario #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155 Rapid - Oceanside to UTC via Hwy 101 Coastal Communities, Carmel Valley (Rte 473)</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 Rapid - Old Town to Sorrento Mesa via Pacific Beach, La Jolla, UTC (Rte 30)</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 Rapid - Carlsbad to San Marcos via Palomar Airport Road Corridor (Rte 440)</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 Rapid - Coronado to Downtown via Coronado Bridge (Rte 910)</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 Rapid - Spring Valley to SDSU via SE San Diego, Downtown, Hillcrest, Mid-City (Rte 11)</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 Rapid - Fashion Valley to UTC/AUSD via Linda Vista and Clairemont (Rte 41)</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 Rapid - SDSU to Spring Valley via East San Diego, Lemon Grove, Skyline (Rte 636)</td>
<td>$39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 Rapid - North Park to 32nd Street Trolley via Golden Hill (Rte 637)</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 Rapid - Downtown Escondido to East Escondido (Rte 471)</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Rapid - Eastlake/EUC to Palomar Trolley via Main Street Corridor (Rte 635)</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 Rapid - San Ysidro to Otay Mesa via Otay, SR 905 Corridor (Rte 638)</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 Rapid - Otay to North Island via Imperial Beach and Silver Strand, Coronado (Rte 639)</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 Rapid - H Street Trolley to Millenia via H Street Corridor, Southwestern College (Rte 709)</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 Rapid - North Park to Downtown San Diego via 30th St (Rte 2)</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 Rapid - Oceanside to Vista via Mission Ave/Santa Fe Road Corridor (Rte 474)</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 Rapid - Camp Pendleton to Carlsbad Village via College Blvd, Plaza Camino Real (Rte 477)</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 Streetcar - Hillcrest/Balboa Park/Downtown San Diego Loop (Rte 554)***</td>
<td>$277</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 Streetcar - 30th St to Downtown San Diego via North Park/Golden Hill (Rte 555)***</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 Streetcar - Downtown San Diego: Little Italy to East Village (Rte 553)***</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 Streetcar - El Cajon Downtown (Rte 557)***</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 Streetcar - Chula Vista Downtown (Rte 551)***</td>
<td>$134</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 Streetcar - Escondido Downtown (Rte 558)***</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177 San Ysidro Intermodal Center</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$13,317</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,254</td>
<td>$13,749</td>
<td>$10,412</td>
<td>$14,144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNCONSTRAINED PROJECTS ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Estimated UNC Cost* ($2010)</th>
<th>Project Ranking</th>
<th>Scenario #1</th>
<th>Scenario #2</th>
<th>Scenario #3</th>
<th>Scenario #4</th>
<th>Scenario #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$13,317</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,254</td>
<td>$13,749</td>
<td>$10,412</td>
<td>$14,144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREEWAY/HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Add’l Improvement</th>
<th>Transit Emphasis</th>
<th>Rail/Freight Emphasis</th>
<th>Highway Emphasis</th>
<th>Fusion</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOV CONNECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Transit Emphasis</th>
<th>Rail/Freight Emphasis</th>
<th>Highway Emphasis</th>
<th>Fusion</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 15</td>
<td>North to North and South to South</td>
<td>$183</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>West to South and North to East</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>South to East and West to North</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>South to East and West to North</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>West to South and North to East</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>East to North and South to West</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenarios</td>
<td>Estimated UNC Cost* ($2010)</td>
<td>Project Ranking</td>
<td>Scenario #1</td>
<td>Scenario #2</td>
<td>Scenario #3</td>
<td>Scenario #4</td>
<td>Scenario #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>I-15 SR 163</td>
<td>North to North and South to South</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>SR 52 SR 125</td>
<td>North to West and East to South</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>SR 94 SR 125</td>
<td>East to North and South to West</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>I-805 SR 54</td>
<td>South to East and West to North</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>I-805 SR 94</td>
<td>West to South and North to East</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>I-805 SR 94</td>
<td>East to North and South to East</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>I-805 SR 163</td>
<td>North to North and South to South</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNCONSTRAINED PROJECTS ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Estimated UNC Cost* ($2010)</th>
<th>Project Ranking</th>
<th>Scenario #1</th>
<th>Scenario #2</th>
<th>Scenario #3</th>
<th>Scenario #4</th>
<th>Scenario #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>High Speed Rail (HSR) Extension from Lindbergh Field ITC to International Border</td>
<td>$3,557</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>SPRINTER - Branch Extensions to East Escondido (Rte 399)</td>
<td>$59</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Trolley - Otay Mesa East Border Crossing to western Chula Vista via Otay Ranch/Millenia (Rte 564)</td>
<td>$854</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Trolley - Downtown Bus Tunnel and Hubs</td>
<td>$2,917</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Streetcar - National City Downtown (Rte 552)</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Streetcar - Oceanside Downtown (Rte 559)</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Streetcar - Mission Beach to La Jolla via Pacific Beach (Rte 565)</td>
<td>$239</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Otay Mesa East Intermodal Transit Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All Managed Lane facilities will have a HOV-3+ occupancy requirement after 2020. HOV-2 and SOVs will be required to pay a fee to use these facilities.

TransNet projects were included in all scenarios with the exception of the I-805 corridor where different improvements are being tested in some scenarios.

N/A - Projects were not ranked using Board-approved project evaluation criteria.

* Capital costs only. Operating costs, which include vehicle and vehicle replacement costs, will be based on phasing.

** Project Ranking was from Temecula to International Border

*** Only 10% of the project cost is assumed for regional funding.

**** This project was recommended to be added to the Unconstrained Network by the Transportation Committee at its December 10, 2010 meeting.

Note A: Included in COASTER double-tracking ranking

Note B: Included in SPRINTER double-tracking ranking

Note C: Included in several LRT project rankings

Note D: Included in several BRT project rankings; cost and length of guideway modified for Hybrid Scenario

Note E: Guideway and/or transit priority measures designed to improve transit speeds in Hillcrest and Mission Valley.
Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW)

December 17, 2010

- $16.1 million to San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) to address obesity
- Partnership with SANDAG to promote healthy communities at regional and local level
SANDAG Initiatives

- Health Impact and Forecasting Assessment
- Regional Comprehensive Land Use and Transportation Policies
  - Healthy Communities Campaign
  - Countywide Safe Routes to School Implementation
- Active Commuters Transportation Promotion
- Regional Bikeway Signage and Promotion

Healthy Communities Campaign

- Healthy community planning grants ($700,000 total)
- Active community transportation grants ($150,000 total)
Program Objectives

- Integrate and institutionalize public health considerations in planning
- Address health disparities and inequities
- Promote physical activity
- Promote access to healthy and nutritious foods
- Establish collaborative working relationships
- Build consensus in the community

Eligibility

- Cities and the County of San Diego
- Tribal governments
- Existing projects are eligible to apply if they propose additional scope of work
Type of Projects

- Public health elements
- Zoning codes, street design guidelines or subdivision ordinances
- Urban agriculture or food systems assessments
- Park master plans or design guidelines
- Active transportation plans for neighborhoods and corridors
- Other . . .

Evaluation Criteria

- Address program objectives (20 Pts.)
- Implement innovative/comprehensive approach (20 Pts.)
- Serve high-need communities (20 Pts.)
- Lead to implementation and systems change (20 Pts.)
- Build on local commitment to public health/active transportation (10 Pts.)
- Support a collaborative and inclusive process (10 Pts.)

Bonus Points

- Leverage funds and resources (10 Pts.)
Selection Panel: Healthy Community Planning Grants

- Two members of SANDAG staff
- One member from the TWG
- One member from the PHSG
- One member of HHSA staff
- Two health and built environment experts
- One member from the San Diego Council of Design Professionals

Selection Panel: Active Community Transportation Grants

- Four members of SANDAG staff
- One member from the BPWG
- One member from the TWG
- One professional with SRTS expertise
- One HHSA staff
Safe Routes to School Implementation

- Capacity building and planning grants ($250,000 total)
- Education, encouragement, and enforcement grants ($50,000 total)

Program Objectives

- Increase walking and biking to schools
- Improve safety conditions
- Realize the benefits of SRTS efforts
- Consider all of the 5 E’s
- Establish collaborative partnerships
- Evaluate effectiveness
- Strengthen support for SRTS
- Initiate institutional change
Eligibility

- Cities and the County of San Diego
- Tribal governments
- School districts
- Non-profit organizations
- Existing projects are eligible to apply if they propose additional scope of work

Type of Projects

- Capacity Building and Planning Grants
  - Neighborhood, community or citywide SRTS plans

- Education, Encouragement and Enforcement Grants
  - Safety courses, curriculums, and lesson plans
  - Incentive programs
  - Teen-oriented programs
## Evaluation Criteria

- Commitment to active transportation (20 Pts.)
- Capacity to implement (20 Pts.)
- Evidence of need (20 Pts.)
- Methodology (20 Pts.)
- Community involvement (20 Pts.)

### Bonus Points

- Leverage funds and resources (10 Pts.)

## Selection Panel

- Two members of SANDAG staff
- One member from the TWG
- One member from the PHSG
- One member of HHSA staff
- One professional with SRTS expertise
Review Process

- Review workshops, October 19 and 21
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group, October 27
- Joint Regional Planning Technical Working Group and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee meeting, October 28
- San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council, November 18
- Public Health Stakeholder Group, November 18

Proposed Grant Program Timeline

- Release Call for Projects by end-December, 2010
- Receive grant applications by mid-February, 2011
- Review applications and award grants by mid-April, 2011
- Project completion by February 1, 2012
The Regional Planning Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the proposed grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, and evaluation process for the Healthy Communities Campaign and Safe Routes to School grant programs, two initiatives under the Communities Putting Prevention to Work program, in substantially the same form as Attachment 2.
Scenario Development Based on Revenue Constraints

Unconstrained Multimodal Network
$145B

$100B-110B

Transit Emphasis
- Typan empan min pen
  - Keth da wity get
  - Cow ver no empan
  - Keth da wity get
  - Cow ver no empan

Rail/Freight Emphasis
- Typan empan min pen
  - Keth da wity get
  - Cow ver no empan

Highway Emphasis
- Typan empan min pen
  - Keth da wity get
  - Cow ver no empan

Fusion
- Typan empan min pen
  - Keth da wity get
  - Cow ver no empan

Hybrid
- Typan empan min pen
  - Keth da wity get
  - Cow ver no empan

What We Heard...

- Board directed staff to create a revenue constrained Hybrid Scenario and continue working with MTS and NCTD
- Support merging Highway Emphasis and Fusion Scenarios
- Importance of the Downtown Trolley Tunnel
- Support for additional funding for regional rail grade separations
What We Heard . . . (cont.)

- Focus on the existing rail investment (COASTER & SPRINT) and eliminate redundant transit services
- Support for BRT services particularly in South County
- UTC COASTER Tunnel/Station are expensive projects, but continued support for providing transit connections in the UTC area
- Support for including higher ranked highway and LRT projects in a Hybrid Scenario
Hybrid Scenario Highway Network

- Managed Lanes
- General Purpose Lanes
- Toll Lanes
- Operational Improvements
- Freeway Connectors
- HOV Connectors
- Freeway & HOV Connections
  - C = Conventional Highway
  - F = Freeway
  - HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle
  - M = Managed Lanes
  - OPS = Operational Improvements
  - T = Toll Road

More than $4 billion for Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Transportation System Management (TSM), and Active Transportation

- $700 million for TDM
- $830 million for TSM
- $2,580 million for Active Transportation
Rail Grade Separations

- More than $2.6 billion in investments for rail grade separations
  - $1.26 billion for 20 grade separations as part of transit improvements
  - Additional $1.4 billion for regional rail grade separations

Hybrid Scenario Performance

- Compared to No Build:
  - Strong improvement in the percentage of work and higher education trips that can be made within 30 minutes
  - Daily travel by transit is projected to more than double in the Hybrid Scenario
  - Access to transit is projected to improve – 75% of trips could access transit within a ½ mile
  - Substantial increase in carpooling, transit, and biking/walking for work trips
Social Equity Analysis

- The data shows the Hybrid Scenario will not create a disparity for LIM populations.
- The Hybrid Scenario is one of the most beneficial Scenarios for low income and minority (LIM) populations for the distribution of proposed RTP expenditures per capita.
- Slightly greater accessibility gains for drive alone, carpool, and transit work trips for LIM populations compared to non-LIMs.

2050 RTP: El Cajon – Kearny Mesa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>SOV</th>
<th>HOV</th>
<th>Transit (Walk)</th>
<th>Transit (Park &amp; Ride)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2050 RTP: El Cajon – Kearny Mesa

- **SOV**
- **HOV**
- **Transit (Walk)**
- **Transit (Park & Ride)**

**Existing (2008):**
- SOV: 29
- HOV: 29
- Transit (Walk): 76
- Transit (Park & Ride): 62

**No Build (2050):**
- SOV: 32
- HOV: 32
- Transit (Walk): 92
- Transit (Park & Ride): 77

**2050 RTP: El Cajon – Kearny Mesa**

- **SOV**
- **HOV**
- **Transit (Walk)**
- **Transit (Park & Ride)**

**Existing (2008):**
- SOV: 29
- HOV: 29
- Transit (Walk): 76
- Transit (Park & Ride): 62

**Hybrid (2050):**
- SOV: 30
- HOV: 30
- Transit (Walk): 48
- Transit (Park & Ride): 38

Minutes

- 0
- 30
- 60
- 90
- 120
2050 RTP: Otay Ranch – UTC

Existing (2008)

- SOV: 45
- HOV: 45
- Transit (Walk): 135
- Transit (Park & Ride): 151

Minutes: 0 30 60 90 120 150 180

No Build (2050)

- SOV: 66
- HOV: 65
- Transit (Walk): 123
- Transit (Park & Ride): 121

2050 RTP: Otay Ranch – UTC

Existing (2008)

- SOV: 45
- HOV: 45
- Transit (Walk): 135
- Transit (Park & Ride): 151

Minutes: 0 30 60 90 120 150 180
2050 RTP: Otay Ranch – UTC

GHG Preliminary Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Year</th>
<th>CARB Target</th>
<th>No Build Alternative</th>
<th>Hybrid Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per Capita Reductions from 2005
(26 lbs/person)
Feedback on the Hybrid Scenario

- Modify streetcar funding assumption
- MTS Board of Directors has endorsed the proposed Hybrid Scenario
- LOSSAN study underway to evaluate future rail investments such as the UTC COASTER tunnel
- Caltrans to further evaluate the terminus of the proposed general purpose lanes on I-5 North Coast corridor

Recommendation

- The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors accept the Hybrid Scenario as the preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario for use in developing the Draft 2050 RTP to be circulated in 2011.
- The Transportation Committee further recommends that the Unconstrained Transportation Network be modified to include I-15 between Centre City Parkway and SR 78 with a configuration of ten general purpose lanes and four Managed Lanes.
### FREEWAY/HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-5 SR 54</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>10F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-5 I-15</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I-5 I-8</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
<td>8F/10F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-5 La Jolla Village Dr</td>
<td>I-5/I-805 Merge</td>
<td>8F/14F</td>
<td>8F/14F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I-5 I-5/I-805 Merge</td>
<td>Manchester Ave</td>
<td>8F/14F+2HOV</td>
<td>8F/14F+4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-5 Manchester Ave</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F 8F+2HOV</td>
<td>10F+4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-5 Manchester Ave</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>10F+4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-5 Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>Vandegrift Blvd</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5 Vandegrift Blvd</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8 I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I-8 I-15</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
<td>8F/10F+Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I-8 SR 125</td>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>6F/8F</td>
<td>6F/8F+Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I-8 2nd Street</td>
<td>Los Coches</td>
<td>4F/6F</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 11 SR 905</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR 15 I-5</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SR 15 SR 94</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I-15 Viaduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I-15 I-8</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I-15 SR 163</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F+2ML(R)</td>
<td>10F+4ML/MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I-15 Centre City Pkwy</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I-15 SR 78</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SR 52 I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SR 52 I-805</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SR 52 I-15</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F+2ML(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SR 54 I-5</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SR 56 I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SR 67 Mapleview St</td>
<td>Dye Rd</td>
<td>2C/4C</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SR 76 Melrose Drive</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SR 76 I-15</td>
<td>Couser Canyon</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C/6C + Ops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SR 78 I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2ML/Ops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SR 94 I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SR 94 I-805</td>
<td>College Ave</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>SR 94 College Ave</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>SR 94 SR 125</td>
<td>Avocado Blvd</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>SR 94 Avocado Blvd</td>
<td>Steele Canyon Rd</td>
<td>2C/4C</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SR 125 SR 905</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>SR 125 San Miguel Rd</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>SR 125 SR 54</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>SR 125 SR 94</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>10F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>SR 241 Orange County</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4T/6T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I-805 SR 905</td>
<td>Carroll Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
<td>8F/10F+4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I-805 Mission Valley Viaduct</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I-805 Carroll Canyon Rd</td>
<td>I-5 (north)</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
<td>8F/10F+2ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>SR 905 I-805</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREEWAY CONNECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fwy</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Intersecting Freeway</td>
<td>Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOV CONNECTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSIT PROJECTS**

- **62** High Speed Rail (HSR) InterCity - Temecula to Lindbergh Field ITC
- **63** COASTER - Double Tracking (including Fairgrounds and Convention Center Stations, and grade separation at Leucadia) + two additional grade separations + quiet zone improvements (Rte 398)
- **64** COASTER - Tunnel (Del Mar) (Rte 398)
- **65** COASTER - Positive Train Control
- **66** SPRINTER - Double Tracking (Oceanside-Encinitas); (including rail grade separations assumed at El Camino Real, Vista Village, Melrose, and Mission/San Marcos Stations) + 2 additional rail grade separations (Rte 399)
- **67** SPRINTER - Branch Extensions to North County Fair (Rte 399)
- **68** SPRINTER Express (Rte 588)
- **69** Trolley - Mid-Coast LRT Extension (Rte 510)
- **70** Trolley - Trolley System Rehabilitation
- **71** Trolley - Blue Line Frequency Enhancements (rail grade seps at: Taylor, Palomar St, H St, E St, 32nd St, 28th St, Washington St/Sassafras St + Blue/Orange Track Connection at 12th/Imperial) (Rte 510)
- **72** Trolley - Orange Line Frequency Enhancements (rail grade seps at: Allison/University, Severin Dr, Broadway/Lemon Grove Ave, Euclid Ave) (Rte 520)
- **73** Trolley - Green Line Frequency Enhancements (Rte 530)
- **74** Trolley - Downtown Trolley Tunnel betw. Park/Island and Ash St (facilitates frequency enhancements for Blue/Orange Lines and Blue/Orange Express) (Rtes 510 & 520)
- **75** Trolley Express - Blue Line Express - UTC to San Ysidro via Downtown (Rte 540)
- **76** Trolley Express - Orange Line Express - El Cajon to Downtown San Diego via Euclid (Rte 522)
- **77** Trolley - SDSU to Downtown via El Cajon Blvd/Mid-City (transition of Mid-City Rapid to LRT) (Rte 560)
- **78** Trolley - Pacific Beach to El Cajon via Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, SDSU (Rte 563)
- **79** Trolley - UTC to Palomar Trolley Station via Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Mid-City, National City/Chula Vista via Highland Ave/4th Ave (Modified Rte 562)
- **80** Trolley - UTC to Mira Mesa via Sorrento Mesa/Carroll Cyn (Modified Rte 561)
- **81** Modified Guideway - Hillcrest to Mission Valley Transit Priority Measures (facilitates direct access for BRT, Rapid Bus, and local bus - Rtes 120, 610, and 640)
- **82** BRT - North I-15 (Sabre Springs/Mira Mesa PNRs, Mid-City Stations) (Rte 610)
- **83** BRT - Escondido-UTC via Mira Mesa Blvd (Rte 470 Project) (Peak only)
- **84** BRT - South Bay BRT (Otay Mesa-Downtown) (Rte 628)
- **85** BRT - South Bay Maintenance Facility
- **86** BRT - Downtown BRT stations/layovers
- **87** BRT - Otay Mesa to Sorrento Mesa via I-805, Kearny Mesa (Rte 680)
- **88** BRT - I-5 - South Ysidro to Kearny Mesa via I-5 shoulder lanes/HOV lanes, Downtown, Kearny Mesa Modified Guideway (Rte 640) (eventually replaced by Blue Line Express Route 540)
- **89** BRT - El Cajon to UTC/Campus Pt via Santee, SR 52, I-805 (Rte 870) (Peak Only)
- **90** BRT - El Cajon to Sorrento Mesa via SR 52, Kearny Mesa (Rte 890) (Peak Only)
- **91** BRT - Mid-City to Palomar Airport Road via Kearny Mesa/I-805/I-5 (Rte 653) (Peak Only)
- **92** BRT - Santee/El Cajon Transit Centers to Downtown via SR 94 (Rte 90) (Peak Only) (eventually replaced by Orange Line Express Route 522)
- **93** BRT - Millenia/Otay Ranch to Sorrento Mesa Express (Rte 688) (Peak Only)
- **94** BRT - Millenia/Otay Ranch to UTC/Torrey Pines Express (Rte 689) (Peak Only)
- **95** Rapid - Mid-City Rapid - Phase 1
- **96** Rapid - Mid-City Rapid - Phase 2 Balboa Park (Rte 15)
- **97** Rapid - UTC Area Super Loop (Rte 180)
- **98** Rapid - La Mesa to Ocean Beach via Mid-City, Hillcrest, Old Town (Rte 10)
- **99** Rapid - Point Loma to Kearny Mesa via Old Town, Linda Vista (Rte 28)
- **100** Rapid - Kearny Mesa to Downtown via K4 Modified Guideway (Rte 120)
- **101** Rapid - Escondido to Del Lago via Escondido Blvd & Bear Valley (Rte 350)
- **102** Rapid - Ocean Side to UTC via Hwy 101 Coastal Communities, Carmel Valley (Rte 473)
- **103** Rapid - Old Town to Sorrento Mesa via Pacific Beach, La Jolla, UTC (Rte 30)
### TRANSIT PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Route Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar - Hillcrest/Balboa Park/Downtown San Diego Loop (Rte 554)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar - 30th St to Downtown San Diego via North Park/Golden Hill (Rte 555)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ysidro Intermodal Transit Center (ITC)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar - Downtown San Diego: Little Italy to East Village (Rte 553)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid - Downtown Escondido to East Escondido (Rte 471)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid - Eastlake/EUC to Palomar Trolley via Main Street Corridor (Rte 635)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid - San Ysidro to Otay Mesa via Otay, SR 905 Corridor (Rte 638)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid - H Street Trolley to Millenia via H Street Corridor, Southwestern College (Rte 709)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid - North Park to Downtown San Diego via 30th St (Rte 2)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid - Oceanside to Vista via Mission Ave/Santa Fe Road Corridor (Rte 474)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar - Hillcrest/Balboa Park/Downtown San Diego Loop (Rte 554)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar - 30th St to Downtown San Diego via North Park/Golden Hill (Rte 555)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar - Downtown San Diego: Little Italy to East Village (Rte 553)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles - San Marcos</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus Routes - 10 min in key corridors</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder Bus System</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh Intermodal Transit Center (ITC)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ysidro Intermodal Center</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Pedestrian Access Improvements</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Maintenance facilities, transit system rehab, park and ride, ITS)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL GOODS MOVEMENT PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Route Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vesta Street Bridge - Mobility connector over Harbor Drive at Naval Base San Diego</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd Street - Freeway Access Enhancement</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City Marine Terminal Entrance - Rail Line Grade Separation/Barrio Logan Enhancement</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City Marine Terminal - Bay Marina Drive, Civic Center Freeway Access Improvements</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City Rail Yard</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All Managed Lane facilities will have a HOV-3+ occupancy requirement after 2020. HOV-2 and SOVs will be required to pay a fee to use these facilities.
December 16, 2010

Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler and Members of the Board of Directors
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Revenue Constrained Network Strategies — Support for Public Transportation Investment and the Hybrid Scenario

Dear Chair Pfeiler and Members of the Board:

Sharp HealthCare, San Diego’s largest private employer and largest provider of health care, requests your serious consideration of 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) revenue constrained transportation network scenarios that will not only allow the region to achieve its greenhouse reduction target of 13 percent by 2035, but will also allow San Diegans to lead healthier lives. Accordingly, the final Revenue Constrained Network Strategy should include the following:

1) Focus discretionary funds on fast, convenient public transportation
   Fast, reliable projects that connect people from where they live to where they work, access healthcare, shop, and learn provide multiple economic and health benefits. We applaud SANDAG for expanding the list of transit projects that are in the fusion alternative. Sharp supports projects that expand the trolley system, rapid bus and express trolley service and 10-minute frequency bus service in the urban area. The Kearny Mesa Guideway project and 10-minute frequency bus service in the urban area have the potential to greatly benefit our patients, their families and our employees who can make use of public transportation.

2) Increase funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects (Active Transportation)
   Bicycle and pedestrian projects encourage active transportation and lead to healthier lifestyles. Sharp HealthCare supports fully funding the Active Transportation program at $2.7 billion, which is less than 3% of the total RTP.

A transit emphasis in the revenue constrained network, as is included in the hybrid scenario, is an opportunity to create a more multi-modal transportation system that decreases exposure to harmful pollutants and promotes healthier, more active lifestyles. We appreciate your consideration of our request and your willingness to work with Sharp HealthCare to improve the health of the region.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Murphy
President and CEO

Daniel L. Gross
Executive Vice President, Hospital Operations

SHARP ORGANIZATIONS
Sharp HealthCare © Sharp Memorial Hospital © Grossmont Hospital Corporation © Sharp Chula Vista Medical Center
Sharp Coronado Hospital and Healthcare Center © Sharp Mesa Vista Hospital © Sharp Mary Birch Hospital For Women
Sharp Vista Pacifica Hospital © Sharp Rees-Stealy Medical Centers © Sharp Health Plan
Sharp HealthCare Foundation © Grossmont Hospital Foundation

8695 Spectrum Center Boulevard © San Diego, California 92123-1489
From: ron lindley [mailto:ronlindley@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 12:52 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Subject: RTP 2050 plan

Please share with all members of the SANDAG board.

You are about to address the RTP for up to the year 2050. Most of us, will not be around by 2050, which makes your work difficult. You shouldn't make your decision based on your personal view of how you want your daily experience of moving around the county to be. You have to consider what that experience will be for your children's children. You can take the status quo approach of building more and widening existing roads, which will only make the concrete jungle we live in even more so for them. Or, you can finally be the ones we will look back on some day and say - thank God someone had the wisdom and foresight to do the intelligent thing. The intelligent thing is the thing that actually solves the problem, which is migrating from personal to mass-transit. It will require some change in their daily lives but, if you don't take us down the road of mass-transit now, it will only be more difficult and expensive for them to do it later.

The recent financial crisis is a strong demonstration of how we, as a culture, refuse to acknowledge the cost of our excessive living, and how, like it or not, things will fix themselves - with us or without us. Nobody likes life style changes that mean less individual freedom but, failure to put mass-transit as the primary focus going forward will lead us to a similar day of reconing that future generations will have to pay the price for.

There are so many reasons to develop mass-transit, not the least of which is the reduction in dependence on oil. Reducing the oil we burn on our roads everyday will improve the air, improve our security, improve our health, improve our finances all of which adds up to improving our (their) lives. All for the cost of a small change in transportation style.

Short term - here are four things that will go along way to reduce rush our traffic jams, without spending a dime
1) reduce speed limit to 45 during rush hour (saves gas, saves lives, saves money, reduces air pollution, reduces noise levels, gets you where your going faster - a win, win, win, win, win, win)
2) use the Highway Patrol to pace the traffic instead of ticketing folks which only creates rubber-necking situations and subsequent jam-ups
3) keep large trucks off the road during rush hour - they typically have as much as 15 car lengths in front of them which becomes inaccessible road space
4) request companies to shift their hours ( I travel the I5 at ~ 7PM in the evening and generally meet no traffic problems)

Thanks for your time,
Sincerely,
Ron Lindley
940 Urania Ave.
Encinitas, CA
From: Elizabeth Taylor  
[mailto:etaylor@brownandwinters.com]  
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 1:09 PM  
To: Johnston, Phillip  
Cc: pam.slater@sdcounty.ca.gov; Jerome Stocks; senator.kehoe@sen.ca.gov; Senator Wyland  
Subject: Item 13: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan  

Mr. Johnston, Please distribute these comments to the Board of Directors. Thank you.

Dear Board Members:

These comments pertain to the Board’s decision regarding the preferred alternative for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. I am concerned that the Hybrid Scenario, if implemented, would continue to place an unacceptable emphasis on highway expansion. Given the economic and environmental realities of the present time, as well as future indicators such as increasing fuel costs and emissions reductions targets, the RTP must focus primarily on transit investment. As fuel prices spike, long commutes and freight transported by truck will become increasingly cost-prohibitive. Therefore, we must provide affordable and convenient public transportation as an alternative to private vehicle use.

When I voted to extend the TransNet tax, I was voting to improve transit infrastructure, not to expand highways. The problem is not that there are not enough lanes on our existing highways, the problem is that there are too many vehicles on the highways. Having lived happily without a car in cities such as Portland, Oregon and Washington D.C., I have experienced the increased quality of life that comes with an affordable, reliable and convenient public transit system. Also, public transit investments lead to increased job creation, at a much higher rate than highway expansion.

For all of these reasons and more, I urge you to consider the 50-10 Plan, as outlined in the comment letter from Save Our Forest and Ranchlands and Cleveland National Forest Foundation, as the basis for a preferred alternative for the 2050 RTP.

Thank you.

Elizabeth M. Taylor  
Attorney  
Brown & Winters  
120 Birmingham Drive, Suite 110  
Cardiff-By-The-Sea, CA 92007-1737  
T: (760) 633-4485  
F: (760) 633-4427  
etaylor@brownandwinters.com
Dear SANDAG Board,

Dec. 16th, 2010

The Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association has been a part of the 2050 RTP process through its tribal working group. We feel it is important to write this letter in support of one of the scenarios we feel best fits our tribal needs and interests.

After analyzing the benefits and drawbacks of each of the four original scenarios and the latest hybrid scenario, the SCTCA Board, has decided to support the new Hybrid scenario. This scenario will positively impact our tribes more than any of the other individual scenarios alone. Please let it also be known that we appreciate the efforts that SANDAG has made in working with our tribes on this matter.

Signed,

Chairman Lawson
SCTCA Representative to the SANDAG
Board of Directors
Mike Bullock
mike_bullock@earthlink.net
1800 Bayberry Drive
Oceanside, CA 92054
September 20, 2010

Air Resources Board
1001 I Street
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, California 95814

SUBJECT: The PROPOSED REGIONAL GHG EMISSION REDUCTION TARGETS FOR AUTOMOBILES AND LIGHT TRUCKS PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 375 (Released: August 9, 2010, for a September 23, 2010 Consideration) and the Failure of Its Proposed SANDAG GHG Reductions to Protect Health, Support S-3-05, and be Just and Reasonable

Dear Air Resources Board Chair Mary Nichols and Members of the Board:

1.0 Introductory Comments

The time for debate has long since passed. The climate science is clear; we need to achieve significant GHG reductions today if we are to avert climate disaster in the future.

1.1 AB 32, SB 375, What Science Has Determined, and Current GHG Levels

AB 32 requires California emissions, from all sources, to be at 1990 levels by 2020. The years after 2020 are covered by Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05. It calls for emissions to be 80% below 1990 levels, by 2050. These reductions, world wide, would limit GHG levels to 450 PPM.

When AB 32 and the executive order were formulated, it was thought that limiting GHG levels to 450 PPM would provide humanity adequate safety from catastrophic climate destabilization. However, climate science now tells us that any level above 350 PPM is dangerous. Unfortunately, the current level is 390 PPM and this is higher than it has been in over a million years.

SB 375 was written to give CARB authority over cars and light-duty trucks, sometimes referred to as personal driving. This personal driving is quantified as vehicle miles traveled, or VMTs. Personal driving is responsible for 32% of GHG in California. In San Diego County, it is responsible for 41%. SB375 calls for CARB to give each regional government in the state (Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO) GHG reduction targets, for personal driving, for the years 2020 and 2035. SB375 requires that CARB give each MPO their targets by September 30th of this year.

1.2 Scoping Plan Observations

1.2.1 AB 32

AB 32 gives CARB the responsibility of allocating reductions to the various sectors. In the “Scoping Plan”, adopted in December 2008, on page 17, CARB specified only 5 million tons per year as the reduction from “Regional Transportation-Related GHG Targets” by 2020.

The Plan added in a footnote, “This number represents an estimate of what may be achieved from local land use changes. It is not the SB 375 regional target. ARB will establish regional targets for each MPO region following the input of the Regional Targets Advisory Committee and a public consultation process with MPOs and other stakeholders per SB 375.”

The 5 million tons identified in the Scoping Plan’s Table 2 is in addition to 31.7 million tons for Light-Duty Vehicle GHG Standards, including Pavley 1 and the anticipated Pavley 2 standards, and 15 million tons for the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. These values are also from the Scoping
1.2.2 Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05

On page 117 of the scoping plan, the overall reductions to achieve the Governor’s Executive Order are given. However, the scoping plan does no allocation of this reduction to the various sectors. Since CARB has no published allocation for reductions in the year 2035, it therefore follows that, as a baseline starting point, each sector must reduce emissions in line with the Governor’s Executive Order. Furthermore, since S-3-05 provides no guidance as to the shape of the trajectory of the reductions as a function of year, since climate science urges reductions to come sooner rather than later, and since climate science tells us that the S-3-05 reductions are too small, it therefore follows that the 2035 target reduction for each MPO must support at least a straight-line trajectory of S-3-05.

1.3 Danger in “Bottom Up” Process of Identifying Draft Targets

In modeling “achievable” reductions, MPOs are free to ignore the AB 32 and S-3-05 legal requirements for reductions and the additional reductions needed for public health and safety, in light of our need to get GHG levels down to 350 PPM, as soon as possible. MPO Boards may push for “path-of-least-resistance” strategies, hoping to sell these strategies to CARB as “aggressive but achievable”. Since government’s primary responsibility, at all levels, is public health and safety, and since this responsibility extends from the three branches of state government down to all boards and agencies, it follows that the final GHG reductions must be based on what the climate scientists have determined is safe. Such reductions will significantly exceed those required by AB 32 and S-3-05. It is certainly CARB’s responsibility to address this issue, even if it is in some other proceeding. Ignoring this issue is negligent, since it may lead to catastrophic climate destabilization, resulting in a significant die off of the human population.

1.4 Reducing GHG from Cars and Light-Duty Trucks

There are three things that will reduce GHG from driving. They are “clean cars”, “clean fuels” and less driving. “Clean cars” includes the benefits of more efficient gasoline and diesel powered cars, hybrids, and battery electric vehicles (BEVs). Since some of our cars will be BEVs, when CARB computes the overall average GHG per mile of our state’s fleet of cars, it must account for how much of our electricity is generated from fossil fuels. Most of our electricity will come from fossil fuels for many years, perhaps several decades. “Clean fuel” refers to fossil fuel formulated to have more hydrogen and less carbon, to result in less GHG emissions. “Clean fuel”, referred to as Low Carbon Fuel Standards (LCFS) fuel, is expected to provide a 10% emission reduction by 2020, but no more after that. This paper uses the LCFS factor of nine-tenths for both 2020 and 2035, even though this may be overestimating reductions in 2035 because the factor is inappropriate for BEVs and the number of BEVs could become significant by 2035.

For at least the next decade and perhaps much longer, less driving will be needed to provide a large reduction in GHG, relative to current 2010 levels.

These factors can be observed in Figure 1 of an analysis by S. Winkleman,¹ based on CalTrans VMT forecast (red line), AB 1493 (“Pavley”, green line), and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS, purple line), compared with the AB 32 target of 1990 levels (light blue line). This Figure has been placed into this document for convenience. Note that the dark blue line, which combines all three factors, shows how the projected increase in VMT overwhelms GHG savings from cleaner fuels and vehicles. Decreasing VMT is the objective of SB 375.

2.0 Comments on the Introduction and Sections I and II of the Staff Report of August 9, 2010

2.1 Introduction (Page 1)

Some of the discussion contained in this section shows significant oversights.

For example, it says, “Planning strategies that promote social equity, such as affordable housing, accessible transit, and jobs-housing fit, are recognized as effective means of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. MPOs should promote equitable land use and transportation practices that result in inclusion, accessibility, efficient use of land, and decreased emissions.”

If CARB wants to mention equity, it should also discuss the most prevalent and significant forms of transportation-related practices which are unfair. The state of California funds roads with sources of revenue (sales taxes, property taxes, income taxes, and so-called “development fees”) that are unrelated to the decision to drive. This is unfair to those that drive less than average and it greatly increases driving. Similarly, the high cost of parking is generally hidden and forced upon everyone that pays rent, receives a wage, buys food, rides on a train with so called “free parking” at the station, and so on. This is unfair and should be fixed through good legislation. If government funding is involved, such as community colleges or housing with government subsidies, bundled parking cost violates equal protection of the law, and is therefore unconstitutional. As an example of the inequity, at an apartment where the cost of parking is bundled into the cost of the rent, families with no car could be paying rent that is $50 or even $100 dollars a month more than what it would be if the parking rent was separated out. This could be forcing families living on a monthly paycheck to go without adequate food at the end of the month, in order to pay the higher rent. Their neighbor could own many cars and be paying the exact same rent. CARB seems to be blind to these inequities that help families drive and park cars,
at the expense of families that happen to own fewer than the average number of cars or drive less than an average amount.

The introduction should also include the fact that CARB has a legal responsibility to set the MPO reductions so that the overall reductions needed by AB32 and the Governor’s Executive Order straight-line trajectory are met. This is discussed in Section 1 of this letter.

2.2 Section I, California’s Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (Page 4)

The following words tend to obscure the fact that state government has a responsibility to correct significant unfairness if local governments fail to do so:

While SB 375 requires regions to consider a variety of greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies, it reaffirms local government authority over land use decisions, and recognizes the critical role local governments play in implementing these kinds of strategies.

SB 375 does not reaffirm local control. SB 375 simply goes along with the common convention that state law usually does not interfere with local government authority over land-use decisions and car-parking policies. Unbundling the cost of parking happens to be a key strategy that could reduce driving. In addition, allowing the cost of parking to be hidden and forced upon even those that do not use the parking is so unfair that it calls for state intervention to protect those harmed. Where government support is involved, such as at schools and subsidized housing, the equal protection of the law, which is guaranteed by our constitution, is being denied those that do not park a car. The opinionated comment about “reaffirming local control” tends to obscure this profound and relevant fact. Since convenient and transparent car-parking reform will require both new hardware and software design and implementation, it is both logical and efficient for the state to play a major role.

Under the heading “AIR RESOURCES BOARD ROLE” on Page 6, comes the following true but insufficient statement:

ARB’s primary responsibility is to set greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets for passenger vehicles for each of California’s 18 federally designated MPOs by September 30, 2010. Targets are to be set for 2020 and 2035. In establishing the targets, ARB must take into account greenhouse gas reductions that will come from improved vehicle emission standards, changes in fuel composition, and other measures that it has adopted.

What this covers up is CARB’s responsibility to set these targets to at least meet the overall reduction requirements of AB 32 and the Governor’s Executive Order. However, this is not enough. CARB also has a responsibility to select targets that set an example, such that if the world followed California’s lead, humanity would avoid the devastation of a destabilized climate. The last sentence about what ARB must take into account is a technical detail. The profound truth that is fundamental to ARB’s mission is overlooked.

2.3 Section II, Target Setting Process (Page 8)

On page 16, under “Challenge of 2035 Targets” comes an admission which shows what a poor job CARB and the MPOs have done so far. It says:

There are several forecasting assumptions that may have a significant impact on greenhouse gas emission reductions in 2035. The cost of travel is one. It can affect travel behavior by influencing mode choice, as well as the frequency and length of trips. Uncertainties in predicting the cost of travel – which may include the purchase, maintenance, and fuel for a vehicle; transit fares; or travel fees in the form of tolls, parking pricing, or other costs – add to the challenge of setting 2035 targets. In addition, although the current models used by MPOs
have embedded travel costs, most do not yet account for the impacts of changes in travel cost on travel.

Rezoning for smart growth will not reduce VMT until projects get built. Getting projects built takes time. The amount of time required and the likelihood that a project will ever get built is dependant on the economy. Similarly, since good transit is expensive to build, it also depends on our economy. Finally, the extent to which California citizens decide to trade in their car for a more efficient model also depends on the economy. This shows that the strategies involving smart growth, transit, and Pavley are highly dependent on our economy, over which neither CARB nor the MPOs have much control. However, correcting the fundamental unfairness of how we pay for parking and driving is not dependent on the economy because it costs less than nothing. It costs less than nothing because if we properly price driving and parking, we will save money on road use, on not needing to build more roads, and on not needing as much car parking. Such strategies would yield immediate and significant VMT reductions. The above paragraph, from page 16 of the subject document shows how little thinking CARB and the MPOs been done on these two crucial strategies.

Nowhere in the target-setting process section does it show how targets are set to support AB32 and S-3-05.

3.0 Evaluation of the Proposed SANDAG Targets (Page 8)

On page 26, the values shown in Table 1 are given.

It is important to note the implications of the asterisked footnote and the fact that this target is per capita. It means that the calculation of the net GHG reduction estimates from these numbers require the use of factors to account for population growth, the Pavley reductions ("Pavley"), and the LCFS reductions, which can be taken from Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Proposed SANDAG Targets for 2020 and 2035 (Per capita GHG reduction from passenger vehicles relative to 2005)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita GHG Reduction</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent reduction numbers do not include emission reductions expected from Pavley Greenhouse Gas Vehicle Standards and Low Carbon Fuel Standard measures.

3.1 Adequacy, 2020 Targets, Compared to AB 32 Reductions

In order to estimate the net 2020 outcome of the Table 1 reduction of 7%, the per capita reduction target, the increase in population, the Pavley reduction, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard factors must be multiplied together. For the calculation, the following factors apply:

1. 0.93, for the per capita reduction in driving of 7%, from Table 1;
2. The factor for population is computed using the populations estimated in CARB’s http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo.co2.reduction.calc.pdf, namely 3,034,388 for 2005, and 3,635,855 for 2020. So the factor from 2005 to 2020 is
   \[ \frac{3,635,855}{3,034,388} = 1.198 \]
3. 0.825, for the 82.5%, shown for 2020, on the green “Pavley” line of Figure 1;
4. 0.90, for the reduction in low-carbon fuel standard (LCFS), as shown on the purple line of Figure 1.
Multiplying these four factors together results in a factor of \((.93) \times (1.198) \times (0.825) \times (0.90) = 0.827\). This is a 17% reduction and so it passes the reduction that would be in line with AB 32, which is around 13%, as shown in the 1990 light-blue line on Figure 1, which is also the first yellow “X” on Figure 1.

### 3.1.1 Need for “Pavley” and LCFS to Meet AB 32 Reductions

What is needed is a complete picture of what the various factors are providing. For example, it would be useful to know if both “Pavley” and the LCFS are needed to get the reductions within the AB 32 level. Therefore Tables 2 through 4 have been computed and appear here.

#### Table 2  Factors Used to Estimate 2020 GHG Reduction from 2005, With a 7% Driving Reduction, from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CARB Predict, SD</th>
<th>Pavley</th>
<th>LCFS</th>
<th>AB32 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT Only</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3  Results of Combining Factors to Estimate 2020 GHG Reductions, With a 7% Driving Reduction from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT Only</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4  Percent Reductions from Combining Factors to Estimate 2020 GHG Reductions, With a 7% Driving Reduction from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
<td>-17.3%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is therefore shown that for the proposed 7% reduction, both “Pavley” and the LCFS are needed to meet the AB 32 standards by 2020. There is always danger in relying on such events. For
example, if the economy remains poor, fewer people will want to spend the money to trade their car in for a more efficient model.

3.1.2 Conclusions Regarding 2020 Reductions, AB 32, & Reductions for Safety

For the 7% reduction, the following conclusions can be drawn. Both “Pavley” and the LCFS are needed to meet the AB 32 reduction. Since AB 32 is inadequate for the industrialized countries, when compared to the world-wide reductions needed to protect humanity from a catastrophic climate destabilization, the proposed reduction of 7% should be increased. This is especially true since the strategies described in Section 5 of this letter would reduce driving well below 7%. These strategies are good public policy for many reasons. They will show the world that we can adopt policies that will result in the GHG emission reductions needed to protect our climate.

3.2 Evaluation of CARB Draft SANDAG Targets for 2035

The -13% value shown in Table 1 will be evaluated.

3.2.1 Required Extrapolations

CARB’s South Coast AQMD Planning Liaison, Earl Withycombe, PE, told me (verbally, in a phone conversation) that CARB is free to ignore S-3-05 when they set the 2035 targets. He also told me that he was instructed by his management to NOT put that into an email. Ignoring S-3-05 is illegal. S-3-05 covers the years from 2020 to 2050 so this would include 2035. If CARB is able to ignore S-3-05, then the order has no effect in any agency. Refusing to put the assertion that they are free to ignore S-3-05 in writing shows a disappointing lack of transparency. It appears that CARB wants to be able to deny that it ever said that it could ignore S-3-05. On page 117 of CARB’s Climate Change Scoping Plan, the text refers to a linear trajectory of GHG reductions from AB32 levels down to the S-3-05 level. What is reasonable, legal, and in writing will be used in this evaluation.

Therefore, for 2035, it is necessary to extrapolate the Governor’s Executive Order target, which is Figure 1’s gold line, out to year 2035. It is 0.87 in 2020 and it is 0.64 in 2030. Therefore, in year 2035, it will be

\[ 0.64 + [(0.64 - 0.87)/(2030-2020)] \times (2035-2030) = 0.525 \]

Likewise, for 2035 it is necessary to extrapolate “Pavley”, Figure 1’s green line, out to year 2035. It is 0.82 in 2020 and it is 0.73 in 2030. Therefore, in year 2035 it will be

\[ 0.73 + [(0.73 - 0.82)/(2030-2020)] \times (2035-2030) = 0.685 \]

Note that Pavley 1 ends in 2017. It is widely assumed that it will be replaced by what is often called “Pavley 2”. If so, the extrapolation computed here is equivalent to assuming that California’s fleet of cars and light trucks will continue the trajectory forward from 2017, all the way to 2035. In other words, it is assumed that the slope of Pavley 2 will be equal to the slope of Pavley 1. At this time, this is the best assumption that can be made. Assuming that the California fleet will continually get more efficient, in terms of CO2 per mile driven, relies on an assumption that a significant fraction of our car owners will be able to purchase newer model cars.

3.2.2 Calculation and Discussion

For the calculation, the following factors apply:

1. 0.87, for the per capita reduction in driving, using the 13% reduction from Table 1;

2. The factor for population is computed using the populations estimated in CARB’s http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo.co2.reduction.calc.pdf, namely 3,034,388 for 2005 and 3,984,753 for 2035. So the factor from 2005 to 2035 is
\[ 3,984,753/3,034,388 = 1.313 \]

Therefore, use 1.313, from the calculation shown;

3. 0.685, from the above-computed extrapolation of the green "Pavley" line of Figure 1;

4. 0.90, for the reduction in low-carbon fuel standard (LCFS), as shown on the purple line of Figure 1.

Multiplying these four factors together results in a factor of \((0.87)(1.313)(0.685)(0.90) = 0.704\).

This is a 30.0% reduction, which is not even close to the required S-3-05 reduction value of 47.5%, from the above-computed extrapolation of the Governor’s Executive Order target fraction of 0.525.

This is a significant failure and indicates that neither the MPOs nor CARB are taking their climate crisis responsibilities seriously.

### 3.2.3 Calculation to Show Contributing Factors

Tables 5, 6, and 7 provide a complete picture of what the various factors are and how they fail to achieve the S-3-05 reductions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Factors Used to Estimate 2035 GHG Reduction from 2005, With a 13% Driving Reduction, from 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GHG Reduction Factors, 2005 to 2035</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VMT Per Capita Reduction of 13%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT Only</td>
<td>Population Arb Predict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.870</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Results of Combining Factors to Estimate 2035 GHG Reductions, With a 13% Driving Reduction from 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GHG Reductions, Combining Factors, 2005 to 2035, VMT Per Capita Reduction of 13%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.870</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7  Percent Reductions from Combining Factors to Estimate 2035 GHG Reductions, With a 13% Driving Reduction from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combining 2005 to 2035 GHG % Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting from a VMT Per Capita Reduction of 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.4 Calculation of Reduction to Meet the Governor’s Executive Order Reduction

The “VMT-Only” value that will support the S-3-05 value of .525 can be computed.

\[
\text{VMT} = \frac{.525}{(\text{Population Factor} \times \text{Pavley Factor} \times \text{LCFS Factor})}
\]

\[
\text{VMT} = \frac{.525}{(1.313 \times .685 \times .90)} = .64848
\]

This factor corresponds to percent reduction of \((1 - .64848) \times 100\% = 35.15\%\).

3.2.5 Calculation Using the Reduction to Meet S-3-05, Showing the Impacts of the Factors

The effects of the various factors are shown in Tables 8, 9, and 10.

Table 8  Factors Used to Estimate 2035 GHG Reduction from 2005, With a 35.15% Driving Reduction, from 2005

<p>| GHG Reduction Factors, 2005 to 2035 VMT Per Capita Reduction of 35.15% |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VMT Only</th>
<th>Population ARB for SD</th>
<th>Pavley</th>
<th>LCFS</th>
<th>GovExecOrder S-3-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.648</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9  Results of Combining Factors to Estimate 2035 GHG Reductions, With a 35.15% Driving Reduction from 2005

<p>| GHG Reductions, Combining Factors, 2005 to 2035, VMT Per Capita Reduction of 35.15% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-----------------------------</th>
<th>----------------</th>
<th>----------------</th>
<th>----------------</th>
<th>----------------</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 10  Percent Reductions from Combining Factors to Estimate 2035 GHG Reductions, With a 35.12% Driving Reduction from 2005

| Combining 2005 to 2035 GHG % Reductions With a VMT Per Capita Reduction of 35.15% |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| -35.2%                          | -14.8%                         | -41.7%                     | -47.5%                      | Yes            |

4.0  A Correct and Reasonable, Science-Driven 2035 Reduction

The Section 3 result of a 35.15% per-capita VMT reduction, required to meet the S-3-05 target for year 2035, is a reasonable starting point. Given the uncertainty of the Pavley reduction by 2035 and the fact that climate scientists have shown that we need large reductions soon and need to be essentially off fossil fuels by 2050, a more reasonable reduction value for 2035 is a 45% reduction.

Results from this assertion are shown in Tables 11, 12, and 13.

Table 11  Factors Used to Estimate 2035 GHG Reduction from 2005, With a 45% Driving Reduction, from 2005

| GHG Reduction Factors, 2005 to 2035 VMT Per Capita Reduction of 45% |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| VMT Only                        | Population ARB for SD | Pavley | LCFS | GovExecOrder S-3-05 |
| .550                            | 1.313             | .685     | .900    | .525          |

Table 12  Results of Combining Factors to Estimate 2035 GHG Reductions, With a 45% Driving Reduction from 2005

| GHG Reductions, Combining Factors, 2005 to 2035, VMT Per Capita Reduction of 45% |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| .550                            | .722                           | .495              | .445            | Yes          |
Table 13  Percent Reductions from Combining Factors to Estimate 2035 GHG Reductions, With a 45% Driving Reduction from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combining 2005 to 2035 GHG% Reductions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT Only</td>
<td>-45.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT &amp; Population</td>
<td>-27.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT &amp; Population &amp; Pavley</td>
<td>-50.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT &amp; Population &amp; Pavley &amp; LCFS</td>
<td>-55.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net meets S-3-05?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-47.5%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 13, the percent margin below the S-3-05 target is 8% (55.5-47.5). It can be shown that this corresponds to being nearly off carbon fuels by 2050, which is needed.

5.0 Fiscally Sound and Effective SCS Strategies

5.1 Introduction

This section will debunk SANDAG’s claim that its strategy set is “aggressive”. Nothing could be further from the truth. Significant reductions in driving can be achieved, as this section will show.

One strategy that the MPOs are trying to implement is enacting zoning changes to reduce sprawl. These changes typically increase densities and allow mixed use, especially around transit stations. These changes are said to support “smart growth”. SANDAG Directors have repeatedly been asked to define “smart growth” to be “VMT-reducing” growth, so that smart growth strategies and estimated outcomes could be quantified. These requests have been ignored. Therefore, SANDAG has done a poor job of creating their “Smart Growth Incentive Plan” and their “Smart Growth Design Guideline”. These documents had great potential. However, SANDAG preferred to keep the definition of “smart growth” vague, using such phrases as “pedestrian and bicycle friendly” so that decisions on spending money could remain arbitrary. Even so, the concept of improving zoning to reduce driving is sound. Over time and to the extent the economy supports growth, this will yield driving reductions. However, building smart growth requires a significant investment. Unless the economy improves dramatically, this strategy will produce VMT reductions that are too little and too late.

The MPOs need to identify all of the significant root causes of the car-oriented California lifestyle, besides just the urban sprawl that can only be partially mitigated by zoning specific and unique areas for smarter development. Several of these root causes are a direct result of government policies that create fundamental unfairness to those that drive less than average. MPOs need to fully develop strategies that eliminate these causes. These strategies would best be accomplished with both CARB and state legislative help.

The primary root causes are the poor methods used to get the public to pay for roads and parking. Fundamental changes in parking policy and road-use pricing, which are both related to the issue of congestion and freeway expansion, are never discussed in any depth at SANDAG. This oversight is reducing the chances of getting strategies that will bring down rates of driving on the scale that is needed. Such strategies would allow California to live up to its global warming responsibility and to do this in a way that is equitable to all.

5.2 Road Use Fee Pricing Systems

A San Diego County newspaper, the North County Times (NCT), in a February 9, 2009 article, reported that the Chair of the California Transportation Commission (CTC) wrote that the gas tax...
currently contributes nothing to road construction and only provides half of the money needed annually for repairs:
510076fafe.txt.

A Canadian company, *Skymeter*, is designing and installing a variable and comprehensive road-use fee pricing system, in the Netherlands by 2014 and in Denmark by 2016. The charge per mile will vary by such things as model of car, road, time of day, and congestion level. In 2005, the gas tax in the Netherlands was equivalent to $3.50 per gallon. However, with the advent of the new system, the Netherlands will eliminate the gas tax. The Netherlands estimates that the GHG from driving will drop by 10%, with the new system. Note that such a system could easily charge a price of zero cents per mile for a low-income driver. Our current system of a gas tax has no such capability. *Skymeter* will program the navigational-unit-like GPS boxes so that no travel information is stored, to protect driver privacy.

On July 11th 2009, the California Nevada Regional Conservation Committee (CNRCC) of the Sierra Club California passed a resolution supporting a “Comprehensive Road Use Fee Pricing System”.

The CNRCC resolution is supported by a 10-Page “Reference Document” that describes the defining characteristics of a road-use fee pricing system that would conform to Sierra Club principles. It has an example of a road-use fee structure that has these characteristics. Useful background information is also provided. This paper can be provided upon request.

On November 14th, the Environmental Caucus of the California Democratic Party (CDP) passed a 1-page resolution in support of a “Comprehensive Road-Use Fee Pricing System”. This one-page resolution contains the following words.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that the California Democratic Party* supports a state-funded study of a design of a road-use fee pricing system that (1) would pay for all road-use costs including the environmental and health costs caused by driving, (2) could still include a fuel tax or fee, (3) would mitigate impacts on low-income users and protect privacy, (4) would include congestion pricing when that technology becomes feasible, (5) would keep the per-mile price incentive to drive energy-efficient cars at least as large as it is with today’s fuel excise tax, and (6) could be accompanied by tax reductions sized to achieve either net-revenue neutrality or near-net-revenue neutrality.

*Not true because the resolution failed in the CDP Resolution Committee

The Nevada Department of Transportation is taking comments on a proposal for a VMT fee to replace their gas tax, as shown at http://www.vmtfeenv.com/. Oregon has done a proof of concept of a decentralized VMT system.

The 2010 Platform of the California Democratic Party (at http://www.cadem.org/aff/cf/7BBF9D7366-E5A7-41C3-8E3F-E06FB835FCC8%7D/Platform2010CDP_FINAL_June.pdf) has words that were in part inspired by the 1-page resolution identified above. These words are the following bullet:

- Work for equitable and environmentally-sound road and parking use

Using sales taxes, property taxes, income taxes, and other general taxes to pay for road expansion and operation makes it artificially cheap to drive. This is unjust to citizens that drive less than average. It also encourages driving. There is no reason why government should adopt policies that increase driving and economically discriminate against those that telecommute, walk, bike, car pool, or use transit. The unconstitutionality of the current system is plain to see since roads are built and maintained by the government. The government must be fair to citizens unless there is a
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significant reason to be unfair. Forcing people with no children to pay for education is justifiable because we will all suffer if we have a poor public education system. However, driving a car is not behavior that justifies government subsidy. Getting an education deserves subsidy; driving does not.

Considering all of this information, CARB has a responsibility to notify the Governor and our legislative leaders that our state has good reasons to implement a comprehensive and variable road-use fee pricing system. There is probably no reason to “reinvent the wheel”. The Skymeter system would work fine here in California. The Sierra Club California analysis can be considered to ensure an implementation that is both equitable to all and environmentally sound.

This strategy, by itself, would probably decrease driving throughout California by between 20% and 25%.

5.3 Unbundling the Cost of Car Parking

For the vast majority of destinations in California, the cost of car parking is hidden within other costs. This has serious consequences. For example, at most places of employment, parking costs reduce the wages that can be paid to all the employees, even those that never use the parking. Similarly, at most apartment complexes, bundled parking costs increase the rent and this is true, even for families that do not own a car. Bundled parking costs routinely increase the costs of goods, such as groceries, for all customers. Again, this is even true for those that do not drive. Since governments require businesses to provide minimum levels of parking, they are involved in this economic discrimination towards those that drive less.

Driving less is, to some degree, a lifestyle choice. Since government has no valid reason to encourage driving, the lifestyle choice of less driving deserves constitutional, or at least legal, protection from any practices that discriminate against it, economically. So far, this agency (CARB) has not taken an active role in educating the MPOs on how parking policy effects economic fairness or how parking policies that were more fair could reduce driving.

On June 22nd 2010, I presented a paper that I coauthored, on how parking could be operated to unbundle parking costs in a way that supports the sharing of parking. This was at the 101st Conference and Exhibit of the Air and Waste Management Association, in Calgary, Canada. The session, Sustainable Land Use and Transportation, included my paper, A Plan to Efficiently and Convenienly Unbundle Car Parking Costs. The paper was extremely well received.

My paper is therefore both peer reviewed and published. I would be pleased to present this paper to the staff of CARB, in the hopes that CARB could help to bring about equitable and environmentally-sound parking policies to California.

The following points, taken from the paper, apply.

- Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) are a major cause of global warming and pollution.
- California’s Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) will need to adopt strategies that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), in order to meet SB 375 GHG reduction targets, to be issued by the California Air Resources Board in late 2010, for years 2020 and 2035.
- The appropriate pricing of parking is one of the least costly tools documented to reduce VMT.
- New technologies, such as sensors feeding computer-generated billing, offer the potential to efficiently bill drivers for parking and alert law enforcement of trespassers.
- Reformed parking policies can increase fairness, so that, for example, people who use transit or walk do not have to pay higher prices or suffer reduced wages, due to parking.
• Methods to unbundle parking cost are inefficient unless they support the spontaneous sharing of parking spaces. Shared parking with unbundled cost would ultimately allow cities to require significantly less parking.

• Typical systems of timed parking and metered parking are far from ideal. Such parking has no automated record keeping, so it is difficult to know where there is too much or too little.

• Good policies will eventually let cities turn parking minimums into parking maximums.

Less land and resources devoted to parking will support mixed use and make “smart growth” more economically viable. It should therefore be a key ingredient supporting the MPO’s stated desire to foster “smart” growth, where “smart” should be defined as “less VMT”.

Here is a copy of the abstract of the paper.

The Introduction shows documented driving reductions due to the pricing of parking. It notes that although the benefits of priced and shared parking are known, such parking has not been widely implemented, due to various concerns. It states that a solution, called “Intelligent Parking,” will overcome some of these concerns, because it is easy to use and naturally transparent. It asserts that this description will support a “Request for Proposal” (RFP) process. Eight background information items are provided, including how priced parking would help California achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets. A story demonstrates some of the key features of Intelligent Parking. Arguments for less parking, shared parking, and priced parking are made. Barriers to progress are identified. The fair pricing of parking is described. New ways to characterize transportation demand management are presented. Seven goals of Intelligent Parking are listed. Eleven definitions and concepts, that together define Intelligent Parking, are described. This includes a method to compute a baseline price of parking and how to adjust that price instantaneously to keep the vacancy above 15% (“Congestion Pricing”). An implementation strategy is described.

This abstract aroused enough interest among those responsible for A&WMA’s Sustainable Land Use and Parking session that they requested that I submit a manuscript, which was ultimately selected to become part of the written Conference Proceedings and for presentation. I hope that it will similarly arouse the interest in the CARB Board and staff. CARB needs to consider working to execute the implementation strategy described in A Plan to Efficiently and Conveniently Unbundle Car Parking Costs. I would be honored to help in any way possible.

This strategy, by itself, would probably decrease driving throughout California by between 15% and 25%. This is shown by Table 1 of A Plan to Efficiently and Conveniently Unbundle Car Parking Costs.

5.4 Increase Bicycle Use: Education and Projects to Support Bicycle Transportation

The criteria for spending money for bicycle transportation should be to maximize the resulting estimated reductions in driving. The SANDAG board has been told this many times but they ignore this suggestion. SANDAG has so many criteria for bicycle projects that the result is that staff can spend their “bicycle money” however they want. As usual, the Directors provide no useful direction. CARB should urge the MPO Boards to be rationale in setting their policies. SANDAG has $270M to spend on bicycle transportation. The following strategies will maximize driving reductions.

5.4.1 Projects

Each of the smart growth place types, both existing and planned, should be checked to see if bicycle access could be substantially improved with either a traffic calming project, a “complete streets” project, more shoulder width, or a project to overcome some natural or made-made obstacle. These projects should be prioritized using a cost/benefit ratio metric. It is hereby assumed that 40% of the $270M
available for SANDAG’s Regional Bicycle Plan should be used to fund the projects. They should be selected for implementation, from the top of the list (lowest cost/benefit ratio) down, until the money (about $110M) is used up. An example of one of these projects, for the proposed town center near the corner of I-5 and SR-78, is to build a pedestrian/bike bridge, over I-5, to reconnect West Vista Way in Oceanside. This would better connect a coastal neighborhood with a large regional shopping center. The current bicycle route requires more distance and a significant hill to climb over.

5.4.2 Education

The remaining 60% of the $270M, about $160M, should be used to

1.) Teach interested adults about bicycle accident statistics (most serious injuries occur to cyclists in accidents that do not involve a motor vehicle), car-bike accident statistics (most are caused by wrong-way riding and errors in intersections; clear cut, hit-from-behind is rare), and how to ride in all conditions, to minimize problems.

2.) Teach riding-in-traffic skills and how to ride in other challenging conditions, by having the class members and instructor go out into real conditions and ride together, until proficiency is achieved.

Students that pass a rigorous written test and demonstrate proficiency in riding in traffic and other challenging conditions are paid for their time and effort. These classes should be based on the curriculum developed by the League of American Bicyclists and taught by instructors certified by the League.

Assuming a class size of 3 riders per instructor and that each rider passes both tests and earns $100 and that the instructor, with overhead, costs $500 dollars, for a total of $800 for each 3 students, means that the $160M could educate $160M/$800 = 200,000 classes of 3 students, for a total of 600,000 students.

This is about 20% of the population of San Diego County.

This strategy, by itself, would decrease driving in San Diego County by at least 5%.

5.5 Replacing Freeway Expansion Projects by Transit Redesign, Construction, and Operations

5.5.1 Background Information

SANDAG’s 2007 RTP, “RTP2030”, called for increasing the number of freeway lanes by 38%. This would be in a region that already had one of the highest VMT-per-capita metrics in the state.

SANDAG also supported a sales tax measure, “TRANSNET”, that was advertised as one that would spend two-thirds of its money on roads and one-third on transit. However, after it was passed, SANDAG defined all HOV lanes to be “transit”, thereby significantly reducing the fraction of money spent on true transit.

Out of a $57 billion dollar budget for RTP2030, SANDAG budgeted about 1% for mitigation. This mitigation is split evenly between “smart growth” incentive money and a Regional Bicycle Plan. They have published a Smart Growth Incentive Plan, a Smart Growth Design Guideline, as well as the Regional Bicycle Plan. SANDAG has an excellent staff. However, the Board does not provide useful direction. One obvious direction needed was to adopt a metric of reducing VMT to decide what “smart growth” should get funding, what “smart growth” design guidelines should be adopted, and what bicycle programs should be funded. They were asked repeatedly to put citizen comments, directed toward the early drafts of these documents, online, to be viewed by all. Not doing this made it easy for the staff to ignore significant public comment and to instead spend bike money mostly for trails and smart-growth money for beautification projects in areas deemed suitable for eventual smart growth. If reduced driving reductions were used as a criteria for spending money, then funding the League of American Bicyclist’s class on how to ride a bike in traffic and the development of equitable and environmentally-sound parking policy (good enough to be politically acceptable), would have been a large part of the spending. Instead, bicycle education and car-parking policies were marginalized to the point of being essentially unfunded.
5.5.2 Putting a Stop to Freeway Expansion

One of the most powerful strategies to reduce GHG would be to stop expanding freeways. Instead of costing money, it would generate money. It is well understood that the metric of freeway-lane miles per square mile of developed land increases an area's average car-trip length and thereby increases VMTs. SANDAG is ignoring this fact and this is probably one of the primary reasons that its 2035 GHG Reduction Target is unacceptably small. When the SANDAG TRANSNET tax was passed, few voters understood that we were threatened with a climate catastrophe and that our responsibility was to drive significantly less. Given our current understanding, SANDAG has a responsibility to go back to voters with a ballot measure that reconfigures TRANSNET to be 100% for transit, bicycles, and pedestrians.

One current freeway-widening project being considered is to widen I-5 from 8 to either 12 or 14 lanes, from La Jolla to Camp Pendleton, at a cost of over $4 billion dollars. The DEIR was released in early July. Caltrans is holding public meetings, where no member of the public is allowed to speak publicly. It sent postcard notifications to those living along the route. However, instead of honestly notifying the recipients of the radical, land-consuming nature of the proposal, these postcards only refer to a "managed lane project". Nowhere on the postcard was there any information suggesting a wider freeway, a taking of land, a reducing of property-tax rolls, an increase in noise, an increase in driving, an increase in air pollution, an increase in GHG or even that there is any kind of construction project being proposed.

If TRANSNET was reconfigured to support transit, the Coaster service, for example, could be redesigned into an electric, automated system that would operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. With skip-stop stations, travel time from Oceanside to San Diego could be substantially decreased, especially at off-peak times.

This strategy, by itself, would decrease driving in San Diego County by between 5% and 10%.

6.0 Conclusions

Targets will have to be more stringent than the AB 32 and S-3-05 target trajectories if we are going to fulfill our world leadership responsibility and give the world a chance at avoiding climate destabilization. The 2020 Target of -7% (per-capita from VMT) can only result in an AB 32 level reduction if both "Pavley" and the LCFS factors are used. The 2035 reduction target of -13% would have to instead be -35.15%, to just meet the straight-line trajectory of S-3-05 for 2035, and this is assuming the Pavley reductions continue on the "Pavley 1" trajectory all the way to 2035. This assumption about "Pavley" may be overly optimistic. The science-supported 2035 reduction is -45%.

The best, largely overlooked strategies to reduce VMT are a comprehensive and variable road use fee pricing system, as is being installed by Skymeter; unbundling the cost of car parking; good bicycle projects and bicycle education; putting a stop to all freeway expansions; and reconfiguring sales taxes for freeways or freeway/transit combinations to instead be 100% for transit. These strategies could easily be implemented by 2020 and would easily decrease per capita driving by a sum of at least 45%. The strategies to do this are primarily those that increase fairness for families that drive less than average.

Given this set of conclusions, it is clear that the reductions proposed for SANDAG are neither just nor reasonable. By extension, this is true for the reductions proposed for the other MPOs.

Sincerely yours,

mike_bullock@earthlink.net
760-754-8025
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San Diego Chapter
8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd, Ste 101
San Diego, CA 92111
http://www.sandiego.sierraclub.org
858-569-6005

First Vice-Chair Jerome Stocks and Members of the Board
San Diego Area Government Board of Directors
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Via E-mail Johnston, Phillip <pj@sandag.org>

Re: SANDAG’s Proposed 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

First Vice-Chair Jerome Stocks and Members of the Board:

The Transportation Committee of the San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club (SDSC) appreciates the opportunity to communicate with you concerning this important topic.

Government’s first responsibility is the immediate and life-long health and safety of its constituents. This includes the just-born, who may be exposed to significant risk from climate change. Each office holder has this responsibility. The proposed RTP projects will cost over $110B, out to 2050, which is the horizon year. Getting the best-possible RTP merits serious and on-going consideration by all local officials. It is your primary responsibility.

S-3-05, Background, Importance, Relevance, and Conclusion

The current level of greenhouse gas (GHG\(^1\)) in our earth’s atmosphere is 390 parts per million (PPM). This is higher than it has been for over 800,000 years. Before the combustion of significant amounts of fossil fuel, this value was considerably lower. For example, in 1860, the value was around 280 PPM. Although “PPM” makes these values sound insignificant, they are not. If the level of greenhouse gas were to approach zero, our planet would become too cold to support most of its current life forms.

Reference 1 is S-3-05, a Governor’s Executive Order. This document was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger in 2005, less than 19 months after he assumed office. It calls for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 2000 levels, by 2010; to 1990 levels, by 2020; and to 80% below 1990 levels, by 2050. These reductions are to be met with efforts coordinated and reported by the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency (“the Secretary”). The Secretary receives progress and planning reports from the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency; the Chair of the California Air Resources Board (CARB); and others. This reporting occurs biannually (every 6 months).

The S-3-05 reduction levels are not arbitrary. The entire world must achieve these reductions to limit our planet’s GHG levels to 450 PPM. At the time S-3-05 was written, 450 PPM was thought to create a reasonable safety margin from a catastrophic destabilization of our climate\(^2\). These

---

\(^1\) This is more precisely carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping gases, but omitting water vapor.

\(^2\) It is now understood that any value over 350 PPM is unacceptably dangerous. This is the primary message of the world-wide organization, 350.org.
reductions were designed so that California would set an example of responsible leadership for other states and governments.

The Business, Transportation and Housing Agency is the parent organization of Caltrans. Clearly, both Caltrans and CARB have significant roles to play in achieving the S-3-05 reductions.

Both are failing. Caltrans has written an unacceptable DEIR for I-5. That DEIR shows that Caltrans is only interested in expanding freeway systems. CARB has issued SANDAG a SB-375, per-capita, driving reduction target, for year 2035, of 13%. However, in order to support S-3-05, this target reduction must be 35%. Both CARB and your SANDAG Board have been asked to check the calculations of the needed 35% reduction for 2035 (References 2 and 3). Your Board, SANDAG staff and, CARB have all failed to respond to these requests.

CARB's South Coast AQMD Planning Liaison, Earl Withercombe has stated that CARB is free to ignore S-3-05 in setting the 2035 targets. He also stated that his management ordered him to NOT put that opinion into an email. This shows an unacceptable lack of transparency. CARB apparently wants to be able to deny that any of its responsible employees ever said that it could ignore S-3-05. On page 117 of CARB's Climate Change Scoping Plan, the text refers to a linear trajectory of GHG reductions, from AB 32 levels of 2020, down to the S-3-05 level of 2050.

Figure 1 is from http://www.nrdc.org/globalwarming/sb375/files/sb375.pdf, one of the most widely-respected reports on SB-375. Its gold line is the S-3-05 trajectory that CARB wants to ignore. Figure 1 shows that significant driving reductions are needed (to get the blue line down onto the gold line).

**Figure 1** GHG Reductions from Pavley (AB 1493, in Green) and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (in Purple); the Caltrans Predicted Driving (VMT, in Red); the Net Result of GHG (C02, in Blue); and the AB 32 & S-3-05 Trajectory (in Gold)

At Senator Kehoe's Senate Transportation Public hearing, in Solana Beach (11/8/10), CARB Chair Mary Nichols stated that the 13% reduction, given to SANDAG for year 2035, "supported AB 32".

---

3 One indication is that with less than 3 weeks to go, California will fail the 2010 S-3-05 reduction target.

4 Mr. Withercombe made these statements in a telephone conversation.
However, AB 32 only calls for reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. It says nothing about what is required for the years after 2020. Chair Nichols said nothing about the critically-important S-3-05.

Your Board and SANDAG staff are happy to accept the inadequate reduction value of 13% and proclaim that the non-no-build “RTP Scenarios” (RTPs under consideration) will achieve that reduction. However, none of the current “scenarios” can achieve the needed 35% reduction.

The world is watching California to find out if our state agencies and regional governments are serious in implementing S-3-05. Your Board, SANDAG staff, and CARB are negligent for failing to fulfill their responsibilities regarding climate change, because their actions are likely to contribute significantly to a climate catastrophe.

**RTP2050, Background and Conclusions**

In 2007 your Board and staff produced **RTP2030**, an RTP that ignored the realities of Figure 1; namely, that we are going to have to reduce driving. It called for a 38% increase in the total number of freeway-lane-miles in San Diego County, a county that already had an unacceptably high per-capita level of driving. Reference 4 documents that there was serious concern that **RTP2030** was sufficiently flawed that it would result in SANDAG being sued by California’s Attorney General. Although that did not happen, under your direction, SANDAG entered into a legal settlement with SOFAR, whose complaint letter is shown in Reference 5. If the new Attorney General decides to file a suit against SANDAG’s 2050RTP, our new Governor might join with her.

Your so-called **Hybrid Scenario** is currently being considered for adoption, with the first vote possible on December 17th, this Friday. This **Hybrid Scenario** is unacceptable. It contains even more freeway expansions than **RTP2030**. For example, in the **Hybrid Scenario**, I-5, from La Jolla Village drive to Palomar Airport Road, is expanded to 14 lanes, instead of being expanded to 12 lanes, as specified by **RTP2030**.

There have been hundreds of comment letters regarding the I-5 DEIR. The authors are concerned and opinionated about transportation, the law, and the environment. Many of their comments would apply to the DEIR that would be prepared for the **Hybrid Scenario**. Senator Kehoe and San Diego Council Member Lightner both wrote letters, regarding the I-5 DEIR. These letters were described in the press. Many of their points will apply to the **Hybrid Scenario**.

Figure 8 of Reference 6 shows that the majority of county voters support a true transit emphasis. Please shift TransNet funds from highway projects to transit projects. This may require a new ballot measure. Please consider putting this topic on a future Board agenda.

Your Board members have a responsibility to protect the interests (health, quality of life, property values) of residents in their city (County), NOT people driving through their city (County). Residents are living with 6 and 8-lane freeways going through their neighborhoods. This is more than enough sacrifice on the part of residents.

---

5 AG-elect Harris has said she will be as pro-active as our current AG in protecting our environment. Our current governor supported a proposed 6-lane toll road through San Onofre state park, as did most of the politicians in Orange County. However, AG Brown did not. You may find that you have few influential friends in Sacramento if you attempt to defend the **Hybrid Scenario** or a similar RTP.

6 You considered sending an I-5-DEIR letter to CALTRANS. On 11/5 you requested a draft letter and placed this item on your 11/16 agenda, with only 2 dissenters. On 11/16, you voted 11-4 to not send such a letter, without allowing Board debate. The draft letter omitted some requested and critical detail about improved Coaster service.
Personal transportation emits 41% of the greenhouse gas (GHG) in our County (Page 4 of http://catcher.sandiego.edu/items/epic/GHG-On-Road1.pdf.pdf) Adding freeway lanes would increase our vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and GHG for two reasons. First, it would encourage people to live further from their work, given any fixed condition of development. Second, it would result in more urban-sprawl development. Both effects would increase VMT.

Please work for a true "Transit Emphasis" RTP, meaning an RTP with NO freeway expansions, with the best transit possible, and with the best transportation-demand-management (TDM) strategies possible. Such TDM strategies would include unbundling the cost of driving and parking. There is more detail in Reference 2.

Please advise us if you have any questions about these comments. Thank you for your leadership.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Bullock
1800 Bayberry Drive
Oceanside, Ca 92054
760-754-8025
Chair of the Sierra Club San Diego Transportation Committee

References
1. S-3-05 (Attached in this Email.)
2. Bullock to CARB (Attached in this Email.)
3. Speech, Bullock to SANDAG (Attached in this Email.)
5. SOFAR to SANDAG (available upon request.)
6. San Diego Voter Poll (Attached in this Email.)

The San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club is San Diego’s oldest and largest grassroots environmental organization, founded in 1948. Encompassing San Diego and Imperial Counties, the San Diego Chapter seeks to preserve the special nature of the San Diego and Imperial Valley area through education, activism, and advocacy. The Chapter has over 14,000 members. The National Sierra Club has over 700,000 members in 65 Chapters in all 50 states, and Puerto Rico.
TO: The San Diego Foundation

FR: David Metz & Curtis Below
    Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz and Associates

RE: Key Findings from Recent Countywide Survey on Climate Change

DATE: September 14, 2010

Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) recently completed a survey of San Diego County voters assessing attitudes toward climate change. Specifically, the research was designed to determine the views, values and perspectives of County residents toward the local impacts of climate change and the public’s appetite for the policies needed to address it. Additionally, it will serve as a tool for policy makers and planners to better understand community opinions and enable all stakeholders to work together as local climate change policies are developed and implemented.

The survey results themselves show that San Diego County voters are concerned about global warming and want the San Diego region to take a leadership role in addressing the issue. Moreover, the results show that this high level of support cuts across many demographic groups. Not surprisingly, when asked conceptually about two of California’s landmark greenhouse gas emission reduction laws – AB 32 and SB 375 – San Diego voters demonstrated strong support for each, as well as for specific steps that might be taken to implement each. More broadly, by a large margin voters share the opinion that we do not need to choose between a strong economy and a healthy environment, a point underscored by the fact that three times as many voters believe that addressing global warming will create more jobs (47%) than will cause there to be fewer jobs (14%).

Among the key specific findings of the survey are the following:
Voters overwhelmingly believe the San Diego region should take a leadership position in setting goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In total, 72 percent of voters surveyed agreed with the statement, “San Diego County should take a statewide leadership position in setting goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions,” including nearly half of all voters (48%) who agreed “strongly” (Figure 1).

**FIGURE 1**
Support for San Diego County Taking a Leadership Role in Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions

_Would you agree or disagree with the following statement: San Diego County should take a statewide leadership position in setting goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions._

- **Total Agree**
  - Strongly: 48%
  - Somewhat: 24%
  - Total: 72%

- **Total Disagree**
  - Somewhat: 16%
  - Strongly: 10%
  - Total: 26%

- **Don’t Know**
  - 2%

The results further suggest that support for San Diego region taking a leadership role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions is shared by San Diegans of many different walks of life, notably including majorities of Republicans and moderates, but also including majorities of Democrats, independents, and liberals, and voters of every level of education, ethnic background, age group and income level.

- **San Diego voters are most concerned that global warming could reduce local water supplies and increase the risk of severe wildfires.** As shown in Figure 2 on the following page, majorities of voters were concerned about most potential impacts of global warming, but were particularly concerned about the “reduction of our water supply” (80% concerned) and the “increased risk of severe fires” (78% concerned). Additionally, though three in five (61%) were concerned about “heat waves,” relative to the other impacts it was seen as the least worrisome potential outcome of global warming.
FIGURE 2
Concerns about Different Potential Global Warming Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Total Concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of our water supply</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased risk of severe fires</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of coastal lands and beaches as sea levels rise and erosion increases</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to human health, including more cases of asthma and other respiratory diseases</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher costs to the public to deal with the impacts of global warming</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of native plants and animals</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased energy supply to meet energy needs</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of jobs</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat waves</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Despite the weak economy, San Diego County voters don’t believe we have to choose between strengthening the economy and having a clean and healthy environment. Given the choice between competing arguments – that we can have a clean environment and strong economy without having to choose one over the other, or that a clean environment and strong economy are sometimes “in conflict” and we must choose one over the other – San Diego voters, by a wide margin (77 to 18 percent), believe we can attain both goals simultaneously (Figure 3).

FIGURE 3
Attitudes toward the Environment and Economy

We can have a clean environment and a strong economy at the same time without having to choose one over the other. OR Sometimes a clean environment and a strong economy are in conflict and we must choose one over the other.

Both/Neither/Don’t Know

- Many San Diego County voters believe addressing global warming would create more jobs for people in the County; few believe taking such actions would result in job losses. Only 14 percent of voters were of the opinion that San Diego County taking
action to reduce global warming – including expanding renewable energy and technology, and requiring pollution reductions – would result in fewer jobs (Figure 4). In comparison, three quarters of respondents (74%) thought that such policies would result in more jobs (47%), or would not affect the number of jobs (27%).

**Figure 4**
**Perceived Impact on Jobs from San Diego County Addressing Global Warming**

- **More jobs**: 47%
- **Would not affect the number of jobs**: 27%
- **Fewer jobs**: 14%
- **Don't know**: 12%

- By a two to one margin voters in San Diego County agree with the principles of AB 32. Voters in San Diego County were read a description of California's Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32), and asked whether they favored or opposed the law. As shown in Figure 5, 62 percent of voters favored AB 32 while 29 percent opposed it (only 9% were unsure). Furthermore, 43 percent indicated they “strongly” favored AB 32, representing more than two in five San Diego County voters.

**Figure 5**
**Voters’ Reactions to the Primary Goal of AB 32**

*To address global warming, do you favor or oppose the state law that requires California to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions back to 1990 levels by the year 2020?*

- **Total Favor**: 43% (Strongly) / 19% (Somewhat) / 62%
- **Total Oppose**: 21% (Strongly) / 8% (Somewhat) / 29%
- **Don't Know**: 9%
These results were similar to a recent statewide survey conducted by the Public Policy Institute of California, in which 67 percent of California voters indicated they favored AB 32 and only 21 percent opposed the law.

- Similarly, seven in ten voters hold a favorable view of SB 375 and support its implementation by SANDAG. Relative to support for AB 32, an even greater proportion of voters in San Diego County think highly of the County’s implementation of SB 375. As shown in Figure 6, 70 percent of voters indicated they support SANDAG’s implementation of SB 375, while only 23 percent were opposed to it.

**Figure 6**

**Voters’ Reactions to the Primary Goal of SB 375**

*The San Diego Association of Governments – or SANDAG – is developing a regional plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution; promote shorter commutes; and conserve open space and natural areas in San Diego County through a variety of methods, including focusing the building of new homes in areas near jobs and schools, reducing commutes and traffic, and providing more transportation choices. Based on this description, would you favor or oppose SANDAG developing such a plan?*

- San Diego County voters strongly support the key policies that would be implemented under these two laws. Survey respondents were given a list of some of the key steps that might be taken to implement AB 32 and were asked to indicate – on a scale from one to seven – whether they would support or oppose each provision; a rating of “seven” signified strong support, a rating of “one” strong opposition, and a “four” represented neutrality. As shown in Figure 7 on the following page, each provision was supported (as indicated by a rating of five, six or seven) by at least seven in ten voters. In fact, over 50 percent of voters expressed strong support (as indicated by a rating of seven) for “expanding the use of clean energy” (53%) and “making large polluters pay fees based on the amount they pollute” (52%).
**FIGURE 7**
Support for Potential Provisions to be Implemented Under AB 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Proportion Rating Each Item 5-7 (Indicating Support)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanding the use of clean energy</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making large polluters pay fees based on the amount they pollute</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding the use of clean technology</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring industrial plants, oil refineries, and commercial facilities to reduce their emissions</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring utilities to generate one-third of their energy from renewable sources, such as solar and wind power</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring automakers to further reduce the emissions of greenhouse gas pollution by increasing mileage of new cars</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring diesel trucks to reduce their emissions</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring an increase in energy efficiency for residential and commercial buildings and appliances</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding SB 375, survey respondents were asked to indicate which should be the highest priority for future investments to improve transportation in San Diego County, “the expansion of roads and highways” or “the expansion of public transit, including buses and rail.” As shown in **Figure 8**, a solid majority of voters prioritize expanding public transit – a likely component of any SB 375 regional plan – over expanding roads and highways.

**FIGURE 8**
Voters’ Preferences between Expanding Public Transit or Roads and Highways

The expansion of public transit, including buses and rail

**OR**

The expansion of roads and highways

Both/Neither/Don't Know

[Bar graph showing 55% for public transit, 32% for roads and highways, and 13% for both/neither/don't know]
Additionally, survey respondents were asked about another key component of implementing SB 375 — locating homes and jobs closer together and near transit (i.e. more compact and transit-friendly development). Nearly three-quarters of voters (73%) indicated they would support such development, with nearly one-half (46%) expressing strong support (Figure 9).

**FIGURE 9**
**Voters Support for More Compact and Transit-Friendly Development**

*Would you support or oppose locating more homes and jobs closer together and near transit in your community, providing people with more choices to shorten commute times and reduce pollution?*

- **Total Support**: 46% Strongly, 27% Somewhat, 73%
- **Total Oppose**: 12% 10% 22%
- **Don't Know**: 5%

Furthermore, the survey results suggest that in addition to addressing climate change, San Diego County voters see many other important benefits of implementing SB 375. For example, at least two-thirds of voters indicated that protecting clean water, forests, wildlife habitat and San Diego’s coastline; stimulating the economy through public transit investments; reducing water consumption; and reducing wildfire risks were all convincing reasons for the County to draft its SB 375 regional plan.

Taken together, the survey results show that San Diego County voters recognize global warming is a significant issue and strongly desire the San Diego region to address the problem head-on for the benefit of their environment, their economy, and their quality of life. Furthermore, voters believe that we can have a clean environment and strong economy without having to choose one over the other. In fact, nearly one-half (47%) believe that addressing global warming will create more jobs for people living in San Diego County. Overall, the opinions reflected in this survey suggest voters broadly support the policy goals of AB 32 and SB 375 and want San Diego County to be a leader in setting standards for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and more compact, transit-friendly development.
Methodology: From August 10-18, 2010, FM3 completed 1,205 telephone interviews with registered voters in San Diego County. The margin of error for the full sample is +/- 3.1%; margins of error for subgroups within the sample are higher. Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100%.

This research was funded by The San Diego Foundation’s Climate Initiative.

AB 32, also known as the California Global Warming Solutions Act, was passed by the California State Legislature in 2006 and requires California to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions back to 1990 levels by the year 2020. SB 375 was passed by the California State Legislature in 2008 and requires each metropolitan region to adopt a “sustainable community strategy” in its regional transportation plans to encourage compact development that aligns with regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board.
Michael Bullock
1800 Bayberry Drive
Oceanside, CA 92054
760-754-8025 (183 words, 2 minutes)

SANDAG Board,

The proposed targets are too low. Especially the value for 2035

1.) Just to show how far off CARB targets are, for 2035, I will use a “huge” 20% reduction, to result in a 2005 to 2035 factor, per capita driving of .8.

2.) For population, I will use the SANDAG populations figures, shown in http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo.co2.reduction.calc.pdf, which is a growth of from 3034388 to 3984753, for a factor of (the larger over the smaller) 1.313.

3.) It can be shown that the the Pavley reduction, extrapolated out to 2035, gives a very nice reduction factor of .685.

4.) The LCFS factor is .9.

5.) It can be shown that the straight-line trajectory of the reduction, needed to get 80% down by 2050, for 2035, is .525.

The four factors are multiplied to give (.8)(1.313)(.685)(.9) = .648. This is not good enough. We need this to be at least as low as .525.

A reduction of 35.1% will do the trick: (.649)(1.313)(.685)(.9) = .525

Please ask your staff to verify my conclusion that a 35.1% reduction is needed to support the Governor’s Executive Order.

Thank you. mike_bullock@earthlink.net
EXECUTIVE ORDER S-3-05
by the Governor of the State of California

WHEREAS, California is particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change; and WHEREAS, increased temperatures threaten to greatly reduce the Sierra snowpack, one of the State’s primary sources of water; and WHEREAS, increased temperatures also threaten to further exacerbate California’s air quality problems and adversely impact human health by increasing heat stress and related deaths, the incidence of infectious disease, and the risk of asthma, respiratory and other health problems; and

WHEREAS, rising sea levels threaten California’s 1,100 miles of valuable coastal real estate and natural habitats; and WHEREAS, the combined effects of an increase in temperatures and diminished water supply and quality threaten to alter micro-climates within the state, affect the abundance and distribution of pests and pathogens, and result in variations in crop quality and yield; and WHEREAS, mitigation efforts will be necessary to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adaptation efforts will be necessary to prepare Californians for the consequences of global warming; and

WHEREAS, California has taken a leadership role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions by: implementing the California Air Resources Board motor vehicle greenhouse gas emission reduction regulations; implementing the Renewable Portfolio Standard that the Governor accelerated; and implementing the most effective building and appliance efficiency standards in the world; and WHEREAS, California-based companies and companies with significant activities in California have taken leadership roles by reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide and hydrofluorocarbons, related to their operations and developing products that will reduce GHG emissions; and WHEREAS, companies that have reduced GHG emissions by 25 percent to 70 percent have lowered operating costs and increased profits by billions of dollars; and

WHEREAS, technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions are increasingly in demand in the worldwide marketplace, and California companies investing in these technologies are well-positioned to profit from this demand, thereby boosting California’s economy, creating more jobs and providing increased tax revenue; and WHEREAS, many of the technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions also generate operating cost savings to consumers who spend a portion of the savings across a variety of sectors of the economy; this increased spending creates jobs and an overall benefit to the statewide economy.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor of the State of California, by virtue of the power invested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the State of California, do hereby order effective immediately: 1. That the following greenhouse gas emission reduction targets are hereby established for California: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels; and 2. That the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency ("Secretary") shall coordinate oversight of the efforts made to meet the targets with: the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, Secretary of the Department of Food and Agriculture, Secretary of the Resources Agency, Chairperson of the Air Resources Board, Chairperson of the Energy Commission, and the President of the Public Utilities Commission; and 3. That the Secretary shall report to the Governor and the State Legislature by January 2006 and biannually thereafter on progress made toward meeting the greenhouse gas emission targets established herein; and 4. That the Secretary shall also report to the Governor and the State Legislature by January 2006 and biannually thereafter on the impacts to California of global warming, including impacts to water supply, public health, agriculture, the coastline, and forestry, and shall prepare and report on mitigation and adaptation plans to combat these impacts; and 5. That as soon as hereafter possible, this Order shall be filed with the Office of the Secretary of State and that widespread publicity and notice be given to this Order. IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed this the first day of June 2005. Is/ Arnold Schwarzenegger Governor of California
December 14, 2010

City Council and Redevelopment Agency  
City of San Diego, 202 C Street  
San Diego, California 92101

Subject: RA-1 – Create an Ad-Hoc Committee of the Redevelopment Agency.

Dear City Council and the Redevelopment Agency:

The following are our suggestions and recommendations for the Ad-Hoc Committee of the Redevelopment Agency:

1. **Merge** the Redevelopment Agency with both CCDC and SEDC to use Tax Increment citywide instead of concentrating on downtown, plus to save on Administration and Rent.

2. **Adopt an Amendment** for the Redevelopment Cap for more Stringent Affordable Housing requirements including changing the Affordable Housing Set Aside from 20 percent to 30 percent of Tax Increment, and targeting funds to the Low, Very Low, and Extremely Low Income levels in accordance with Health and Safety Code Sections 33333.10 (f) and (g).

3. **Move all the Housing Set Aside Funds (20 to 30 percent) to the San Diego Housing Commission** into a Locked Box account, which will ensure all the Housing money will be used for Housing only.

4. After Merging the 17 Project Areas into one large Project Area, **subdivide the new Project Area into Sub-Areas** according to City Council Districts, existing Neighborhood Planning Groups, etc.

5. Currently only 7 of the 17 Redevelopment Project Areas have operating local volunteer Project Area Committees. We recommend that all 17 Redevelopment Project Areas and/or Sub-Areas **should have their own local Project Area and/or Sub-Area Committee** consisting of local residents and nearby neighbors immediately.


Regards,

Katheryn Rhodes and Conrad Hartsell MD
rhodes@laplayaheritage.com 619-523-4350

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2011 RDA Budget (in Millions)</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>CCDC</th>
<th>SEDC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011 Tax Increment (20% Housing + 80%)</td>
<td>$44.9</td>
<td>$125.3</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
<td>$175.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Bonds, Credit, Proceeds, Interest, Lease, Prior Year</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$29.3</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
<td>$36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES (in Millions)</strong></td>
<td>$46.5</td>
<td>$154.6</td>
<td>$10.7</td>
<td>$211.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIXED EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Payment - Tax Sharing (including County/Education/ERAF)</td>
<td>$13.1</td>
<td>$25.1</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Debt Repayments to City (including CDBG and Petco Park)</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$13.3</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Debt Services on Bonds (Previous Projects)</td>
<td>$8.1</td>
<td>$44.3</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>$55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VARIABLE EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for Affordable Housing and Capital Projects</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
<td>$61.1</td>
<td>$4.1</td>
<td>$84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Administration</td>
<td>$3.9</td>
<td>$7.2</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of City Services/Audit/County Administration Fee</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES (in Millions)</strong></td>
<td>$46.5</td>
<td>$154.6</td>
<td>$10.7</td>
<td>$211.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
http://blogofsandiego.com/Elections.htm#12/07/10

12/07/10  The TRUE story behind raising the CCDC cap by Pat Flannery.

The California State Legislature created a process whereby cities can borrow against future property tax revenue for the primary purpose of expanding the supply of low-and-moderate-income housing. The process is called "redevelopment". "The Legislature finds and declares that a fundamental purpose of redevelopment is to expand the supply of low-and moderate-income housing, to expand employment opportunities for jobless, underemployed, and low-income persons, and to provide an environment for the social, economic, and psychological growth and well-being of all citizens."

This original Redevelopment Law required each redevelopment agency to set aside 20% of its tax increment revenues and put it into a "low and moderate income housing" fund, commonly known as the "affordable housing" fund. CCDC fulfilled its affordable housing requirement by creating all "moderate" income housing and no "low, very low, or extremely low" income housing. In San Diego, "moderate" income housing is very close to "market" price housing. The original Redevelopment Law also provided that in the event a redevelopment agency amends its project plan in any way, it triggers the following more stringent affordable housing set aside requirements:

(1) the 20% set aside would increase to 30%;
(2) expenditure on "moderate" could only happen when at least 49% had already been spent on "low, very low, or extremely low";
(3) total "moderate" could not exceed the total of "extremely low income" in any 5 year period;
(4) total "moderate" could not exceed 15% of the total set aside fund in any 5 year period;
(5) the number of "moderate" units could not exceed the number of "extremely low income" units at any time.

CCDC wished to remove its revenue cap while continuing to avoid the "low, very low, or extremely low" income housing requirement. So, its Los Angeles-based outside law firm, Kane, Ballmer & Berkman, found a loophole in the wording of the Redevelopment Law. Unfortunately Section 33333.10(f) of the Redevelopment Law refers to "an agency that has adopted an amendment", rather than an agency that has "amended" its project plan. Kane, Ballmer & Berkman therefore advised CCDC that amending its project plan (e.g. raising its cap) by statute i.e. by State Legislative action, rather than by agency action, would not trigger Section 33333.10(f). This is the TRUE story behind raising the CCDC cap at Sacramento rather than at City Council. Today, Jerry Sanders, who exploited this loophole in Redevelopment Law in favor of developers at the expense of citizens, is asking City Council to re-appoint him as Chief Executive Officer of the San Diego Redevelopment Agency.

http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=hsc&group=33001-34000&file=33330-33354.6

"33333.10, (g) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) or (3), commencing with the first fiscal year that commences after the date of adoption of an amendment pursuant to subdivision (a), not less than 30 percent of all taxes that are allocated to the agency pursuant to Section 33670 from the redevelopment project area so amended shall be deposited into that project's Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund for the purposes specified in subdivision (f)."

"33333.10 (f) (1) ... after the limit on the payment of indebtedness and receipt of property taxes that would have taken effect, but for the amendment... agencies shall only spend moneys from the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund for the purpose of increasing, improving, and preserving the community's supply of housing at affordable housing cost to persons and families of low, very low, or extremely low income... During this period, an agency that has adopted an amendment pursuant to subdivision (a) may use moneys from the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund for the purpose of increasing, improving, and preserving housing at affordable housing cost to persons and families of moderate income... However, this amount shall not exceed... the amount of moneys from the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund that are used to increase, improve, and preserve housing at affordable housing cost to persons and families of extremely low income... In no case shall the amount expended for housing for persons and families of moderate income exceed 15 percent of the annual amount deposited in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund... and the number of housing units affordable to moderate-income persons shall not exceed the number of housing units affordable to extremely low income persons.

... (2) Commencing with the first fiscal year that commences after the date of the adoption of an amendment pursuant to subdivision (a) and until the limit on the payment of indebtedness and receipt of property taxes that would have taken effect but for the amendment pursuant to this section, an agency that has adopted an amendment pursuant to subdivision (a) may use moneys from the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund for the purpose of increasing, improving, and preserving housing at affordable housing cost to persons and families of moderate income... However, this amount shall not exceed... 15 percent of the amount of moneys deposited in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund... and shall only be used to assist housing projects in which no less than 49 percent of the units are affordable to and occupied by persons and families of, very low, or extremely low income."
From: joan herskowitz [mailto:jmherskowitz@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 02, 2010 2:39 PM
To: Gunn, Deborah
Subject: Comments on I-5 Expansion

Please distribute to the Sandag Board the attached comments on the I-5 expansion project EIR from the Buena Vista Audubon Society, San Diego Audubon Society and Preserve Calavera.

Thank you,

Joan Herskowitz

ATTACHMENT

Buena Vista Lagoon/Watershed

Potential Projects Related to I-5 Widening/Interchange

This list of potential projects is submitted on behalf of member organizations of the North County Open Space Coalition (NCOSC) and Carlsbad Watershed Network (CWN). The framework for this list is the Carlsbad Watershed Management Plan, and the position of NCOSC in support of the salt water alternative for the restoration of the Buena Vista Lagoon. Our key objective is to support improved coordination of watershed and habitat conservation efforts. Assessing the impacts for the two projects, the I-5 widening and the I-5/#78 interchange, and planning effective mitigation for the impacts should be done concurrently.

Hydrology

- support lagoon restoration plan

We're quite far along now in the planning and EIR development phase, and a decision on the approved restoration plan should be forthcoming within a reasonable time frame. The timing of the two projects could neatly coincide. The cost of the restoration will be in the $100 million range.

- expanding the width of the I-5 bridge

Assuming the selected lagoon restoration is restoring it to a natural salt water condition, expanding the width of the I-5 bridge would probably be considered a critical component. The design of the new bridge should best accommodate our preferred alternative of an all-saltwater estuary.

- add gauging stations

There are currently no gauging stations on Buena Vista Creek so there is little quantitative/historical data available on discharge rates, and variation in surface flow. Adding such stations would support the lagoon restoration effort as well as improved storm water management in the watershed.
Public Education/Access Programs

- Boardwalk Interpretative Trail

BVAS has the concept plans for this project already in hand. It involves a loop boardwalk trail which begins and ends at the Nature Center, and incorporates raised observation platforms and interpretative signage. The second, more problematic project would be a pedestrian boardwalk running along the east side of Pacific Coast Hwy and linking the small picnic park and lagoon overlook in Carlsbad with the BVAS Nature Center.

- north side lagoon trail

This proposed trail would go from the Nature Center east along the north side of the lagoon. The trail would probably need to deadend at the freeway, but such a trail would greatly expand the ability of BVAS to serve as a focal point for nature education about the lagoon.

- Watershed/ monitoring component

This would be similar to the program the University of California has at the headwaters of the Santa Margarita River - Reserve Station. The BV Nature center would be provided with high speed access - wireless access as field stations for on-going research, mitigation and protection of the local wildlife and watersheds. The nature center would function as a working field station with mobile carts and wireless laptops that go along with ancillary monitoring devices. These along with onsite and upstream monitoring equipment needs to be in place for nearby high school and university student for on-going conservation studies and research.

- expand educational component of annual creek clean-ups

There have been broad based community clean-up efforts along the creek and to the coast. What these efforts haven't included is a strong public education component. Hundreds of volunteers turn out for this event. Interactive exhibits at the event, hand-out materials etc could be designed with age appropriate messages about watershed protection.

Land Acquisition

- coordinate habitat conservation planning within the watershed

Sections of the watershed are included in separate subarea plans for the MSCP North County (being finalized), city of Vista (draft not issued), city of Oceanside (second draft under revision), and city of Carlsbad (plan adopted). There is an opportunity to improve the functioning of the riparian corridor and wildlife movement by coordinating habitat planning across these four plans.
- acquire key parcels along the lagoon or strategically located within the watershed.

The list of potential acquisition parcels should include the following for consideration:

- the Boardwalk parcel adjacent to the inner lagoon

This parcel was recommended for acquisition in the lagoon restoration plan and is the top priority for direct lagoon benefit. It is ideally located for wetlands restoration.

- lower basin area around tributary entrance

This area of non-native grassland is between high quality riparian woodland and disturbed wetlands. It is identified as a Biological Core and Linkage Area in the MHCP.

- conservation easement of the Marron Adobe site

This is within the key connecting linkage between Oceanside and Carlsbad and adjacent to the pending Sherman acquisition. Homesite has been continuously occupied by the original land grant family descendents. And while current occupant is committed to preservation, without such an easement there is no protection of this site from future sale for development.

- Sherman parcel

A conservation acquisition is currently underway through the Trust for Public Land. There is currently a small funding shortfall for financing the acquisition.

- segment of South Coast parcel that parallels Marron Rd extension and the creek

This area next to the reclamation plan site and the Sherman acquisition would result in significant protection of this entire valley.

- Hughes parcel next to pump station in the outer basin.

Hard to believe this is actually potentially developable.

- undeveloped parcel east of College between the two senior facilities along Lake Blvd

This acquisition could be combined with replacing the concrete channel through this area using the adjacent parcel to provide for improved natural vegetation and creek biological function.

**Habitat Restoration/Enhancement**

- TET site along Mossey Nissan in Oceanside

This is one of the unmanaged TET mitigation sites. Several invasive plants need to be removed and former homeless encampments and erosion areas require replanting.
- Hosp grove restoration

This area has a planned restoration program that has been hampered by funding. Eucalyptus need to be replaced with native species in this preserve area right across the street from the outer basin of the Lagoon.

- continuation funding for CWN invasives removal project

Initial focus was on Arundo donax and pampass grass. Mapping of key invasives has been done. Funding is needed to complete the removal/restoration effort of other target species.
-----Original Message-----
From: Clare Luconi [mailto:clare@timesharelodgers.com]
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 10:14 AM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Subject: Item 13

Please distribute to the board:
Thank you for your good work for us but......please don't let CalTrans ruin north county by allowing 14 lanes to be built along this beautiful corridor! The congestion is only for a few hours and could easily be remedied with reversible lanes and a second rail line. Please ask that there be more studies done and at least a compromise. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Best regards, Clare Luconi

Clare Luconi
Timeshare Locators Corporation
www.timesharelodgers.com
877-774-2737 Phone
858-720-1206 Fax
From: magnumforc [mailto:magnumforc@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 11:10 AM
To: Johnston, Philip
Cc: council@carlsbad.ca.gov; senator.kehoe@sen.ca.gov
Subject: I-5 expansion Plan

Please distribute to the Board as opposition to the Freeway Expansion:

ITEM 13:

As a resident of Carlsbad, a Safety Engineer, a Private Investigator and a homeowner, I am appalled at the lack of foresight that has been put into this expansion project. The pouring of concrete will not eliminate congestion; by CalTrans' own agreement, it will only move it back some years, and then what? Pour more concrete, destroy more homes, businesses and lives while you look for a better solution? One that is within reach and has been for years?

I've taken sound level readings and found that those postulated by CalTrans were models. Yes, simply models. They never took real readings, but did the same as they have done throughout the state, and used computerized models as what the sound levels "might" be at certain peak traffic times. All without due regard for un-muffled vehicles, compression braking, motorcycles, illegal mufflers, high stacked trucks, vehicles from south of the border, stop and start traffic during traffic jams, noise and vibration below the "normal hearing range" that creates stress, etc. In other words, their readings are more than suspect; they're actually of no value to the humans who have to endure the traffic noise and vibration. The only value is self-serving in telling you, SANDAG, and other groups that they actually did a sound level analysis.

It is interesting how the EIR/EIS spent a huge amount of time, money and paper to elucidate the effect an expansion might have on wildlife, but very little on the effects on humans. Sure, some criteria on how it might affect some neighborhoods that may be bisected, but what about all the humans who would be impacted? Looks like we were forgotten. Noise, dirt, dust, pollution and other particulates will rain down and CT has a plan to water down the dust per FHWA standards? That won't help as our homes fill with dirt and our lungs become clogged with yet more pollutants, created by this mess.

What happened to the plan to move the San Diego light rail (the Trolley) through Sorrento Valley and Carmel Valley back in the mid 1990's? Building plans called for right-of-way to be set aside for the trolley. Yet it was never built. The Coaster was decided to be the main route of rail transit...north to south only with no way to reach UTC or UCSD or anywhere between. No decent para-transit or shuttle service. Schedules on shuttles cut, time to get to work so long that people wouldn't take the rail system, bus interfaces so bad that a "you can't get there from here" attitude pervaded the commuting public.
Improving our public transit system needs to be first priority. NOT MORE CONCRETE.

Please stand up and be counted as taking positive steps to reduce pollution and stop the concrete jungle attitude of Orange and LA counties. We don't want to become like them. If we did, we'd move there. Laying concrete there didn't work and it won't work here.

Thank you.

Bruce J. Schryver, CSP
Licensed Private Investigator #25264
803 Spindrift Lane
Carlsbad, CA 92011
Dear My Representatives,

I have been a San Dieguito resident for 41 years.

I strongly oppose any expansion of I-5, and I urge you to nix the plan.

I support expansion of mass transit in the north coastal corridor.

Further, I support population reduction. Overpopulation is the 500-pound gorilla in the room, yet almost nobody confronts that fact. Overpopulation is at the root of nearly every major problem humans face on Earth. There are too many of us. We are destroying Earth’s ability to sustain life.

The suggested justification for expanding I-5 is population growth. If we reverse growth, if we reduce population to a sustainable level, expansion of I-5 will never be needed, and nearly every major problem facing life of Earth will be moderated, made manageable or eliminated.

I urge you to kill the I-5 expansion plan. It’s not a solution to anything. Rather, it would exacerbate many problems. As elected or appointed government officials, you have a responsibility to lead, to do what is in the best public interest. The public interest is best served by expanding mass transit and reducing population. Let’s get started now before it’s too late.

Doug Fiske
Leucadia
Dear Representatives:

We just finished our retirement home in Solana Beach. We are on the lagoon. So, as doubtless you will remember, we had to have a review and approval of our plans by the Coastal Commission. This is expensive and time consuming for an individual. Nevertheless, we did the right thing.

The Coastal Commission told us what color to paint our house, what plants we could plant, how far back on our lot we could build, what windows and roof tile to use, etc. As you know, this is NO JOKE! The idea is that you would not see our home from the sea or the lagoon. And you very nearly cannot.

How in the world do they think they can build the DAR lanes across the San Elijo Lagoon? What an environmental disaster! Drive by Disneyland some day on the 5 Freeway. There are DAR lanes there. A football field is not an exaggeration. The walls are perhaps 20 feet tall and there is an intersection with night lighting and traffic signals on top!

We are not against all progress. Adding 1 to 2 lanes a side may be necessary over time, but the DAR lanes, in particular, will be ruinous.

Please make a more moderate decision.

Paul and Eva Linke
1050 Santa Queta
Solana Beach, CA 92075
858-720-1183
paul_eva@att.net
From: Jill Mesaros [mailto:jill.mesaros@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 8:36 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip; jstocks@ci.encinitas.ca.us; chilliard@delmar.ca.us; council@carlsbad.ca.gov; jwood@ci.oceanside.ca.us
Cc: senator.kehoe@sen.ca.gov; sherrilightner@sandiego.ca.gov; solanasteve@roadrunner.com
Subject: ITEM 13-Friday, December 17 meeting

Dear Mr. Johnston,

Below are my thoughts on the proposed expansion of the I-5 from La Jolla to Oceanside. Please distribute my comments to the full SANDAG board at your Dec. 17 meeting:

I urge SANDAG not to take the Transportation Committee’s recommendation to support building 14 lanes along I-5 from La Jolla Village Drive to Carlsbad and 12 lanes from there to Camp Pendleton. I have reviewed Caltrans EIR on the I-5 expansion and in my view the plan to expand I-5 is short-sighted, far too expensive and in the long term will be ineffective at best. Los Angeles is living proof that you cannot build your way out of traffic congestion.

The EIR report did not give adequate consideration to alternatives that would include expansion of mass transit, nor did it assess how a high speed rail line might affect future traffic. While I can understand the need to have long term planning, I think it is extremely narrow minded to think that in a world that is changing as quickly as ours is that a plan drawn today will be adequate, or even applicable, 40 years from now. Particularly if that plan does not address our collective need to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels. There can be no denying that we are changing the way we live and work with growing numbers of people telecommuting and working either at home or closer to work. Why did the EIR not even address these real issues?

These concerns do not even come close to the devastation all of us will feel when our lagoons are irreversibly impacted and our vistas forever ruined by this plan which is nothing more than a multi billion dollar band-aid that in this economic environment is unconscionable.

Most of the communities up and down the coast that will be drastically affected by this plan have expressed major concerns. Do not turn a blind ear. Do not support the 14 lane plan. At the very least, require CALTRANS to seriously address these issues.

Thank you
Jill Mesaros
resident of Encinitas
From: Andi MacLeod [mailto:andi.macleod@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2010 10:45 AM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: Pam.Slater@sdc.ca.gov; senator.kehoe@sen.ca.gov; sherrilightner@sandiego.ca.gov; chilliard@delmar.ca.us; Lheebner@cosb.org; jstocks@ci.encinitas.ca.us; council@carlsbad.ca.gov; jwood@ci.oceanside.ca.us
Subject: A letter for all SANDAGBoard of Directors to consider re ITEM 13 for Fri., Dec. 17, 2010 meeting

Dear SANDAG Board of Directors: I am sending this letter both in the body of my email and as an attachment for your perusal before this Friday’s board meeting. I look forward to seeing you there.

Sincerely,
Kristin MacLeod
resident of 24 years in Solana Beach

December 14, 2010

Dear SANDAG Board of Directors,

On Friday, December 17, Item 13 will sit before you which is vital to the future of this area: to our ecology, economy, housing, transportation options, and way of life. Please vote no on the option to spend $100 billion in the next 40 years on the plan in its current form to widen the freeway. There is a reason a number of coastal communities like mine have voted “no” on this plan, and why there were nearly enough weighted votes at the November 19 meeting to kill the project outright. The proposed project is ecologically unsound, and would use funds which are badly needed for mass transit projects which better address the traffic issue. The current RTP 2050 plan wouldn’t address the need to move away from single car use, as you yourselves have said is a priority, and which is mandated by the state of California. Building 20 foot walls along the freeway won’t stop the noise pollution, but it will kill our view corridor. Turfing dozens of people out of their homes, destroying acres of sensitive habitat, and increasing the heavy metal and fine particulate pollution is against everyone’s interests. The EIR which supports this is based on inadequate sampling and should be redone before any further action is taken.

I and others are counting on you to use funds more wisely than ever in the times that we face. The jobs that would be created to build this version of the RTP 2050 plan could employ people just as well for a variety of mass-transit projects. Los Angeles has recognized the need to augment mass transit. Don’t force us back into the mindset of the last century, but forward into the future. We and oncoming generations are counting on you. I will attend this Friday’s meeting and look forward to see your priorities at work.

Sincerely,
Kristin MacLeod
536 S. Rios Ave.
Solana Beach, CA 92075
(858) 481-3537
andimacl@hotmail.com
From: Maryoren@aol.com [mailto:Maryoren@aol.com] / Mary Oren/7842 Sitio Coco/Carlsbad, CA 92009 / 780.271.3059
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2010 11:53 AM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: sherrillghtner@sandiego.ca.gov; council@carlsbad.ca.gov; senator.kehoe@sen.ca.gov; solanasteve@roadrunner.com
Subject: FREWAY EXPANSION IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY ITEM 13

Re: ITEM 13 PLEASE DISTRIBUTE TO BOARD

I have resided in San Diego County almost 30 years having graduating from San Diego State University in the early 80's. Who would have thought we'd see this city expand like it has? In many ways great things have happened and we've done a good job managing our space and transportation growth and now with the proposed expansion of our north south freeways I think it's time to carefully look at our options to maintain an established quality of life with growing transportation needs and choices.

I remember while at SDSU in 1982 there was interest in the Bullet Train coming our way and at the time people were excited about what it would mean to our quality of life and how we could better manage our time. So much time has come and past and still no Bullet Train but wider freeways for sure. We have the Coaster and the Trolley and these are fantastic additions to our travel options and new wheels moving in the right direction. But obviously we need more and it doesn't have to mean just wider freeways. There are growing needs to be met no doubt and questions to be answered. Here's some below:

Why do we not have a mass transit choice, train, trolley etc directly transporting residents and visitors to our Airport? This vital service would greatly reduce traffic and parking issues and improve quality of life by eliminating more cars and emissions from our roads. We are a big enough city to require this like other big cities. (We need direct fast connections to other airports outside our area as well.) What is stopping San Diego from providing this simple accommodation and why is there no know plan?

Why do we not have more east west connectors to our north south passenger rail service? This would be an integral function for an airport line as well.

When will we make a serious commitment to providing off road bicycle trails and better pedestrian walk ways to give residents safe and healthy alternative transportation choices also designed to lighten traffic from our roads? I hear Germany leads in this arena and they have very cold challenging weather conditions that don't stop residents from getting around this way. Look at our supreme and easy lifestyle weather conditions here. I grew up in Santa Barbara where the small business community helped get the city to provide safely removed bike paths that followed creeks and other natural water ways with simple asphalt trails that connected to quieter residential streets. Mini buses also helped connect larger bus routes. These steps were taken with the idea that it would bring students from UCSB off campus to inspire more spending and it worked. We all benefited and the highways remained two lanes for a long time probably because of it.

Just because we perceive that we have the room for further expansion does not make it right. I have traveled around little enough to learn that a community is shaped often by what the people believe and are able to successfully accomplish together. We value our freedom yes, to get here and there and where we want to go in our cars when we feel like it but we also recognize that it's not the only way to go. We want alternatives. It is time to consider expanding our choices and not just our roads. We must seriously look at how we can grow and perhaps protect our communities and the integrity of our neighborhoods. If expansion is necessary then we must compromise and also seriously commit to trying new and better means to get around. If we look close enough maybe we'll come up with a meet in the middle alternative.

We are very lucky to live here. We are smart. We know how to do things in new ways and in better ways than the way they have always been done before. We have a chance to do something better and different here and now. I hope industry, leaders and residents can work together to come up with a blending of great and important solutions to better meet our future transpiration needs. Please excuse the rather rude metaphor that has come to me but widening our roads to suit our growing transportation challenge is a lot like buying bigger clothes when we've put on weight. We need new behaviors and options to move into a healthy future that will improve lifestyles and protect the communities in our lovely city. Thank you for taking the time to look this over. Good luck and all the best to you in the months to come.
Phillip

Please help us with our freeway widening problem. Most of the people that live close to the freeway object completely to the widening. Giving the Coaster another set of tracks and enlarging the parking area would make more sense. The environmental reports also state that it is not reasonable to widen the freeway.

Please help us remain healthy
Please distribute to the full SANDAG board with respect to item 13

Dear Directors of SANDAG,

I strongly urge you to reconsider the I-5 expansion plan before you. I am deeply concerned that the only purpose for the expansion is to provide one extra HOV lane in each direction, and to accomplish this the plan adds 6 lanes (2 HOV and 4 HOV access lanes) plus fly-over bridges and high sound walls. I do not believe this will help with highway congestion, and is an outrageous design just to get a couple of HOV exits. In addition the walls and fly-over bridges are intrinsically ugly and placed at some of the most beautiful portions of I-5. Please vote to reconsider the plan, make additions to the general traffic lanes, since they carry the bulk of the traffic, and reject the walls and bridges.

Sincerely,

Richard Rothschild

Solana Beach, CA
-----Original Message-----
From: nancy tomich zapp [mailto:netomich@me.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2010 3:42 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.ca.gov
Subject: Item 13, Expansion of I-5

Dear Mr. Johnston,

Please distribute the attached letter to the SANDAG Board of Directors regarding the expansion of Interstate 5 (Item 13).

Thank you,
Nancy Zapp

December 14, 2010

To the SANDAG Board of Directors:

As a resident of San Diego County, I strenuously object to the planned expansion of Interstate 5. San Diego County has the opportunity to address transportation challenges by leading the nation in use of light rail and other forms of public transport. We must make the most of this opportunity. Business as usual no longer is feasible, given rising gas prices and intensifying air pollution. We must be innovative and careful ancestors for those who will follow us. Bigger is not always better.

The delights of this part of California lie in our lagoons, beaches and open spaces. To pave our paradise by laying more asphalt would be foolhardy and counterproductive — and certainly would seriously mar San Diego's reputation as a tourist area, destination wedding locale, and attractive mixture of beach and lagoon.

Put your thinking caps on and come up with a light rail alternative. Please, for the sake of all of us who live here.

Sincerely,

Nancy Zapp
3886 Quarter Mile Drive
San Diego 92130
From: Jennifer FitzGerald [mailto:jenniferfg@pacbell.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2010 5:19 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: senator.kehoe@sen.ca.gov; pam.slater@sdcounty.ca.gov
Subject: SANDAG meeting 17 Dec, 2010, designate item 13

Dear Phillip Johnston,

Please distribute this letter to all the representatives attending the SANDAG Board meeting on Friday 17 Dec. re designate item 13, on the 40-year plan for transportation improvements in our region, including the proposed expansion of I-5.

As a resident of Cardiff, Encinitas, San Diego County, I am deeply concerned that the SANDAG Transportation Committee voted on 10 Dec. 2010 on a “hybrid” plan for the I-5 extension. A “10 plus 4” lane expansion from La Jolla Village Drive to somewhere in Carlsbad, and an “8 plus 4” lane expansion from there to Camp Pendleton cannot be seen in any way as a compromise of the options on the table. Most residents agree that a minimal expansion of lanes is advisable but an expansion of this extent, which incentivizes an increase in car usage rather than actively fostering a decrease, can only be detrimental—and completely unnecessary. That is before we consider other consequences: the destruction of existing homes and businesses, air pollution, particularly with particulates, visual degradation following noise abatement measures.

It is to be deeply regretted that the SANDAG meeting on 10 Dec. 2010 refused to consider the compromise suggested by Solana Beach Council Member Lese Heebner, of an initial “8 plus 2”, followed by double-tracking the passenger rail line all the way through San Diego County, with a later increase of 2 more lanes. I gather that the SANDAG Board refused even to consider this proposal at their meeting on 19 Nov. 2010.

I am alarmed that by this decision SANDAG has in effect preempted Caltrans’s review of the nearly 1000 representations made to the I-5 expansion Draft EIR protesting against the most extreme form of expansion and offering compromises of the order of Ms Heebner’s, rather than the non-compromise of the Transportation Committee’s “hybrid” version chosen on at the SANDAG meeting of 10 Dec.

I am asking each member of the Board meeting on 17 Dec. to request the withdrawing of the Draft EIR for the I-5 expansion, so that it can be re-issued in a form that reflects valid long-term concerns. This would include the careful evaluation of the Heebner compromise of an initial “8 plus 2”, followed by double-tracking the passenger rail line through San Diego County, with a later increase of 2 more lanes.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Sir:

On behalf of the homeowners association of the Santa Helena Park Homeowners located at 1107 Santa Helena Park Court, Solana Beach, CA 92075, which is right across the street from the north bound I-5 Freeway corridor and Lomas Santa Fe entrance, we want to thank you very much for completing the on and off ramps at the Lomas Santa Fe Road entrances/exits before the deadline date and for the entire re-configuration of the I-5 Freeway corridor in this area.

However, please be advised we are very much opposed to the I-5 14 lane expansion from La Jolla to Carlsbad and beyond. We also are opposed to the destruction of homes and businesses in our area. We were at the meeting with CalTrans, SANDAG, Senator Christine Kehoe, Senator Alan Lowenthal and Alan Kosup at Solana Beach Presbyterian Church on November 8, 2010 and agree with Senator Kehoe that CalTrans presented only two plans, i.e., do nothing or widen the I-5 freeway. We listened to the Environmentalists' positions as well as all of the I-5 Pollution Activists, coastal wetlands and endangered or threatened species activists, and we are against any kind of I-5 Freeway expansion based on their testimonies. The air and noise pollution levels for the surrounding neighborhoods have increased to decibels to drown out a conversation. Where is our quality of life?

We agree there is a need for further alternatives to meet our regional goals, but why is there only one set of train tracks for the Coaster and Amtrak trains? Shouldn't mass train and bus transportation be considered before expanding the freeway for automobiles and commuters who continue to not use the present HOV lanes provided for them? There has to be a media campaign to enlighten motorists of the benefits of using public mass transportation that will be provided in the future by CalTrans and SANDAG.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter, and hopefully together we can find a solution to the I-5 Freeway Expansion.

Sincerely,
Diane B. Tyson
Secretary
Santa Helena Park Homeowners Association
Gentlemen-

Please see my note below expressing my concerns regarding the I-5 corridor project. Attached are also my concern/questions sent to Caltrans primarily regarding noise pollution mitigation. I strongly urge you to put first and foremost, the preservation, or even the improvement, of the Quality of Life within the communities affected by this project. Thank you for your patience and attention to this matter that affects us all and this 33 year resident of this community.

Sincerely,

Mike Lewis

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Mike Lewis <mlewis500@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Sep 23, 2010 at 1:24 PM
Subject: I-5 comments
To: Dan Dalager <DDalager@ci.encinitas.ca.us>, jstocks@ci.encinitas.ca.us

Dan and Mr. Stocks-

I have attached my comment/question sheet to Caltrans. Danny, we have discussed in part my view of the proposed improvements of the I-5 corridor. I understand the delicate nature of the ongoing negotiations between the cities and Caltrans. While I personally believe that the 4.5 billion dollars could be much more wisely spent by developing some alternative transportation methods, I am also a realist with regard to what is likely to occur. So if we are going to spend our tax dollars on the freeway, then I believe it is incumbent on our city leaders to do what they can to protect the Quality of Life of our city.

At the Stocks, Dalager roast the other night, the presenters and the crowd seemed to be highly focused on preserving the views on the freeway (and questioning the intentions and good will of you two). In my mind, they seemed to be more focused on the Quality of the driving experience while on the freeway than they were on preserving or improving the Quality of Life in our neighborhoods. The pollution from the freeway comes in many forms and each of them need to be addressed. But the Noise Pollution directly effects residents near and AWAY from the freeway. My home doesn’t even make the Caltrans maps, but the noise, particularly during offshore or Santa Ana winds, is intolerable today, let alone after they make the proposed improvements and significantly increase the capacity of the freeway. Noise mitigation MUST be part of the discussion with Caltrans.

I hope that you Danny, and Mr. Stocks (who I understand is or will be involved with SANDAG), will spare no effort in dealing with the issue of noise pollution. I am far more concerned, and I hope that both of you are far more concerned, about the quality of life in our city than you are about the quality of the drive and the view as you drive down the freeway. I would appreciate you reviewing my questions to Caltrans so you can have them in mind as you work through this process. Thank you in advance for your efforts.

Mike Lewis / 760 802 6639 / mlewis500@gmail.com
I-5 North Coast Corridor
HOV/Managed Lanes Project: Public Hearing

Comment Slip
Date: September 9, 2010
Place: Oceanside High School, Multipurpose Room
1 Pirates Cove, Oceanside, CA 92054

Name: Mike Lewis
(Print Clearly)
Date: 9/21/2010

Address: 1771 Hillcrest Scenic Lane
(Print Clearly)
Encinitas, CA 92024

Contact Phone: 760 802-6639

Email (Optional): mlewis500@gmail.com

Do you wish to be added to the mailing list? ☑ Yes ☐ No

I would like the following comments included in the public record for this project:

1. How was it determined that noise pollution mitigation was unreasonable for the area between Poinsettia and Leucadia Blvd?

2. Given that the current decibel level exceeds the mitigation levels today, how is it reasonable to not mitigate noise pollution at the higher future levels?

3. Why were nearly all of the noise receptors on the west side of the freeway, knowing that the prevailing wind pushes the noise to the east? Why would the placement of these receptors on the West of the Freeway not provide a distorted or inaccurate reading of the actual or normalized noise pollution?

4. What were the dates and wind condition on the dates conditions were measured?

5. What was the duration of the measurements?

Comments must be received by October 7, 2010

Mail to: Attn: Shay Lynn M. Harrison, Caltrans District 11, MS# 242, 4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, CA 92110
From: Jane Beck [mailto:beckpv@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2010 9:59 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: Steve Goetsch
Subject: Fwd: Opposition to I-5 expansion

Mr Johnston, please distribute to the Board. DESIGNATE ITEM 13. thanks you.

Bill Beck

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jane Beck <beckpv@aol.com>
Date: December 14, 2010 9:55:12 PM PST
To: Lheebner@cob.org
Cc: senator.kehoe@sen.ca.gov, chiliard@delmar.ca.us, jstocks@ci.encinitas.ca.us, council@carlsbad.ca.gov, jwood@ci.oceanside.ca.us, sherrilightner@sandiego.ca.gov, bill.horn@sdcounty.ca.gov, perm.slater@sdcounty.ca.gov
Subject: Opposition to I-5 expansion

Lesa-

Thank you for opposing the I-5 expansion plans between La Jolla and Oceanside. I too oppose the expansion as expressed to CALTRANS in these attached letters. All of the proposed expansion alternatives in the draft EIR are incongruous with the thoughtful development plans seen elsewhere in the county. They certainly do not consider the changing patterns and norms as the county populace deals with energy cost increases, global warming considerations, technology advances and demographic changes.

The proposed expansion is patterned on the simpleminded expansions that did not work in the last century, and is even less less suited to the coming decades. Count on my continued opposition to these plans and any legislator who endorses them without a more thorough and deserved assessment.

Respectfully,

William Beck
760 San Mario Drive
Solana Beach
I oppose all expansion options. I have included several questions regarding your report.

Chapter 3.19 - Affected Environmental Consequences, and avoidance, Minimization and/or mitigation, Plant species; this section omitted an assessment of the Sen Elijo Lagoon area. This area which is planned for encroachment with the expansion options currently sustains numerous rare plant types including Del Mar Manzanita, wart stemmed ceanothus, Del Mar San aster among others. This area needs to be assessed with appropriate mitigations offered.

Other areas which were evaluated offered only mitigations of re-vegetating disturbed areas but no compensation to the coastal scrub acreage which would be lost to expansion. The limited acreage of coastal scrub is an issue to both the rare plant species currently in existence, as well as to the endangered species which require coastal sage scrub such as the California Gnat Catcher. Given the limited coastal range of these species, it is imperative to retain or expand suitable areas for habitation. How will compensating acreage be provided to offset sensitive acreage lost to expansion? as currently referenced, (pg 3.21-7), compensatory mitigation is bounded by "To the extent practicable, some compensatory mitigation would be completed in each watershed". What is the definition of "extent practical, and some compensatory"... who makes these determinations and when will they be made? In what way has it been determined that lost sensitive acreage not be mitigated? Assuming that it will be mitigated, what areas are being provided and in what region so as to assure suitability for sustaining Coastal Sage Scrub?

In the vicinity of the Manchester exit and expansion adjacent to San Elijo Lagoon area, how will light and noise be addressed as potential impacts to resident species? This needs to be answered for both the temporary construction phase, and most importantly, the eventual reconfiguration. Please also provide the impact and mitigation for additional paved areas as it relates to additional water runoff and the effect on lagoon salinity and general water quality.

William Beck
760 San Mario Drive
Solana Beach CA 92075
I oppose all expansion options at this time. I have included several questions and requests for clarification regarding your report.

Highway utilization Rate: - The requirement for expansion is not well defined and as a result, the no-build option has not been appropriately evaluated. The principal variables associated with highway use and congestion are highly dependent on economic and environmental factors that have changed significantly since the initial need statement was defined and are subject to ongoing change.

Please define the governing growth rate associated with the necessary infrastructure required from time of the initial assessment of need through; current date, construction, and life of the highway. Please clarify the effects of the following variables on highway volume so as to appropriately assess the No-Build alternative: fuel prices using recent and projected escalation rates; fuel prices with the inclusion of a carbon emission tax (equivalent to European), housing starts in San Diego Country, employment rate in San Diego Country, assumed telecommuting employment for San Diego businesses (I run a significant operation in SD county and have made extensive use of telecommuting), car pool utilization rates and trending of urban vs suburban habitation. If these variables are not already included in the projection of future traffic needs, please include or explain their exclusion. Projecting these variables from the initial need assessment through the life of the project and asset are necessary to understanding the viability of all alternatives including the no-build plan.

Traffic Flow Assessment: - What assumptions are used for the probability of traffic disruption and safety with increased lanes? With higher lane counts and flow, there is a higher incidence of mechanical failure of vehicles or accident even if the probability of incidence is based solely increased traffic volume alone. Individual incidences cause multiple lane or even complete highway shutdown. It is not clear in the report how the traffic patterns are affected by the increased likelihood of disturbed flow and how the benefits of normal flow are eroded by this effect. Please include the effect of emergency and tow equipment implementation into a highway which increases their cross lane transits and inter-exit travel distance. What is the increased response time to an accident or disabled vehicle? What is the effect of a lowered ratio of break-down to standard flow lanes? What is the increased probability and effect of accident or disabled vehicles in lanes with flow on both sides?

Advances in relevant technology: - What requirements are anticipated for the incorporation of autonomous/ semiautonomous vehicular movement into the planned infrastructure? How are these requirements provisioned for over the extensive time horizons of the project? Given the very recent autonomous advances in other modes of transportation (aircraft, rail), how was it determined that at this point in time, irreversible infrastructure investments and commitments of direction can be made? Please provide the assessment which addresses the general advances in autonomous and semi-autonomous vehicular control and their relationship to infrastructure requirements. Similarly, the high rate of change in propulsion technologies, and fuel costs/environmental impacts are affecting both infrastructure needs as well as driver habits. Accepting the no-build alternative as an interim solution until more predictive assessments can be made for; autonomous automotive advances, the rate of change in fuel costs, and/or the changes in propulsion technologies stabilize or can be confidently projected need to be considered. There does not appear to be an assessment of optimum timing for the initiation of the project. Please explain how the correct time to make the expansion decision was derived or will be derived. Include the affect of the high rate of change in these variables.

Security: - What security measures are being put in place to address the significance increase in the I-5 as a target of terrorist value as measure by: infrastructure asset value, potential for economic disruption, potential for loss of life? What security provisions are being made to ensure adjacent properties are protected from the same (by way of collateral damages)? Please specifically address all bridges, intersections and flyways.

William Beck / 760 San Mario Drive / Solana Beach CA 92075
From: kasey [mailto:kcinciarelli@roadrunner.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2010 5:33 AM  
To: Johnston, Phillip  
Subject: Freeway Widening

I urge the Board NOT approve a Regional Transportation Plan that widens freeways. I especially do not want a 12 or 14 lane I-5 going through our urban village neighborhood of Carlsbad or demolishing our family home in Oceanside. A bigger freeway will reduce train ridership and service and will NOT provide increased quality of life. We simply must come up a better and more cost effective solution to transportation at peak hours.

kasey cinciarelli  
2727 Lyons Ct.  
Carlsbad, CA 92010
December 15, 2010

Dear SANDAG Board Members,

As a Carlsbad resident living very close to I-5, I am very concerned about the massive expansion that has been proposed for the freeway. I wanted to do my best to be an informed citizen, so I reviewed the Caltrans EIR. I found so many flaws in the proposal that I felt it necessary to send you this letter.

All citizens living in San Diego are aware of gridlock. They understand the importance of addressing the issue now and for the future. They rely on organizations such as Caltrans and SANDAG to offer viable, rational solutions and to present these solutions in a clear, concise manner. Neither has been done with this proposal.

I attended several town hall meetings and the State Senate hearing about the expansion. The same question was asked over and over, “Why aren’t you offering another solution?” It was never clearly answered.

It is embarrassing for San Diego and disgraceful that this project, which will destroy our beautiful coastal views, our homes and wildlife does so little to at least discuss a better solution in detail. Other states are using upcoming technology to build a better highway. Why aren’t we? The Washington State Department of Transportation, which is embracing the West Coast Green Highway had this to say. This new highway, “designated a “Corridor of the Future” by the U.S. Department of Transportation, could soon become the nation’s cleanest, greenest, and smartest highway. The drivers of hundreds of thousands of cars and trucks that travel on this major roadway each day soon may select from a menu of clean alternative fuel such as natural gas, biodiesel, ethanol, or hydrogen. “

This was never mention in the EIR. In fact I found it interesting that San Diego did not receive “Corridor of the Future” funds.

The only solution is to send Caltrans back to the table to rewrite the proposal before any final decisions are made. All citizens have a right to fully understand the impact of this project. I urge you to offer your support in accomplishing this goal.

Below are many examples of questions I submitted to Caltrans. I separated them into sections to make them easier to follow.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kathy Combs
7149 Lantana Terrace
Carlsbad, CA 92011
Issues with Caltrans Proposal and Solutions

First Let’s Fix the Problems with the Current System

Public Transportation: The cost to build a successful public transportation system in San Diego is high. The question is, “If we build it, will they come?”

Despite claims that San Diego residents will never give up their cars, I strongly believe the answer is yes – they will switch to using more public transportation once it is quicker, cheaper and less stressful than driving. We are already trending in that direction. Here are two examples.

In 2006 ridership on the Coaster increased 8 percent. Lane Fernandes, who manages the Coaster told the North County Times, “Our Coaster service is extremely popular, and I’d like to believe it’s more than $4 (a gallon) gas”.
As pump prices test new highs for regular gas, San Diego train and trolley travel is becoming a preferred alternative for more commuters looking to shave some of the expenses, and even road rage, from their daily trips. "Everybody knows it's hard to get Southern Californians out of their cars - but there are tipping points when people do consider alternatives," said Richard Hannasch, director of fiscal and support services for the North County Transit District. This past April, according to local transportation service providers, the Coaster averaged 276 passengers per train - up from 253 the previous year and 245 in April 2006.

Re-evaluate ADT, population growth and job growth using current data: For example, how does an aging population fit into the projections?
Focus on forecasting the types of businesses San Diego wants to have in the next 20 years. Let’s work to get more cars off from the road. How many of these jobs can or will be done by telecommuting? “More than 20 million people work from home at least one day a week, including the self-employed”, said Kate Lister, principal researcher at Telework Research Network in San Diego, which compiles data using a variety of sources. The number of employees working remotely at least one day a month is up about 75 percent since 2005, Lister said.
Here in San Diego, real estate is an example. When we purchased our home last year, 90 percent of the paperwork was taken care of through email. Offer incentives to business to encourage either working from home or a site close to home when applicable.

Use traffic management similar to what was done during the 1984 Olympics, such as having businesses stagger work hours. (see UCI-ITS-WP-87-8 from the Institute of Transportation Studies). The study suggests that these changes wouldn't work well on a permanent basis, however a lot has changed since 1984.
Make public transportation a viable option. HOV lanes do little good if easy, reliable, connections are not in place. I love taking the Coaster to the airport. It’s cheap ($6 a trip), it gets there on time and there is no need to pay for parking. Unfortunately, if I arrive at the airport at night or on weekends, there is little or no service. Instead of a $6 ride to get home, we paid $70 for a shuttle on our last trip.

All freeway improvements should support the latest technology and put reducing emissions first. The EIR refers to the Corridor of the Future, but that is not what is being built. As mentioned above, Washington and Oregon are way ahead of us in this area. Why aren’t we joining them? Other examples are Google’s no-driver car (less gridlock and fewer accidents) and new mobile applications that help drivers steer around traffic messes.

Issues with the current EIR
Section #1 – Proposal uses out of date and ambiguous data
In Part One, I noticed that the data used for the forecasts was old (8-10 years) and in some cases the results didn't make sense. Will the EIR be revised when 2010 is available? How will it affect the forecast for ADT, Population Growth, demographics, employment and HOV use? (details are below)

a) Why is ADT forecast to increase when the table shows it has decreased between 2000 and 2006? (please note that this was prior to the recession). Annual Average Daily Traffic (ADT) (table 1.3.1) estimates an annual increase of about 32 to 38 percent by year 2030. Average over 20 years is about 1.8 percent. However between 2000 and 2006 ADT measured in Del Mar, Encinitas, Carlsbad and SR-78 declined about 1 percent.

b) Population Growth (table 1.3.8) shows population growth from 1970 until 2000. It does not show growth from 2000 to 2010. Also, why aren’t demographics included?

c) Total Population Housing and Employment (table 1.3.9) is not up to date. 2000 Census and estimates are based on 2003 and 2006 numbers.

d) Project Area Employment (table 1.3.10) is not up to date, estimates are based on 2003 and 2004 numbers, which were main years for the housing boom and low unemployment.

e) HOV volumes (tables 1.3.6 and 1.3.7) data is from 2002.

Section #2 - an analysis of the effectiveness of HOV lanes

From the EIR.

A traveler may choose to meet the eligibility requirements, such as including a permitted number of occupants (HOV), traveling in a certain vehicle, or paying for the use of Managed Lanes, especially if the general-purpose lanes become congested.

1) Why are HOV lanes being proposed when data from credible sources show they are not effective for reducing traffic congestion? A paper published in 2008 by UC Berkeley’s Dept of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science says this about I-15 “I-15 This 8-mile 2-lane reversible HOV facility opened in 1988 and was converted to 2+HOT lanes in 1996. Funded by tax dollars, the I-15 2+HOT lane system is not financially viable. 77% of traffic is 2+HOV vehicles, there are only 30,000 transponders in circulation, generating a mere $2 million in revenue per year. As might be expected, the 2+HOV lane is very under-utilized, with weekday peak period per lane volume of 900veh/hour. Nonetheless, I-15 2+HOT lane is slated for a major expansion, with four reversible managed lanes.”

A previous article from 2007, also from UC Berkeley states that:

2) HOV lanes are either under-utilized or suffer degraded operations. (3) HOV lanes do not measurably increase car-pooling. (4) HOV lanes do not reduce overall congestion in a reasonably well-managed system.

2) After July 2011, the Clean Air Vehicles stickers will expire, meaning cars using HOV lanes now will not be able to use them. How is this taken into consideration in the HOV forecast?
3) Why aren’t provisions for high tech cars, such as electric refueling stations, included in the project?

4) If SOV/HOT is part of the plan how much will it cost to drive in the lanes? Were drivers asked what they are willing to pay as part of the survey? (EIR survey says “The groups generally agreed that free or drastically reduced tolls are necessary to effectively motivate the formation of carpools and vanpools”.

5) What happens to the lanes if they are underutilized?

6) The EIR says that 60 percent of the vehicles are HOV. Has analysis been done to determine where and how far vehicles are going? For example, if my friend and I are on the freeway headed to a shopping mall one or two exists away, what benefit would an HOV lane be to me?

7) Why are forecast HOV volumes lower with the 10+4 option than with the 8+4? (table 1.3.6 and 1.3.7)?

Section #3 – Cost

1) The proposal says that the project will be completed in three phases. Will all the funding be secured before each phase is started? Where will funds come from if a phase goes over budget?

2) Was inflation factored into the estimates?

3) How much will it cost to maintain the expansion? Who will pay for it?

4) What percentage of funding comes from the following sources?
   a) Transnet
   b) Federal Funding
   c) State Funding
   d) Property Tax increases (special assessment?) That includes the current plan and any potential changes when it is underway.

5) Also, Caltrans EIR and presentations described project enhancements but the cities are expected to maintain them.

Section #4 – Misleading Information Presented to Voters in Prop A. Voters did not approve 10+4 options.

From SANDAG Transnet Extension and Ordinance Plan, June 2004 (Prop A)

Interstate 5 North: Add four managed lanes from I-805 to Vandegrift Boulevard in Oceanside, including HOV to HOV connectors at the I-5/I-805 interchange and freeway connectors at the I-5/SR 56 and I-5/SR 78 interchanges - $1,234 million.

1) Why are options for 10+4 shown when voters only approved adding a maximum of four managed lanes in the Transnet extension? (they did not approve a general purpose lane)
2) Why are details shown only for the 10+4 with buffer option in Part Two of the EIR?

3) Why does the 8+4 plus barrier include a general purpose lane? (no voter approval for that related to Transnet extension).

4) I noticed that the auxiliary lanes are present for nearly all of the project route. This was not mentioned in the Caltrans presentations. Why not? It is the size of another general purpose lane (12 feet). They will cut into more property and span across the Aqua Hedionda lagoon adding more noise and pollution.

5) How can Transnet funds be a viable source of funds for this project when the amount that voters approved in Prop A is only $1,234 million dollars? The project is $3.5 to $4.5 billion dollars. Even with inflation factored in this makes no sense.

Section #5 - Sound Barriers (pertains to my community, however this is true for many other sound walls proposed)

1) In dBA, how does the transparent sound wall compare with other proposed sound walls in terms of abating noise? Please note that the existing sound walls located at S736, which are transparent sound walls, do not adequately reduce freeway noise.

2) Sound receptors are shown located along Linden Terrace in the Sea Cliff community, however a major noise contributor comes northwest of Poinsettia during the morning rush hour and south of the community during the evening rush. This noise has a significant impact on homes located on Lantana Terrace, one street to the east of Linden. How do you plan to abate noise there? Does a resident have the option to request another receptors for this area?

3) For S736, time of day, time of year and atmospheric conditions greatly affect the amount of freeway noise. At this location:
   
   - How often were the samples taken?
   - What time of day were they taken?
   - In what weather conditions were they taken?
   - How is the dBA determined (highest noise level, average noise level, etc.)

4) The EIR says that property owners will be responsible for maintaining the transparent sound walls. This in very labor intensive. I doubt they would stay clean 24 hours. Why was this fact not presented either presentation (State Senate hearing and Carlsbad City Council meeting)?

5) Why does the EIR say that property owners will be responsible for maintaining the transparent sound walls for S736, when the FHWA says that Caltrans is responsible for the maintenance? (EIR, says that S736 will be built on private property. This is from the Highway Traffic Noise Abatements, Chapter 30, 6-18-2009, Noise Abatement Outside the Right of Way: When responsibility for maintenance is assigned to a property owner, it is done with the understanding that on a federally funded project, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will hold Caltrans responsible for that maintenance.
6) What does Caltrans plan to do if sound abatement requirements are not met? For example dBA exceeds the maximum 67 dBA for residences (taken from Highway Traffic Noise Abatement Project Development Procedures manual, 6/18/2009). Please note that in my neighborhood, dBA is already exceeded.
From: wardell1@aol.com [mailto:wardell1@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2010 10:46 AM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Subject: SANDAG Hwy 5 widening

Tracy Weiss
Terry Wardell
630 Barbara
Solana Beach, CA 92075

December 15, 2010

SANDAG

Hello!

I have been to the Cal Trans “meetings” and heard their spiel. This project is unconscionable whether we are talking about the cost, the aesthetics or the environmental/political imperatives for us to get out of our cars and into workable public transportation. If not for our excessive oil needs we would have no reason to be in a war right now. This is what the Cal Trans imperative ought to be, i.e. ridiculously affordable public transportation where it doesn’t even make sense for every person to own a car. What a radical idea to go up against oil, insurance, and automobile manufacturing interests yet an idea whose time has come.

So, SANDAG, the time has come to support what the people want which is way more public transportation options. Cal Trans ideas are obsolete. Vote no to this monstrosity.

Thank you for listening and for the time that you spend on behalf of the public good.

Tracy Weiss
Terry Wardell
-----Original Message-----
From: amdigi@cox.net [mailto:amdigi@cox.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2010 11:56 AM
To: pam.slater@sdcounty.ca.gov; seantor.kehoe@sen.ca.gov; Johnston, Phillip;
lheebner@cosb.org
Subject: I-5 widening comments

This email is for your consideration as you vote on the I-5 widening project. Please distribute to the Board and designate Item 13.

I am a Solana Beach resident with property in danger of being fully acquired as part of the I-5 widening plan.

First, I would like to voice my support of the "No-Build" option or the "8 + 4 with BUFFER" option. In the event that the "10+4" options are considered, I would appreciate your support in voting for the "10+4 with BUFFER".

Additionally, we have requested that Cal Trans look into moving the freeway east on the corridor between Via de la Valle and Lomas Santa Fe in an effort to keep the Ida properties from being acquired. There is at least 30 feet of unused land on the east side of the freeway that can be used instead of taking our home.

Nationwide studies have shown that widening freeways does not alleviate traffic but instead encourages more cars on the road. We would like to see the monies set aside for this project to be circumvented to a more efficient public transport system and not freeway widening.

I appreciate your time and service to this city.

AnnMarie L. DiGiacomo
830 Ida Ave.
Solana Beach, CA 92075
e-mail: amdigi@cox.net
-----Original Message-----
From: houby@juno.com [mailto:houby@juno.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2010 1:44 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: senator.kehoe@sen.ca.gov; Pam.Slater@sdcounty.ca.gov;
sherrilightner@sandiego.ca.gov; chilliard@delmar.ca.us;
jstockes@ci.encinitas.ca.us; council@carlsbad.ca.gov;
jwood@ci.oceanside.ca.us; lheebner@coasb.org
Subject: Comments Regarding Proposed Expansion of Interstate 5

DESIGNATE ITEM 13

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Please distribute this letter to SANDAG Board members.
We understand that the Board of Directors of SANDAG will be meeting this Friday to discuss the proposed expansion of Interstate 5 and the option SANDAG will recommend to CALTRANS. We have been told that this matter will be Item 13 on the agenda. As citizens of the City of Solana Beach and the County of San Diego, we want to register our thoughts on this matter.

We sent comments to CALTRANS on November 19, 2010 regarding its Environmental Impact Report. We have attached a copy of that letter below. CALTRANS did not state which of several expansion options it favored. Since CALTRANS must do so in its final EIR, as required by United States law, SANDAG's recommendation to CALTRANS will carry great weight, much more than the comments of individual citizens.
We have been residents of Solana Beach since 1978. Our Mayor, Lesa Heebner, and another SANDAG Director (Jerry Stocks of Encinitas) made a proposal at SANDAG's last meeting which was not acted upon. We understand that their proposal was for SANDAG to officially recommend, in writing, an expansion option WHICH WOULD NOT WIDEN the existing right-of-way of Interstate 5. We believe that our Mayor and Mr. Stocks of Encinitas are correct to insist upon an option which does not involve seizing private property in order to expand Interstate 5. We know that the citizens of Solana Beach were assured many years ago that future expansion of Interstate 5 would NOT involve seizing private property, and those assurances must be honored by our elected representatives.
We recently read in the San Diego Union Tribune that the Transportation Committee of SANDAG will recommend to the Board of Directors for its consideration an option WHICH WOULD WIDEN the existing right of way of Interstate 5 (and thereby would involve seizing private property).
We OPPOSE the Transportation Committee's recommendation, among other reasons, because it would violate assurances previously made to the citizens of our city. We also believe that there are ample opportunities for increasing automobile traffic efficiency within the existing right of way. Those efficiencies can be further augmented by expanding public transportation, also within existing rights of way. We believe that SANDAG's recommendation to CALTRANS should take the realities of the 21st Century into account. Paving more land to make way for more cars and pollution is NOT the best way to serve the people of San Diego County (or any other place).

Sincerely,

William E. Miller  and Ida Houby
639 Glenmont Drive
Solana Beach, California 92075-1314
To: I-5_NCC_EIR_BIS@dot.ca.gov
Subject: Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 2010 18:31:29 GMT

Dear Shay Lynn Harrison,

We have been residents of Solana Beach since 1978.
We have read the Draft Environmental Impact Report of the California Department of Transportation regarding the proposed expansion of Interstate 5 from Del Mar to Oceanside. We have also read the analysis of the draft EIR by the City of Solana Beach staff, who presented their findings at a public meeting last night (November 18, 2010).

We are troubled by the fact that the draft EIR does not state a preferred option, and does not give its reasons. We understand that U.S. regulations require the California Department of Transportation to state a preferred option.

All of the proposed options involving expansion of Interstate 5 would have an adverse impact on our city, particularly to those residents whose homes would be lost in the proposed expansions. But the EIR does not state which of the options would have the most public benefit relative to its impact, nor does it propose specific mitigations for the increased traffic which would result from any Interstate 5 expansion.

In view of this shortcoming of the Draft EIR, it is clear to us that using funds allocated by the California Department of Transportation for expanding Interstate 5 in our city and region would be better used to expand public transportation. For example, double tracking the Coaster line and expanding bus services to the stations which serve the Coaster would greatly increase the efficiency of commuter traffic in our region and provide a sustainable alternative to Interstate 5 expansion. It would minimize adverse impacts to the City of Solana Beach, as well as to other coastal communities (San Diego, Del Mar, Encinitas, Carlsbad, and Oceanside) and the environment of the entire north San Diego County coastal region.

A revised EIR should be prepared which takes the reality of the 21st Century into account. The California Department of Transportation should not build projects which increase carbon dioxide production, noise, and congestion, and destroy the beauty and health of the communities in which the projects are being built. Expansion of Interstate 5 is not sustainable, and the California Department of Transportation knows this to be true.

Sincerely,

William E. Miller and Ida Houbÿ
639 Glenmont Drive
Solana Beach, California 92075-1314

cc: Lesa Heeber, Mayor, City of Solana Beach
Pam Slater-Price, Chair, Board of Supervisors, County of San Diego
SANDAG representatives from the Cities of San Diego, Del Mar, Encinitas, Carlsbad, and Oceanside
State Senator Christine Kehoe
From: Janie [mailto:janiekinca@cox.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2010 3:26 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Subject: Proposed Widening of I-5

From all I’ve observed Caltran’ is hell bent on the most extreme measures in the proposed widening.

This is diametric to what our State of has proposed to be, a leader in energy conservation. Our resources should be going to cutting down, not increasing dependence on gasoline.

The old truism, “If you build it, they will come,” us true.

While fueling my car yesterday and saw that the price as jumped up another notch or two I was wondering what more will it take to wake us up.

Please move forward in true energy conservation by vastly improving our poor and thus underutilized public transportation system.

Janie Gilbert, Solana Beach
Dear Sir:

As a resident and property owner in Solana Beach, I strongly oppose the proposed expansion of I-5 from La Jolla to Oceanside.

This will cause the destruction of homes and businesses, increase traffic pollution and have a negative effect on our environment and quality of life.

A far better solution to our current and future auto congestion would be to expand our mass transit services. Please consider this option.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diana Jordan
This email is for your consideration as you vote on the 1-5 widening project. Please distribute to the Board and designate Item 13.

I am a Solana Beach resident with property in danger of being fully acquired as part of the 1-5 widening plan.

First, I would like to voice my support of the "No-Build" option or the "8 + 4 with BUFFER" option. In the event that the "10+4" options are considered, I would appreciate your support in voting for the "10+ 4 with BUFFER".

Additionally, we have requested that Cal Trans look into moving the freeway east on the corridor between Via de la Valle and Lomas Santa Fe in an effort to keep the Ida properties from being acquired. There is at least 30 feet of unused land on the east side of the freeway that can be used instead of taking our home.

Nationwide studies have shown that widening freeways does not alleviate traffic but instead encourages more cars on the road. We would like to see the monies set aside for this project to be circumvented to a more efficient public transport system and not freeway widening.

The highway at 5 and Via de la Valle is already 12 lanes wide - just where my home sits - and rush hour traffic has not eased up a bit since its being built last year. I believe if there was adequate mass transportation available to the riders of the freeway, they would use it.

Another question I need to ask: why isn't the 5 highway being widen where it needs to be widened the most? When you are traveling North to Los Angeles on the 5, the freeway becomes just 3 lanes as you leave Orange County.

I appreciate your time and service to this city.

Yours truly,
Darlena Del Mar, 832 Ida Avenue, Solana Beach, CA. 92075
Hello Mr. Johnston. I am writing to you to humbly request that you reject the Transportation Committee's recommendation regarding the I-5 expansion RTP 2050 plan and further that the draft EIR for the Cal-Trans proposed expansion be withdrawn and re-issued. If you would also please be so kind as to distribute this e-mail accordingly to the Board (re: Item 13).

Thank you for your time and efforts.

Sincerely,

Marisa Diaz-Waian
513 S. Nevada St.
Oceanside, CA 92054
E-Mail: wtkite333@me.com
www.seasidepreservationmovement.com
I believe traffic is a problem. But, I am not convinced that expansion of the freeway is the correct environmentally conscious decision. And I am not sure we really want another LA.
All that pollution will just give us LA air. This is not good for our health and well being.

Let's try to preserve what is so great about San Diego, and brainstorm to solve this problem responsibly.
Please do not vote to expand to 10-14 lanes of I 5.
Thank you,
Judy Deken
San Diego Association of Governments Board of Directors (SANDAG)
Attention: Mr. Philip Johnson, SANDAG
December 17 Board of Directors Meeting
ITEM 13

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Please distribute this letter to SANDAG Board members.

I am one of the organizers of the group Citizens Against Freeway Expansion. We formed this summer in reaction to the Draft Environmental Impact Report released by CalTrans District 11 this summer on the proposed expansion of I-5. I have personally been following this proposed project since the first CalTrans public hearings held in 2001. At a hearing in Solana Beach, the CalTrans project director at the time was subjected to such intense criticism that he lashed out verbally at one of my neighbors and was relieved of his job within a few days. At the hearing held at the City of Solana Beach City Hall on November 18, 2010 over one hundred people resoundingly denounced the current proposals and the City Council accepted a staff report unanimously which listed over 450 separate objections to the proposed expansion within the city limits of Solana Beach alone. City Council member Dave Roberts was so incensed he suggested that we sue CalTrans to get back the $80,000 expended on preparing the staff report!

Now that the CalTrans comment deadline has passed I have been able to review the staff reports of every city along the route as well as two major lagoon conservancies, the Torrey Pines Community Planning Board and Carmel Valley Community Planning Board in San Diego, the San Diego County League of Women Voters, the Audubon Society, the San Diego County Sierra Club, the Surfriders and other citizens groups. The commenters are unanimous in condemning this project which Solana Beach characterized as “ambiguous and unstable”. San Diego City Council Member Sherri Lightner stated the following:

In the letters we see a recurring theme: the DEIR/DEIS is flawed and did not adequately consider alternatives, impacts or mitigations. Particularly, my constituents desire a reliable multi-modal transportation system that does not include freeway expansion and provides transportation options for both residents and tourists. Frustration has been conveyed that this was never explored as an option or alternative. Additional alternatives should be coupled with the No Build alternative, along with better and more appropriate technical studies and evaluations of the various Build alternatives. The evaluations should be performed using current data and the currently required simulation techniques. The comments on the DEIR/DEIS are substantial. A recirculation of the DEIR/DEIS is warranted to allow for a more informed review of the document by the public. All inadequacies, questions and comments

Possible alternatives to be considered should include immediate, substantial and aggressive investment in transit and freight infrastructure and improvements to encourage the use of transit. This should occur before there is any further widening of the freeway infrastructure.

The City of Del Mar criticized the emphasis on freeway improvements over other alternatives, impacts on the San Dieguito Lagoon and river mouth and increase in greenhouse gas emissions. The San Dieguito River Conservancy also expressed their concerns about this project which endangers a lagoon where $80 million in restoration money has just been invested. The City of Encinitas criticized the report
on technical grounds and demanded more information on the proposed Park and Ride and Direct Access Ramps at Manchester. In a letter dated November 12, 2010 the San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy Board of Directors requested that the Park and Ride and DAR should be removed from the project. City planners informed the Carlsbad City Council in a meeting on November 15 that the DEIR lacked detail, that the project’s impacts on the city would be significant, and that it is hard to tell what those impacts would be. The City of Oceanside concluded that the project would cause serious harm to residents of their city will providing very little benefit.

Thus a recurring theme of these staff reports, prepared with enormous amounts of city staff time in the five cities involved. The Draft EIR is so confusing, lacking in clarity and deceptive, as well as riddled with factual and technical errors, that it should be withdrawn and re-written. The EIR fails to follow the basic requirement of both the US Environmental Protection Act and the California Environmental Quality Act that any such project must fully consider all alternatives. This report begins with the premise of expansion along the existing corridor and fails to consider any other form or transportation.

Finally, this project is dangerously out of control and explosively out of budget. The CalTrans Project Study report (signed by CalTrans District 11 Director Gary Gallegos on January 31, 2000) estimated the cost at $516 million (attached). A later CalTrans report in 2001 estimated $600 million. At the time of the TRANSNET election in 2004 CalTrans sent a mailer to register voters stating that the cost of the I-5 expansion would be precisely $1.234 billion. The current DEIR estimates the cost at $3.3 to 4.5 billion, some 640% to 870% higher than originally budgeted!

Finally, there is the moral issue. SANDAG Board members Joe Kellejian and Marion Dodson both stated at the time of issuance of the CalTrans report “North Coast Transportation Study” in December 2000 that there was to be “no taking of private property”. Both leaders, now retired from the SANDAG Board, have publicly stated this summer that this was the mandate given to CalTrans. As of September 1 of this year, CalTrans issued a 33 page study titled “Preliminary Potential Parcel Impacts” which cited a minimum of 73 partial and 6 full property condemnations to a maximum of 230 partial and 36 full property condemnations. This is reprehensible! Oral traditions and early biographies of Abraham Lincoln, during his time as a road surveyor, tell of Mr. Lincoln deliberately moving the path of a roadway so the home of two widows would not have to be condemned. President Lincoln was known for his compassion as well as his honesty, two traits which are not apparent in the CalTrans public relations campaign to relentlessly promote this badly planned and hopelessly outdated highway expansion plan.

In conclusion, we at Citizens Against

Copy to: SANDAG Board Member Lesa Heebner
Joe Kellejian, Solana Beach City Council, former SANDAG Board member
County Supervisor Pam Slater-Price
State Senator Christine Kehoe
State Assembly Member Martin Garrick
Marion Dodson, Former SANDAG Board Member
Bob Hawkins, San Diego Union Tribune
Chris Nichols, North County Times.
PROJECT STUDY REPORT
(PROJECT DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT)

On Interstate 5 Between Del Mar Heights Road in the City of San Diego
and Vandegrift Boulevard in the City of Oceanside.

SUBMITTED BY:  

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:  

APPROVED:  

DATE: 1-31-2000
Introduction

This report identifies various proposals to reduce the congestion, increase the capacity and improve the operational capabilities of Interstate 5 (I-5) in northern San Diego County (Exhibit 1). The Project Study Report (PSR) limits are from Del Mar Heights Road (KP 54.9; PM R34.1) in the City of San Diego to Camp Pendleton/Vandegrift Blvd. (KP 87.7; PM R54.4) in the City of Oceanside. The recommended alternative includes adding two general purpose lanes and a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction between Del Mar Heights Road to Encinitas Boulevard and adding one general purpose lane and an HOV lane in each direction between Encinitas Boulevard and Camp Pendleton/Vandegrift Blvd. Auxiliary lanes would be added in areas where projected operational constraints warrant their use. This proposed project is the freeway recommendation of the North Coast Transportation Study, conducted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). Estimated capital cost is $507 million. The support cost for environmental studies is $9.1 million (Exhibit 7). The project would be considered for funding as part of the Inter-Regional TIP program for the years 2000 through 2006 for environmental studies and preliminary engineering only. It has a programming code of HB5 (HOV Facility) and will be an eligible candidate for STIP funding.

Background

Interstate 5 is the major north-south interregional highway in San Diego County connecting to Orange County and Los Angeles. It is the most western interstate highway and runs from the Mexican border to the Canadian border. It was built in the mid-1960s and early 70s in the project area. The San Diego County portion of I-5, within the project area, has four 3.65 m portland cement concrete lanes in each direction with a 10.8 m median. Some spot improvements have been made to relieve specific operational problems, however traffic has steadily increased and the freeway is currently operating at or near capacity during a large segment of the day and is breaking down in the peak travel hours in both directions at several locations. The current travel volumes of 224,000 ADT (1998) and the projected growth of 345,000 ADT (2020) will require an overall upgrade of the facility.

The North Coast Transportation Study was started in January 1997 to study improvements to all modes of transportation facilities in the north San Diego County area. The study incorporated studies of goods movements, by rail, sea, air and truck, as I-5 is the main trucking corridor between Mexico and San Diego and to other areas of California. The study also investigated transit improvements in the region including bus, commuter rail and trolley as well as freeway and arterial street improvements and enhancements. The goal of the study is to provide an adequate transportation network based on population and transportation needs in the year 2020.
Dear Mr. Johnson,

Please distribute the following comments regarding the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (Agenda Item 13) to the SANDAG Board for consideration at the Friday Dec. 17 meeting:

I urge the SANDAG Board to not approve the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) unless it is revised to eliminate the significant expansion of vehicle lanes for I-5 and also to increase plans for alternate forms of transportation.

The proposed ultimate "improvement" of I-5 along the north coast corridor (10 F + 4ML) would nearly double the expansive width of the I-5 corridor. I drive I-5 almost every day and the thought of increasing the number of vehicle lanes as proposed is appalling. The proposed expansion of I-5 would eliminate many coastal and natural views; potentially degrade air quality; negatively impact coastal lagoons and habitat; and increase our reliance on personal automobiles and fossil fuels. Quality of life would most likely diminish. The deleterious environmental impacts and public costs far outweigh the marginal improvements in traffic flow along I-5.

I'm pleased to see the inclusion of some elements of mass transit and alternative transportation forms in the 2050 RTP. However, the RTP is still primarily focused on building bigger and bigger highways to accommodate and encourage the use of private vehicles. Transportation planning today should focus on providing better mass transit systems and land use planning rather than relying on land-gobbling vehicle lanes and claustrophobic noise barriers. We are fortunate to have a gorgeous coastline and stunning natural views in San Diego County. Please don't act to destroy them. Please revise the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan now to include a real mass transit system to service the I-5 corridor. Do not increase the number of lanes and width of I-5.

Please see also the following comments I submitted to CalTrans via email on the Draft EIR/EIS regarding the proposed expansion of I-5 (Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor project) on Nov 22, 2010.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to call me at 858 259-5131 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Vicky Gallagher
3834 Fallon Circle
San Diego, CA 92130
Dear Ms. Shay Harrison,
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed expansion of I-5 (Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project) and the Draft EIR/EIS.

I've been a resident of San Diego for over 30 years and drive the I-5 Corridor on a daily basis. The Draft EIR/EIS document describes 4 Build Alternatives designed "to maintain or improve the existing and future traffic operation in the I-5 north coast corridor in order to improve the safe and efficient regional movement of people and goods for the design year of 2030." I appreciate the fact that traffic and transportation planning is complex and difficult but I am sincerely appalled by the proposals to greatly expand the I-5 corridor as described in the Draft EIR/EIS. The 4 proposed Build Alternatives represent a truly archaic approach to transportation planning.

Implementation of any of the 4 proposed Build Alternatives would be awful. Even the least intensive of the Build Alternatives (the 8 + 4 with buffer) would nearly double the expanse of the I-5 corridor. This would significantly increase the dominance of I-5 as a coastal feature and contribute to the decline of our quality of life. Hopefully, Cal Trans and SANDAG will soon realize that adding more and more traffic lanes to freeways does not equal excellence. I'm very disappointed that the transportation solutions proposed in the Draft EIR/EIS rely almost exclusively on adding lanes and broadening the width of the I-5 corridor to horrifying dimensions. Transportation planning today must incorporate better mass transit alternatives and not rely almost exclusively on land-gobbling vehicle lanes with claustrophobic noise barriers. If any of the 4 Build Alternatives were constructed, I-5 would be the obvious dominate feature along our coastline which is neither desirable nor necessary. What's needed in Southern California and San Diego County is to focus greater planning and building efforts on functionally designed mass transit system including light rail, rail, and buses.

Based on the information provided in the draft EIR/EIS it is clear to me that none of the four build alternatives are desirable. The deleterious environmental impacts far outweigh the very marginal estimated improvements in traffic flow. The described alternative projects fail to achieve stated goals of the project which is to "protect and/or enhance the human and natural environment along the I-5 corridor." Each of the four Build Alternatives described in the draft EIR/EIS would nearly double the width of the existing I-5 corridor and create an overwhelming expense of concrete. It seems foolish to continue to build more freeway lanes. This path increases our reliance on the personal automobile, contributes to air quality degradation, destroys our scenic coastal resources, and ultimately lessen our quality of life.

The Draft EIR/EIS does not identify a preferred alternative. Which of the 4 build alternatives does CalTrans prefer and recommend? From my perspective, the No Build alternative is preferred over any of the Build Alternatives. But if CalTrans insists on building, I would prefer the least obtrusive alternative (the 8 +4 with buffer).

As described in the document, each of the Four Build Alternatives will have auxiliary lanes throughout significant portions of the I-5 corridor which are not noted in the Build Alternative titles. This is misleading to the casual reader. For example, Figure 2-2.10 on page 2-23, shows the proposed 10+4 Alternative will actually have 12 + 4 in portions of the I-5 corridor. This should be more clearly addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS. The increase in width of I-5 is most alarming.

Following are a few specific comments in the areas addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS. These comments are limited and should not be considered to be exhaustive nor complete:

**Human Environment:**

- **Traffic & Transportation:** The decrease in project area travel times for the each of the 4 alternatives is not substantial enough over the No Build alternative to justify the public expense
and resulting impacts to the human and natural environment. Why doesn’t at least one of the project alternative include a strong mass transit component in the I-5 corridor such as light rail?

- **Visual/Aesthetics**: The proposed loss of ocean and other views is not acceptable. The visual and aesthetic impact of the proposed noise barrier walls will have an impact on people’s emotional well being which has not been adequately addressed in the draft EIR/EIS. Being able to glance at expansive ocean and other natural views creates a more pleasant travel experience which contributes to personal well being and reduces road stress. The impact of the loss of such natural views and pleasant aesthetics must be evaluated and weighed against any benefit of the Build Alternatives. Has this been considered? If not, why not?

- **Other Human Environment**: The draft EIR/EIS fails to evaluate the impact 8 + 4 and 10 + 4 lanes of traffic would have on people’s emotional and psychological well being and driving behavior. For many drivers, even the existing four to five lanes of traffic are overwhelming at times and adding more lanes will likely exacerbate stress levels and lead to additional driving accidents. These issues must be evaluated if the 8 + 4 and 10 + 4 alternatives are going to be seriously considered. Have these issues been considered? If not, why not?

- **Parks and Recreation**: What redesign of the Build Alternatives is necessary in order to eliminate impacts to Park and Recreation lands? What would be the change in cost?

**Physical Environment:**

- **Noise**: Although the Draft EIR/EIS indicates noise would be mitigated by the proposed Noise barriers, the barriers themselves are significant imposing structures which would create a closed-in feeling to what should be a scenic drive. What other types of noise mitigations were considered? The use of rubberized asphaltic concrete made with waste tires can significantly reduce road noise as demonstrated in Arizona and other areas. To what extent was this considered? If not, why not?

- **Materials**: I did not see a discussion of the the materials to be used for the proposed road construction. Did I miss it somewhere? Materials used for road bed preparation, embankments, slopes, and road surface should include recycled materials where feasible. California generates over 44 million waste tires each year and these tires can be recycled into rubberized asphaltic concrete for use in vehicle lanes and shoulders. Recycled waste tires can also be used in creating berms and embankments. To what extent would each of the 4 Build Alternatives use recycled materials, including waste tires?

**Biological Environment:**

- Impacts to the biological environment, including both plant and animal species and their habitats, should be further reduced.

In summary, the Draft EIR/EIS fails to fully evaluate the impacts of the proposed Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project. None of the proposed Building Alternatives should be implemented. The cost of the projects cannot be justified by the rather meager benefits to traffic flow especially in light of the significant unmitigated impacts to the human and natural environment. I believe the emphasis in transportation planning today should be on developing better mass transit capabilities instead of relying on bigger and bigger highways.

I appreciate your efforts and look forward to seeing your response to comments. Thank you for your time and consideration and your work on this project.

Sincerely,

Vicky Gallagher
3834 Fallon Circle
San Diego, CA 92130
From: Walter Carlin [mailto:wcarlin1@san.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 11:41 AM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: Senator.Kehoe@sen.ca.gov
Subject: I 5 Proposed Expansion

Please distribute to the Board as Item 13:

Will it be worth it? The destruction of homes and businesses, the increase in pollution, the loss of ocean view over a 27-mile segment to save 10 minutes of travel time compared with 2006?

What happens when 12 lanes of traffic, downsized from 14 lanes just miles before, shrinks to eight lanes at the Oceanside/Camp Pendleton border? Monstrous gridlock or more concrete? That’s not addressed in the proposal.

And when plans are announced (doubtless already planned but not publicly disclosed), to widen the Camp Pendleton segment to 12 lanes, how will Orange County handle this 50% increase over their existing capacity? Might the San Onofre Toll Road will rise from its well-deserved grave and solve the problem? And make a few developers rich(er)? (At what grade level need our children be taught to spell "oligarchy?")

Meanwhile, Los Angeles is extending its successful MTA rail system west from downtown, this in a city where the residents – it was said – will never forsake their cars for something as plebeian as public transit.

Is this our legacy to our kids – 12 and 14 lanes of heavily traveled, pollution-spewing, noise-creating traffic? Must we first become an L.A. to learn its sad lesson?

Walter Carlin
Del Mar
From: Roger Boyd [mailto:heyroger@roadrunner.com]  
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 12:52 PM  
To: Lesa Heebner  
Cc: Pam Slater-Price; Bill Horn; Mark Wyland; Martin Garrick; Christine Kehoe; Sherri Lightner; Johnston, Phillip  
Subject: SANDAG - 2050 RTP and Item13

Thank you Lesa, for your continued advise and education on SANDAG's 2050 Regional Transportation Plan evolution and how the proposed I-5 expansion fits as one of the components (Item 13).

We oppose the I-5 DEIR and its proposed expansion plan in its entirety, because it is incomplete, and ambiguous. It needs to be revised and rewritten to include responses to the thousands of questions and suggestions submitted before the Nov. 22 comment deadline. This comprehensive public input will be valuable during the revision process and must be recognized as such. The public is significantly more engaged in transit planning and other environmental issues than we were six years ago when Transnet was passed. We are better educated and more active than in the recent past. We can feel the new energy around us, from both young and old.

We documented a few issues in letters to Caltrans before the comment deadline, and at the July 27th Encinitas public meeting during a conversation with a staff public recorder and additional hand written questions.

Our primary issue, without getting into details, is the absence of thorough coordination of the I-5 DEIR with the RTP. In our opinion the 2050 RTP must be the master planning document and the I-5 DEIR and other highway modification plans are important, but only part of the RTP. We believe the RTP takes priority and the many other components of Transit should be coordinated to maximize regional quality of life, including health, safety, and environmental protection. This coordination planning may reveal a modified project funding plan with emphasis on Transit and a deemphasize on highway modifications for the forty year planning period.

Also, the possibility of separation of freight traffic from passenger cars and small local delivery vehicles must be addressed. It is a realistic possibility.

Regarding the 2050 RTP:

1. "High Speed Rail" is on its way to the San Diego region and this inevitability must be recognized with substantial comment in the RTP
2. In the next 40 years air transportation systems, both continental and international, will significantly change and grow. Their impact must be recognized, including cross-border issues and opportunities.

Thanks again for representation.

Mary Jane and Roger Boyd  
Solana Beach  
858.481.7547
To the SANDAG Board-

Please consider and approve the 50/10 Transit Plan option on your vote tomorrow. We must think beyond the "one car, one driver" mentality, and the ever-widening freeways, as the region grows in the coming years.

Bruce Bekkar, MD
Chair, Energy Issues Advisory Committee
City of Del Mar
From: lisa hamilton [mailto:skilisa@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 1:17 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Subject: I-5 expansion

Please further reduce the expansion of the I-5, item 13. The number of lanes proposed will be built for the cars of yesterday and today, not the cars of tomorrow. Computer controlled cars are not a science fiction; they are real and coming to a freeway near us within a few years, probably before the proposed expansion is finished. When computers guide vehicles they can run faster and closer together. When coastal views are built out they can never be regained. Build LESS, not MORE. We know technology doubles every 18 months; don't build for yesterday. Build for the future and save the I-5 viewsed.

There are too many bridges and off/on ramps to rebuild to have enough money in the project left over to double track the railroad and offer it as a meaningful alternative to the freeway. Cost overruns are inevitable. Double tracking would mean expanded service. Service that is easy to access means people use the facility. See Honolulu Bus service which runs very frequently and is heavily used. Think about more alternatives than building the I-5.

Please distribute this to your fellow Board members. Sincerely, Lisa Hamilton, 323 S. Ditmar St. Oceanside, CA. 92054
Dear SANDAG Board of Directors:

The I-5 expansion plan, as it stands, is unacceptable to me and almost everyone I know. You need to scrap it and start over again.

Our money should not be spent on increasing the capacity of the region’s highways without first exploring all possibilities for state-of-the-art transit alternatives. The current plan lacks vision.

Its implementation will destroy what draws people to the San Diego area, it will divide our city visually, and on a larger scale, it will leave us stuck in the past.

You have heard the outcries of the public against the current plan. Do you really choose to ignore them?

Sincerely,

C.J. Minster
1202 Melba Road
Encinitas, CA 92024
Johnston, Phillip

From: Kate David [katedavid@cox.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 4:57 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: pam.slater@sdcounty.ca.gov; jstocks@ci.encinitas.ca.us
Subject: Comment regarding the 50-10 Plan
Attachments: Letter to SANDAG Board re 2050 RTP (FINAL) (2) 1 .pdf

Dear Mr. Philip Johnson,

I want to submit my comment to you and my SANDAG representatives - to SANDAG - in favor of a greater emphasis on transit, as outlined in the attached letter's 50-10 Plan. I can only add my one voice to this letter's well articulated argument regarding this preferred alternative for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan for SD County. Please hear us.

Sincerely,
Kate David
December 16, 2010

Via Electronic Mail

Vice Chair Jerome Stocks and
Members of the Board of Directors
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario

Dear Board Members:

Save Our Forest and Ranchlands ("SOFAR") and the Cleveland National Forest Foundation ("CNFF") submit this letter to comment on the Board of Directors’ deliberations on the preferred alternative for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan ("2050 RTP"). While the Transportation Committee is recommending that the Board of Directors accept the Hybrid Scenario as the preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario, we are concerned that this Scenario, if implemented, would continue to place an unacceptable emphasis on regional highway capacity. Although the Hybrid Scenario is certainly a step in the right direction because it includes about $24 billion in transit investment, the Scenario also includes about $21 billion for highway expansion. Increasing highway capacity at the same time as the region is trying to grow its transit mode share is an inherently flawed approach to regional transportation mobility. Moreover, such an ill-fated approach will sabotage the potential to create a truly sustainable land use for the San Diego region.

SOFAR and CNFF respectfully request that the Board defer further consideration of the Hybrid Scenario and instead direct SANDAG staff to evaluate the merits of a 50-10 Plan. The 50-10 Plan, which envisions 50 years of transit within a 10-year period, would include the
following components: (1) transit infrastructure and operational service improvements fully built-out prior to any consideration of highway capacity projects; (2) a comprehensively designed and fully integrated transit network; (3) an initial emphasis on the urban core and the Sprinter and Coaster lines.  

1. **Background**

For much of the last decade, SOFAR has participated in SANDAG’s regional transportation planning processes, advocating that SANDAG pursue a comprehensive transit network for the San Diego region. To this end, SOFAR participated in the 2003 RTP (referred to as 2030 RTP) and the 2007 RTP planning processes. With each iteration of the RTP, SOFAR has consistently advocated that SANDAG allocate the vast majority of the region’s transportation funding to expanding transit infrastructure and operational service instead of highway infrastructure.

Notwithstanding these requests, SANDAG directed the lion’s share of revenue in the 2007 RTP to expanding the region’s highway network while directing a relatively minor portion toward public transportation. Indeed, the 2007 RTP called for adding more than 800 total-lane miles to the region’s highways which, when constructed, would result in a 52 percent increase in daily system-wide vehicle miles traveled (“VMT”) compared to 2007 conditions. DEIR at 7-3 and 7-12. SANDAG’s environmental impact report (“EIR”) for the 2007 RTP confirmed the RTP’s alarming implications for global climate change -- the Plan was projected to cause a cumulatively considerable contribution to the worldwide increase in greenhouse gas (AGHG©) emissions, adding 5.3 million tons of GHG emissions to the atmosphere every year. DEIR at 4.7-34 and 4.7-38. SANDAG’s highway-centric approach to regional transportation in the 2007 RTP also prompted a sharp response from the California Attorney General who criticized SANDAG because it had not analyzed an RTP alternative that would greatly reduce the extent (and cost) of freeway lane expansion projects, and therefore allow investing more funds in urban core transit, walking and biking improvements that would reduce VMT.

SOFAR’s participation in the 2007 RTP process culminated in a settlement agreement with SANDAG. The 2008 SOFAR/SANDAG Settlement Agreement required SANDAG to “develop a regional long-range transit plan, and five-year and ten-year transit action plans, with emphasis given to the urban core.” 2008 Agreement at 3. According to the Settlement Agreement, the purpose of the “transit plan with urban core emphasis” was intended to investigate “regional, corridor, local, and neighborhood transit services (e.g., transit capital improvements; operational changes; fare restructuring; design of intermodal transfer facilities) that would make transit time competitive with the private car. Id. (emphasis added). SOFAR and CNFF agree with this purpose. It is important to note, however, that SOFAR also intended that the purpose of the urban core plan was to design a transit program that allocated the vast majority of the region’s transportation resources to transit and that these resources be allocated

---

1 The “urban core” is the geographic sub-area that includes the downtown San Diego Trolley Ring and National City.

2 SOFAR’s participation in the 2003 RTP also culminated in a Settlement Agreement with SANDAG.
primarily to projects within the urban core. SOFAR’s vision of the urban core plan thus never included funding for the expansion of highways. Thus far, SANDAG has not developed or studied an urban core alternative as envisioned by SOFAR.

2. SANDAG’s Hybrid Scenario Would Not Result in a Sustainable Region.

With this iteration of the RTP, we are pleased that SANDAG recognizes the importance of transit as a viable component in the region’s transportation network. Yet, the Hybrid Scenario contains serious flaws which would result in a failure to advance the region’s smart growth goals. First, the Hybrid Scenario would continue to fund massive increases in highway infrastructure concurrently with the expansion of the region’s transit network. Funding both highway expansion and transit is an ill-fated approach that will not allow the region to achieve its sustainability goals.

Investing in highways will undermine the region’s attempt to promote infill development within the region’s urban communities. Continued emphasis on facilitating highway travel also perpetuates development patterns that are inherently unsuited to alternative modes. Investing in transit capital and operational improvements, on the other hand, creates transit certainty which in turn is a critical factor for supporting the growth of compact communities. Moreover, as discussed below, substantial increases in highway capacity perpetuate auto-oriented development and significantly impact transit patronage, since the presence of congestion is an incentive to transit usage.

In addition, while the Hybrid Scenario contemplates investing about $24 billion in public transportation, certain of the transit projects are proposed in locations, or along relatively low-density development corridors, that would not achieve optimal ridership. By funding transit projects over such a dispersed geographical area, the effectiveness, and therefore benefits, of transit become diluted. Without a concentrated and integrated transit system, the region will never achieve optimal transit mode share goals. Transit investment must be targeted for areas that either already have relatively intense land use or which have planned intensified land uses. In other words, it is not just the amount of transit, but the location of that transit that will ultimately affect land use that will, in turn, lead to major changes in travel habits.

As discussed above, SOFAR has repeatedly emphasized the importance of implementing a comprehensive transit system in the region’s urban core. See e.g., the alternative SOFAR provided to SANDAG in the context of the 2007 RTP, February 16, 2007. The infrastructure in the urban core, coupled with this community’s demographics, suggest that this location has tremendous potential for increased transit mode share. Roadways within the urban core were developed on a grid system which inherently supports the efficient movement of transit vehicles. In fact, some of the heaviest traveled bus routes in the trolley ring area were once served by streetcars. It is important to note that, in addition to concentrating transit in the urban core, SOFAR and CNFF wholeheartedly endorse SANDAG’s proposals to double track the Sprinter and the Coaster lines.
In sum, SANDAG’s proposed Hybrid Scenario would not ensure that the region meets its sustainability, transportation or environmental goals. SANDAG should follow the precedent being set by urban regions around the world by: (a) committing to a future of smart growth, and (b) funding a transportation network that will support the mobility needs of this smart growth. Alternative transportation approaches to the Hybrid Scenario are available and should be examined. Set forth below is a sketch of an approach — referred to as the 50-10 Plan — that would achieve this important goal. We respectfully request that SANDAG work with this sketch to formulate a revised alternative for the 2050 RTP.

3. The 50-10 Plan Would Result in Considerable Benefits Compared to SANDAG’s Hybrid Scenario.

SANDAG should develop a 50-10 Plan for the San Diego region. A 50-10 Plan, which envisions 50 years of transit implemented within a 10-year period, would include the following components: (a) full buildout of the region’s public transportation network prior to funding any additional highway expansion; (b) the regional transit network would be a comprehensive, well-integrated system; and (c) an initial focus on the urban core, the Sprinter and the Coaster. In developing this 50-10 Plan, we encourage SANDAG to look to the plans prepared by two cities: Bordeaux and Los Angeles.

In just six years, Bordeaux completed a transit revolution, changing the car-dominated nature of the city center, by building 3 tram lines with total length of 27 miles and 88 stations. Sustainable transportation mode share is expected to increase to 17% city-wide by 2010 (37% for the city centre), compared to 9% in 1998. These transit investments have supported housing revitalization, walk-ability and business activity in downtown Bordeaux. The average time gain on every transit trip with the tram network was estimated to be eight minutes. This significant improvement was accompanied by an urban revitalization of an unequalled magnitude in France, transforming a much neglected downtown area.3

Los Angeles is also undertaking what appears to be an equally ambitious approach to fund a comprehensive transit program. The 30/10 Initiative would use the City’s 30-year sales tax revenue (which allocates ½ cent to transit projects) to leverage federal funding and complete a robust transit plan in ten years. According to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, the 30/10 Initiative will:

- Create 160,000 new jobs
- Result in 77 million more transit boardings
- Generate 521,000 fewer pounds of mobile source pollution emissions
- Use 10.3 million fewer gallons of gasoline
- Result in 191 million fewer vehicle miles traveled

See Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (www.metro.net), available at http://www.metro.net/projects/50-10/.

Set forth below is a summary of the components, and overall goals, of a 50-10 Plan.

A. The 50-10 Plan Would Implement Transit Projects Prior to Highway Capacity Projects.

If transit is to succeed in the region, it must now be the region’s highest priority. SANDAG must build out its public transportation network before funding any additional highway projects. Highway expansion is not unlike a treadmill. Decades of highway expansion projects have encouraged decentralized development patterns supported by easy highway access. In turn this decentralized development has encouraged massive traffic growth, leading to congestion, and the demand for further highway expansion. Consequently, for at least the last 30 years, San Diego’s legacy has been a devotion to the automobile. The sprawling pattern of land development and the extensive highways have contributed to a region that is almost entirely automobile dependent. Not surprisingly, vehicle miles traveled (“VMT”) has grown exponentially. Moreover, the San Diego region has more than its fair share of freeways. According to the Texas Transportation Institute Urban Mobility Study, the San Diego region ranks as having the most per capita freeway lane miles of the country’s fifteen largest regions.

A confluence of factors is contributing to a dramatic shift in our development patterns: the economy, an aging population, global climate change, and concern about our dependence on foreign oil are contributing to an escalating shift in residential market demand. The public is now seeking smaller homes, shorter commutes and more urbanized living. Developers and jurisdictions are reacting to this demand by intensifying land uses in our urban areas. This shift in development patterns results in a corresponding shift in transportation needs. Residents of more compact development – such as that in the urban core – have much less need for automobiles compared to their suburban counterparts. SANDAG must acknowledge this fundamental land use shift and plan its future transportation network accordingly. The region no longer needs wider highways to the suburbs. Instead, the region’s highest priority must be enhanced mobility for urban residents.

There are two additional reasons why the 50-10 Plan should not include any highway widening projects. First, increases in highway infrastructure undercut transit ridership. Traffic congestion provides a significant incentive to seek alternative modes of transportation. High quality public transportation tends to attract travelers who might otherwise drive. Once highways are widened, however, traffic congestion eases, travel speeds increase (at least for some period of time), and travelers again begin to drive. Thus, a comprehensive transit program would be essentially guaranteed to fail if a massive increase in highway capacity were to accompany the Plan’s public transit investments. Second, as discussed further below, intensive land use tends to follow transit development. Improving transit thus provides further incentive for the growth of compact communities. Funding highways, on the other hand, would only contribute further toward decentralized, low density development patterns.
Now is the time to shift directions in transportation mobility and this simply cannot be accomplished in a half-hearted manner. Instead of committing $21 billion toward highway expansion projects, as the Hybrid Scenario contemplates, SANDAG must commit this funding to transit. In any event, SANDAG must not fund increases in highway capacity at the same time as it proposes a substantial commitment to transit. Put simply, a comprehensive transit system must be fully implemented prior to considering any further increases in highway capacity.

B. The 50-10 Plan Would Be Based on a Compact Development, High Density Land Use Plan.

The foundation of the 50-10 Plan must be the development of a preferred regional land use plan—a smart growth land use plan—and the development of a transportation mobility network that supports the needs of this smart growth plan. This is a vitally important point. The region’s historical land use patterns must change in order to ensure a sustainable future. This shift is already underway. SANDAG must be at the forefront of this change and lead the region in this new direction. The fact that the San Diego region has traditionally experienced a low-density, decentralized development pattern should not be an excuse for a continuation of unsustainable land use practices.

San Diego, like many urban regions around the country, is undergoing a fundamental shift in residential development patterns toward more compact, infill, multi-modal development. Not surprisingly, residents of these urban areas are seeking transit-oriented homes. As one study shows, in the San Francisco Bay Area, about 600,000 households are located within a half-mile of an existing rail transit or bus station. Over the next 25 years, an estimated additional 250,000 households will be seeking transit-oriented homes, an increase of 40 percent. See Transit Oriented Development, New Places, New Choices in the San Francisco Bay Area, November 2006, available at: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/tod/TOD_Book.pdf.

At the same time, this compact, infill development has the potential to make public transportation more efficient. People living or working close to high-quality transit use it with much greater frequency than people farther from transit. One study found that California transit station area residents are about five times more likely to commute by transit as the average worker in the same city. See Land Use Impacts on Transportation, Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, (citing Land, Cervero and Willson (2004)), December 7, 2010 at 24. These higher levels of transit use can improve the cost-effectiveness of transit investments, bolster the financial stability of transit systems and support higher-quality transit. In turn, proximity to higher quality public-transit infrastructure such as rail, trolley or bus lines and stations tends to further encourage compact, mixed, multi-modal development. See Evaluating Transportation Land Use Impacts, Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, at 16.

The planning principles of transit oriented development or communities are not new—indeed they represent a return to the development patterns common to older cities throughout the world. Siting homes, jobs, shops and services within walking distance of mass transit hubs was the typical pattern of development as American cities expanded along railroad corridors and
streetcar lines in the 19th and early-20th centuries. See Transit Oriented Development, New Places, New Choices in the San Francisco Bay Area at 3. Indeed, in the 1970s, San Diego led the nation by being the first to build a low-cost rail line. Dozens of other cities have since followed, using rail transit as the foundation for their transit systems. Unfortunately, over the last 40 years, San Diego seems to have lost its way.

Despite the San Diego region’s unsustainable past, ample opportunity exists to develop compact, infill, multi-modal development within the County’s urbanized areas. SOFAR and CNFF recently commissioned an analysis of the infill development potential within the County’s 18 cities. See Infill Scenario Study, prepared by GreenInfo Network (submitted previously). Using SANDAG’s 2030 Employment and Residential Land Inventory (“SANDAG Inventory”), the Infill Study determined that the County can more than meet its need for new housing over the next several decades by concentrating development in existing cities. The SANDAG inventory projects that the County will require 230,000 new housing units by 2030. Using this figure as a starting point, the Infill Scenario Study concluded that, based on the incorporated cities’ existing General Plans and zoning, there is ample development capacity to accommodate approximately 400,000 new homes in the incorporated cities of San Diego County. Thus, all of the region’s projected housing needs for 2030 could take place as infill development (within the incorporated cities of San Diego). Moreover, the cities would still have 170,000 additional units available for development beyond 2030.

The implications of this Infill Study are profound. Beyond the obvious benefits to transportation (such as reduced commute trip lengths, reduced VMT and increased potential for a viable public transportation system), focusing development in the County’s urbanized areas or cities and developing in a compact manner would reduce unnecessary land consumption and allow for the preservation of the back-country’s environmentally sensitive lands. A land use plan such as that described in the Infill Study would reduce the waste of natural resources including energy and water, as well as the impacts of development on air and water quality. According to the draft EIR for the San Diego County General Plan Update, the proposed General Plan would result in 22 significant and unavoidable environmental impacts including impacts to aesthetics, agriculture, air quality, biological resources, hazards, hydrology/water quality, minerals, noise, public services, traffic, and utilities. Many of these environmental impacts could be reduced or avoided altogether if the County directed the vast majority of its projected residential development to the County’s 18 cities.

C. The 50-10 Plan Would Fund a Comprehensive, Integrated Transit System that Focuses Initially on the Urban Core.

SANDAG’s proposal to commit $24 billion to transit, while ambitious, is unlikely to result in a substantial increase in transit mode share. The problem with the Hybrid Scenario’s approach extend beyond the ill-fated proposal to commit $21 billion in highway expansion while also funding transit. The second fundamental flaw is that the transit projects that are contemplated by the Hybrid Scenario are simply spread over too large a geographical area and planned for inappropriate transportation corridors.
The SANDAG urban region is enormous, comprising about 800 square miles. The Hybrid Scenario proposes transit investment over an area that is roughly 200 square miles. In contrast, the urban core area is about 40 to 60 square miles. In order to be successful, the region’s transit system must be initially focused in a discrete geographical location that allows for the development of a comprehensive and well-integrated system. We strongly encourage SANDAG to initially build-out transit in the urban core (along with double-tracking the Coaster and Sprinter). The goal of such a transit system is that it would allow mobility within the geographical limits of the Urban Core without an automobile; efficient transitions between various public transit modes (e.g., light rail, trolley and bus service); and connections to other modes (e.g., pedestrians and bicyclists should have safe, accessible routes to transit stops. Indeed, the work that SANDAG did conduct on the Urban Area Transit Study shows that there is tremendous potential to increase transit mode share within the urban core.

Once the urban core public transit system is fully built out, as well as the Coaster and Sprinter, the second phase of the 50-10 Plan would be designed, working outward from the urban core.

4. Conclusion

SOFAR and CNFF are encouraged by SANDAG’s willingness to allocate $24 billion of the region’s relatively scarce transportation resources to public transportation. Yet SANDAG should not commit this funding to a transit plan while concurrently increasing the capacity of the region’s highways. In addition, SANDAG should design a geographically focused and well-integrated transit program beginning with the urban core, the Sprinter and the Coaster. SANDAG owes it to the residents of the region to plan for the future, and not just perpetuate the unsustainable transportation policies of the past. We urge the Board to direct SANDAG staff to design and study the 50-10 Plan.

Sincerely,

Duncan McFetridge

P:\CNFF\SANDAG RTP\SOFAR CNFF Documents\Letter to SANDAG Board re 2050 RTP (FINAL).doc
Johnston, Phillip

From: Carris Rhodes [carrisrhodes@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 4:58 PM
To: council@carlsbad.ca.gov; jstocks@ci.encinitas.ca.us; t.heabner@cosb.org; chilliard@delmar.ca.us;
    sherrilightner@sandiego.ca.gov; pam.slater@sdcounty.ca.gov; Johnston, Phillip; jwood@ci.oceanside.ca.us

Subject: Input for 2050 regional transportation plan

Hello Board Members and County Supervisor,

After looking over the proposals for the 2050 San Diego County regional transportation plan I strongly encourage you to choose the 50-10 with a greater emphasis on transit rather than freeway expansion.

Thank you for your service,

Carris Rhodes
Encinitas Resident
From: Noel Spaid [nspaid@san.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 5:36 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip; bill.hom@sdcounty.ca.gov; pam.slater@sdcounty.ca.gov; Elizabeth Taylor; DENNIS RIDZ; NORM RATNER; CHARLES RICHMOND; CARLA LAPORTE; Anna Cotton; ckeenton1@san.rr.com

Subject: SANDAG - DESIGNATE FOR ITEM 13 ON FRIDAY'S AGENDA

SANDAG 12-17-10 ITEM 13

PLAGUE appreciates "strong principles" which is how we believe we are- with "Strong Principles" and the belief that putting 4.5 billion dollars into a 38 year plan that has a proven history of constant failure, is about as oblivious to reality, smart planning, wise use of taxpayers' money, and good government as we can even imagine, on top of the fact that it will bring more cars creating more pollution and we already rate as the worst city in America for days of pollution-literally #50. How do you want us to compromise on these issues which are plain no brainers?

We want the 4.5 billion put into Transit Not Traffic like all major, metropolitan cities have gone to, including LOS ANGELES, which has given up on expanding freeways as a solution to gridlock, after 40 years of failure in doing just that. It is time for real leadership in San Diego, we need effective, efficient transit that moves many people, not many little machines. Transit does work, and is a proven solution just as expansion is a proven failure. The studies are all available. How do we compromise this?
Attached please find a letter that includes Equinox Center’s research and position on transportation issues in the County, particularly as they relate to the discussion which will occur at SANDAG’s board meeting tomorrow on the 2050 RTP. A list of Equinox Center supporters follows the letter.

Please distribute to the SANDAG board. Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

--
Ann Tartre, Program Director
Equinox Center
545 2nd St, #3
Encinitas, CA 92024
Tel: 760-230-2960
www.equinoxcenter.org
December 16, 2010

The Honorable Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair
SANDAG Board of Directors
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mayor Holt-Pfeiler:

The Equinox Center is an independent, non-partisan, non-profit research and policy center based in Encinitas. We are dedicated to providing objective information to decision makers in San Diego County about how to balance regional growth with our finite natural resources. We are writing to you today to provide data and research to the SANDAG board that we hope will be valuable in your decision making process on the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan.

Summary of Equinox Center Position on Item 13 of Dec 17 Board agenda:
In the RTP 2050, the SANDAG Board of Directors has a tremendous leadership opportunity to step out to create a bold and sustainable transportation plan for San Diego County. Data from Equinox Center’s soon-to-be released 2011 Regional Quality of Life Dashboard reveals that we need to do better when it comes to transportation in our region. We believe SANDAG should put the region on the path towards more sustainable development by ensuring the updated RTP does the following:

- Minimizes vehicle miles traveled in the region, thereby reducing air quality problems, helping us achieve climate goals, reducing congestion and improving our economic competitiveness
- Focuses discretionary funds on public transit
- Prioritizes projects that help us meet our multiple goals

1. Minimize vehicle miles traveled

HIGHWAY VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT)
PER CAPITA PER DAY
SELECT REGIONS, 2008 AND 2009

![Graph showing highway vehicle miles traveled](chart.png)

Source: Equinox Center, 2010; California Department of Transportation, 2008, 2009
Total vehicle miles traveled in the region have doubled in the past two decades, as have traffic delays. As you can see from the chart above, per capita vehicle miles traveled in San Diego County are above the California average, and even significantly above Los Angeles County. High VMTs have many consequences on quality of life in the region.

It is estimated that traffic delays cost us about $1,000/person/year, and have an economic cost to the region as a whole. 75% of businesses in the region say that traffic congestion is a significant obstacle to doing business in the region. For this reason, we call for actions that get people off the roads and using fast, reliable transit that connects people from where they live to where they work, shop, and learn.

In addition to the impacts of congestion on economic development and on personal time available to spend with family and friends, we hope you will consider the air quality impacts of the new RTP. Though San Diego has made some gains in air quality in the last decade, we are still in non-attainment for particulate matter, and according to 2009 EPA data, air quality in the county was considered unhealthy on 28 days for elderly and children, our most vulnerable populations. Air pollution costs the California economy more than $28 billion annually, about $1,200/person in Southern California because of lost worker productivity and public health costs. And lower income and minority communities suffer disproportionately from air quality issues, especially if they live near highways.

In addition to air emissions that impact public health, we need to act aggressively now to achieve our climate goals.

**AVERAGE GHG EMISSIONS**
**PER CAPITA PER DAY (LBS CO₂)**

![Graph showing average GHG emissions per capita per day](image)

To reduce the number of days our air is considered unhealthy, and to achieve our climate goals, we must plan and act now to reduce miles traveled in the region.

II. Focus discretionary funds on fast, convenient public transportation

In order to address the region's long-term economic, environmental, and mobility challenges, first-class public transportation is necessary. To reduce VMT, congestion that inhibits economic development and to improve quality of
life for residents, more people need to have access to and choose transit.

TRANSPORTATION TO WORK
SAN DIEGO, 2009

- Taxicab, Motorcycle, Bicycle, or Other: 2%
- Walked: 3%
- Public Transportation: 3%
- Carooled: 10%
- Worked at Home: 6%
- Drove Alone: 76%

Source: Equinex Center, 2010; American Community Survey, 2009 (Table C08301)

SANDAG’s own public opinion survey revealed these barriers to more transit ridership.

PRIMARY BARRIERS TO INCREASED PUBLIC TRANSIT RIDERSHIP IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY

Source: Equinex Center, San Diego Regional Transportation Public Opinion Study 2008, Fig. 21
We cannot increase transit ridership significantly if we do not spend the funds necessary to do so. The committed projects in the region’s RTP provide the highest percentage of highway expansion dollars of any major region in California. By focusing discretionary funds on public transportation projects, it will create better overall balance in SANDAG’s transportation investments. Although the network strategy represents a small portion of the budget, it is an opportunity to create a better balance in transportation investments.

III. Prioritize projects that support regional goals

Because TransNet has sizeable flexibility in the sequencing and timing of projects, all projects in the TransNet ordinance should be ranked according to their ability to effectively meet multiple goals, such as reducing vehicle miles traveled and cutting pollution. High ranking projects should be prioritized for inclusion in the 2020 and 2035 time frames.

In summary, the San Diego region has a remarkable quality of life and as our population grows we need to make choices that maintain or enhance it. We ask you to consider the common good of all the region’s residents and businesses, and to help make San Diego County a model when it comes to integrated, intelligent transportation planning for the future.

We have attached a list of Equinox Center's board and supporters. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions.

Sincerely,

Ann Tartre, Program Director
Equinox Center
545 2nd St, #3
Encinitas, CA 92024

CC:
Clerk of the Board
LIST OF SUPPORTERS

San Diego Visionaries: $50,000 +
- Brown Family Trust
- Contorer Foundation
- Orca Fund

San Diego Futurists: $10,000 - $50,000
- Eric and Jennie Busboom
- Trevor and Sandy Callan
- Katherine Kennedy and Robert Horsman
- Phyllis Huckabee
- Larry Marcus Family Fund
- Mintz Levin
- Scott Peters and Lynn Gorguze
- Deirdra Price
- John and Marcia Price Family Foundation
- Diane Rosenberg and Chris Gopal
- San Diego Foundation
- SDG&E
- Sempra
- Tom Sudberry – Sudberry Properties

San Diego Stewards: $2,500 to $10,000
- Cox Communications
- Reed Caldwell
- Roi Ewell
- Mark and Kathy Fackler
- Murray and Elaine Galinson
- Jeremy and Kyla Hayden
- Ellen Kirk
- Leichtag Family Foundation
- Bill Malloy III
- Mary Matava – Agri-Serve, Inc.
- Mervyn L. Brenner Foundation
- McKewon Family Foundation
- NAMTRA Media
- PEERS
- Abe Ordover and Eleanor Musick
- Ron and Marion Paul
- Gina and Pat Rogers
- San Diego Downtown Kiwanis
- SeaWorld San Diego
- Charles Schwab
- Ann Tartre
- Union Bank

San Diego Citizens: Up to $1000
- Dan A. Conners Trust
- Malcolm Davies
- Dining Details
- Todd and Marie Gutschow
- Olaf Walters
From:  Dennis Lees [dennislees@cox.net]  
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 7:21 PM  
To: Johnston, Phillip  
Cc: bill.horn@sdcounty.ca.gov; pam.slater@sdcounty.ca.gov; jstocks@ci.encinitas.ca.us  
Subject: Comments on Proposed I-5 Widening Project  

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I am writing to communicate my views on the proposed I-5 widening project. I was born in San Diego and remember the city when access to principal activities in Mission Valley, the dairies, was on dirt roads. I remember going away to college and coming home for breaks long before there were any freeways. We drove north on the Pacific Coast Highway. So I recognize that construction of the freeways has resulted in substantial convenience and has allowed the City of San Diego and the neighboring communities to grow. Working on the construction of I-8 while in college also helped me pay for my college education.

But I also know the extent to which the construction of these freeways have reduced the charm and beauty of the entire area. And the freeways have allowed and encouraged us, as citizens and the population of this great city, to become accustomed to living in a very inefficient and unsustainable manner, especially in comparison to many of the great cities of the U. S. on the East coast, where they have invested in developing rapid transit and other public transportation networks.

Regarding the proposed I-5 expansion, it certainly seems that a large proportion of the populace in the communities bordering I-5 have made it abundantly clear they have very strong concerns about a variety of issues regarding this plan and are concerned that far more consideration should be given to mass transit and other public transportation options - anything to get us, the citizens and residents of the cities, off the freeways in our cars.

Moreover, SANDAG's own projections indicate that the "new and improved" freeway will be overloaded again within a short time. I well realize that you and your colleagues at SANDAG feel the voters cast their votes on this project when they passed the TransNet tax measure several years ago. However, you must also realize the majority of the voters didn't look carefully at what was proposed and, in any event, were not voting for the currently proposed plan for widening I-5. Moreover, since it was a county-wide plan and a large proportion of the vote came from voters that live quite distant from I-5, far from the impacts of this proposed monstrosity, the vote wasn't really a fair way to ask the question.

You must also realize that this project will be a terrible blight on the phenomenal views and feel of our coastal freeway and the adjacent neighborhoods. Before we make such a change, which will last generations, we need to think it through far more carefully and thoughtfully. We must think of what will work for the next generation of residents and transportation. We won't be driving individual cars for many more years. There are lots of better ideas out there. We need to encourage them by thinking futuristically rather than just provide continued support for the status quo, a century-old technology, the same-old same-old. Let's plan for the future rather than the past.

In addition to those aspects of the project, the environmental aspects of the Draft EIR were inadequate and unsatisfactory. For example, the open water habitats in the lagoons are virtually ignored. Given the fact that most of the pollutants from the increased traffic on the freeways will ultimately end up residing in sediments underlying these bodies of water, this is unacceptable. Using a search feature of the document, I found no mention of crabs of any kind,
particularly fiddler crab that are restricted to the edges of the seaward portions of the lagoons, or burrowing or motile shrimp, or clams. As a marine ecologist that specializes in animals that live in and on the sediments, I know that fiddler crabs occur in San Elijo and Batiquitos Lagoons but I'm not sure whether they occur in Agua Hedionda or have colonized San Dieguito Lagoon since its restoration. All of these groups are important as forage items for the many bird species that move through the lagoons during spring or fall migration, or overwinter in these sensitive bodies of water. Moreover, because they burrow extensively down to, at least, the water table, their activities are very important to sediment quality, which has major implications for the nature and "health" of the rest of the infauna (animals living in the sediments).

Additionally, fish are given very little comment and the effect of increased runoff of polluted water into the lagoons on their quality as nursery habitat for fish such as California halibut is ignored. Again, this is unacceptable and requires further examination and analysis.

Basically, from what I saw during the short period I had to look over the document, the environmental section looked pretty superficial. The environmental implications of such a major project through and over these major sensitive habitats deserve far more attention and respect. And the potential effects on future generations deserve much more attention and respect. As Chief Seattle said many generations ago, "We have not inherited the Earth from our ancestors, we have just borrowed it from our children!"

The damage this project would do to the region, its communities and ecosystems, and its residents will last generations. Many cities around the world have shown there is a better, cleaner, and more efficient way. Why are SANDAG and CALTRANS still stuck in an approach that is a century old?

Please, let's start planning for the future and not make complete fools of ourselves.

Respectfully,

Dennis Lees
Leucadia
Re: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario

Dear Board Members:

Please include this letter of support for the comments previously submitted by SOFAR and CNFF regarding the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario. I hereby join SOFAR/CNFF in respectfully requesting that the Board defer further consideration of the Hybrid Scenario. Instead, please direct SANDAG staff to evaluate the merits of a 50-10 Plan, to implement 50 years of transit within a 10-year period, to truly embrace a smart growth solution for our region.

This plan would include: (1) transit infrastructure and operational service improvements fully built-out prior to any consideration of highway capacity projects; (2) a comprehensively designed and fully integrated transit network; (3) an initial emphasis on the urban core and the Sprinter and Coaster lines.

For further information, please thoroughly review and consider the letter and materials submitted on behalf of SOFAR and CNFF.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. We all know how important it is to get it right!

Dr. Lorri Greene
2058 Oxford Ave.
Cardiff-by-the-Sea, CA 92007
760-436-6798
December 16, 2010

Vice Chair Jerome Stocks and
Members of the Board of Directors
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario

Dear Board Members:

On behalf of myself, please include this letter of support for the comments previously submitted by SOFAR and CNFF regarding the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario. I hereby join SOFAR/CNFF in respectfully requesting that the Board defer further consideration of the Hybrid Scenario. Instead, please direct SANDAG staff to evaluate the merits of a 50-10 Plan, to implement 50 years of transit within a 10-year period, to truly embrace a smart growth solution for our region.

This plan would include: (1) transit infrastructure and operational service improvements fully built-out prior to any consideration of highway capacity projects; (2) a comprehensively designed and fully integrated transit network; (3) an initial emphasis on the urban core and the Sprinter and Coaster lines. Please thoroughly review and consider the letter and materials submitted on behalf of SOFAR and CNFF.

I would also like to comment on the predictable health impacts of continuing our over-reliance on automobile travel in San Diego County. It is well understood among transportation professionals that more roads lead to more VMT, more air pollution, and more chronic lung diseases and the associated health care costs. Less recognized are the links between driving and obesity. The automobile is the most sedentary mode of transportation because the infrastructure allows people to drive essentially from door to door. As documented in the attached research brief (also available at http://www.activelivingresearch.org/files/ALR_Brief_ActiveTransportation.pdf), amount of driving time is a risk factor for obesity, which is one of America’s and San Diego’s leading health problems. Thus, additional highway construction can be expected to worsen the obesity epidemic, in addition to creating health hazards through air pollution.

By contrast, public transit is an active mode of transportation, because people usually walk to and from transit stops. Studies show that transit commuters walk about 1 mile on average more than
automobile commuters. Physical activity reduces risk for virtually every chronic disease. Thus, dramatically changing our transportation investments to allow a real choice of transit will produce multiple health benefits, in addition to greenhouse gas benefits.

Most people in San Diego County have no realistic option of using transit on a regular basis, especially by rail. The only way to improve transit access and ridership is to build more transit lines in places where people live that connect to the places where people go. Given the low-density nature of development in most of San Diego, this certainly is a challenge. But building more roads only encourages more low-density development, which makes transit even more challenging. Transportation officials have a responsibility to consider the health costs of their decisions, and spending many billions more on road miles will cost the county billions by increasing chronic disease. Please break the auto-dependence cycle now by making a commitment to create a viable transit system for most San Diegans within 10 years.

Sincerely,

James F. Sallis, PhD
Professor of Psychology, SDSU
www.drjamesallisd.sdsu.edu
Land Use, Residential Density, and Walking
The Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis

Daniel A. Rodriguez, PhD, Kelly R. Evenson, PhD, Ana V. Diez Roux, MD, PhD, Shannon J. Brines, MS

Background: The neighborhood environment may play a role in encouraging sedentary patterns, especially for middle-aged and older adults.

Purpose: The aim of this study was to examine the associations between walking and neighborhood population density, retail availability, and land-use distribution using data from a cohort of adults aged 45 to 84 years.

Methods: Data from a multi-ethnic sample of 5529 adult residents of Baltimore MD, Chicago IL, Forsyth County NC, Los Angeles CA, New York NY, and St. Paul MN enrolled in the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis in 2000–2002 were linked to secondary land-use and population data. Participant reports of access to destinations and stores and objective measures of the percentage of land area in parcels devoted to retail land uses, the population divided by land area in parcels, and the mixture of uses for areas within 200 m of each participant’s residence were examined. Multinomial logistic regression was used to investigate associations of self-reported and objective neighborhood characteristics with walking. All analyses were conducted in 2008 and 2009.

Results: After adjustment for individual-level characteristics and neighborhood connectivity, it was found that higher density, greater land area devoted to retail uses, and self-reported proximity of destinations and ease of walking to places were each related to walking. In models including all land-use measures, population density was positively associated with walking to places and with walking for exercise for more than 90 minutes/week, both relative to no walking. Availability of retail was associated with walking to places relative to not walking, and having a more proportional mix of land uses was associated with walking for exercise for more than 90 minutes/week, while self-reported ease of access to places was related to higher levels of exercise walking, both relative to not walking.

Conclusions: Residential density and the presence of retail uses are related to various walking behaviors. Efforts to increase walking may benefit from attention to the intensity and type of land development.


Introduction

By limiting opportunities for being physically active in everyday life, contemporary urban areas are believed to play a role in encouraging sedentary patterns and obesity. Relative to young adults, the role of the neighborhood environment as a barrier or support of active lifestyles may be more pronounced for middle-aged and older adults. In addition to physical activity benefits, for older adults a supportive neighborhood environment may also encourage independent engagement in community life. Despite the importance of the built environment, there is a paucity of studies examining its relationship to physical activity among older adults.

Proximity to nonresidential land uses, specifically retail uses, has been linked to higher walking rates for utilitarian purposes in the general population. For older adults, convenient access to nonresidential destinations has yielded inconsistent findings, although recent studies using objective measures of the built environment have shown more consistent associations. Only one study has examined access to retail land uses for older women, and the analysis was limited to department, discount, and hardware stores. Positive associations were found between accessibility to retail and higher physical activity.

Beyond the presence of specific land uses, others have argued that the proportion of land devoted to different uses within a given distance from a home
location may also affect levels of physical activity.\(^7,8,14\) Areas with more proportional mixing of uses may be supportive of walking because of the availability and variety of destinations. Further, this diversity may be more important for populations with limited access to automobiles, such as children and older adults.\(^15\) Thus, not only proximity to specific uses such as retail but also the relative intensity among uses within one’s neighborhood may help explain physical activity levels. For example, a neighborhood with 95% of its parcel area devoted to residential uses and 5% to retail has a different, less proportionate distribution of area among uses than a neighborhood with 80% of its parcel area devoted to residential uses, 30% to retail, and 40% to institutional uses. Identifying associations of physical activity with specific uses of land, such as retail, and the intensity at which land is developed provides planners with guidance to improve communities and future decision making.

Relying on data from a large, multi-ethnic cohort of adults aged 45 to 84 years, associations between self-reported walking and neighborhood population density, retail access, and land-use distribution, while controlling for other environmental and individual characteristics, are examined. It is hypothesized that greater population density and improved access to retail land uses are related to higher levels of walking for various purposes. Responding to calls for including objectively measured and perceptual environmental data simultaneously,\(^4,10-13\) the study combines self-reported and objectively measured land-use information. These analyses contribute to the understanding of the role that the mixing of particular land uses can play in supporting physical activity in middle-aged and older adults. Identifying the specific ways in which the mixing of land uses may affect physical activity has important implications for planning and public health policy.

**Methods**

**Study Sample**

The Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA) is a longitudinal study of cardiovascular disease among adults aged 45-84 years at six field sites in the U.S.: Baltimore MD, Chicago IL, Forsyth County NC, Los Angeles CA, New York NY, and St. Paul MN.\(^11\) There was no clinically overt cardiovascular disease at cohort entry. The baseline visit for MESA, on which these analyses are based, took place between July 2000 and September 2002. The study was approved by the IRBs at each site and all participants gave written informed consent.

**Walking Outcomes**

A detailed interviewer-administered, semiquantitative questionnaire adapted from the Cross-Cultural Activity Participation Study\(^20,21\) was used to collect data on all forms of physical activity, including leisure, household, work, and transportation activities at the baseline examination. The questionnaire was developed using extensive qualitative research\(^22\) and has been shown to have acceptable test-retest reliability and validity among a sample of women.\(^23\) For each type of activity queried, participants were asked (1) whether they did the activity during a typical week in the past month and (2) how many days per week and how many hours and minutes per day they did the activity.

For this study, the focus was on the types of physical activities related to walking, which are most likely to be associated with two key land characteristics: the type of land use and the intensity of residential development. The two walking behaviors examined were minutes per week in walking for transport (e.g., walking to get places such as to the bus, car, work, or store), defined as walking to places; and minutes per week walking for leisure (e.g., walking for exercise, pleasure, social reasons, during work breaks, walking the dog), defined as walking for exercise. Given unavoidable measurement error in reports of exact times of walking, the data were categorized rather than investigated as a continuous measure. Categories usually have better reliability than continuous measures and allow a parsimonious way to manage data skewness. As a result, outcome variables were created by classifying each type of walking into three levels: no walking, walking time that is less than the median of nonzero data, and walking time greater than or equal to the median for nonzero data.

**Neighborhood Built Environment Characteristics**

Neighborhood information was collected in part by the MESA Neighborhood Study, an ancillary study to MESA, which included the geocoding of each participant's home address. All objective measures were derived using ArcGIS 9.2. Neighborhoods were person specific, defined as the area covered by a circle of 200-m radius drawn around each person's home location.

Land-use data were collected from municipal and regional governments in the six study sites. The data were dated between 2001 and 2005 depending on the site. An investigator classified the land-use codes of each site into four mutually exclusive categories: retail (including commercial), residential, institutional, and office. For each parcel, whenever a retail use was present (regardless of other uses present in the building occupying the parcel), the parcel was coded as retail use. If the parcel had institutional uses (but no retail), it was coded as institutional use. If the parcel had industrial use (but no retail or institutional), the parcel was coded as industrial use. Land uses in Baltimore County were categorized into only commercial and residential uses, as their data lacked the institutional and office designations. A second investigator verified the classification and resolved disagreements. Appendices A-F, available online at www.ajpm-online.net, detail the classification of land uses for each site.

Availability of retail in each neighborhood was calculated using the percentage of land area in parcels that contain retail uses. By focusing on the area in parcels, transportation features such as roads and railroads, water bodies, and utilities are excluded from the calculations. One drawback of using parcel area is that it penalizes vertical development, for example by treating a parcel with a four-story building in the same way as a parcel with a one-story building. Entropy was calculated using an established formula\(^24\) to assess the similarity in the proportion of the area in parcels devoted to
Entropy values range between 0 and 1, with 1 representing equal proportion (25%) among the four uses in the neighborhood and 0 representing the presence of a single dominant land use. Population density (hundreds of people/hectare) was measured using population data from the U.S. Census at the block level and dividing them by the land area in parcels. When a block was not fully contained within a neighborhood, its population was assigned in direct proportion to the area of the block contained within the neighborhood, which assumes a uniform population density within each block. Road connectivity was measured as the proportion of the neighborhood (the 200-m-radius circle area around each person’s home) that is covered by a network buffer. The ratio varies between 0 and 1, with 0 meaning that none of the circle area can be reached through the road network and 1 meaning that the entire circle can be reached through the street network, denoting highest connectivity.

Subjective measures of the neighborhood physical environment were obtained from a questionnaire administered to MESA participants that included items on ease of walking to places and having stores within walking distance. Responses were reported on a 1 to 5 scale in which 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree and are treated as continuous. These questions were part of an 11-item index shown to have high test–retest reliability (intraclass correlation coefficient [ICC] = 0.88, 95% CI = 0.70, 0.90). The questionnaire also included two questions on the availability of YMCA/YWCAs and on the availability of free community centers and schools open to the public, both reported as a binary variable (yes or no). The two variables were merged into a single variable defined as the availability of institutional uses for physical activity and coded as a binary variable (yes if either is present, or no if neither is present). These two questions were part of an eight-item index with high test–retest reliability (ICC = 0.85, 95% CI = 0.73, 0.92). Item reliabilities were not reported. In responding to these neighborhoods’ environment items, participants were asked to refer to the area that was approximately a 20-minute or 1-mile walk from their home.

Sociodemographic Measures

Person-level data on age, gender, race/ethnicity, family income, and education were self-reported during the baseline MESA examination. Age was classified into four categories (45–54, 55–64, 65–74, and 75–84 years). Race and ethnicity were classified as Hispanic, non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, and Chinese. Family income was grouped into four categories (<$20,000, $20,000–$39,999, $40,000–$74,999, and ≥$75,000). Education was categorized as less than high school, high school/GED diploma, college, or graduate/professional school.

Statistical Analysis

Of the 6051 MESA participants at baseline that lived within geographic areas for which land-use data were available, 237 were excluded because their address information could not be connected to the road data set, likely the result of geocoding error, road data error, or the fact that participants lived on very small roads not represented given the scale of the road data. An additional 284 were excluded because they were missing physical activity information, and 11 participants were excluded because of missing self-reported neighborhood environment data, leaving 5529 participants for analysis.

Multinomial logistic models were used to analyze the three-level categoric outcomes for each of the two outcome variables (walking to places and walking for exercise) using Stata 9.2. In all cases, no walking was used as the reference category. Robust SEs with clustering were used to account for potential correlations among participants within sites. None of the neighborhood objective and self-reported variables had particularly high colinearity (variance inflation factor <4), suggesting that they measure different constructs or they measure similar constructs differently. Therefore, the neighborhood environment variables (objective and self-reported) were first entered one at a time into models that adjusted for individual characteristics (age, gender, education, race/ethnicity, and family income). Models also adjusted for neighborhood road connectivity, because it may be associated with both land use and walking and could therefore confound the association of land use with walking. Next, all environment variables were entered simultaneously into a single model, adjusting for the same factors. Finally, Stata’s lincom command was used to provide a graphic representation of the relationships of interest. All analyses were conducted in 2007 and 2009.

Results

Descriptive statistics for sociodemographic characteristics and walking activity of participants are shown in Table 1. Age of study participants ranged between 45 and 84 years. Just over half of the sample (51.7%) were women; 40.1% of participants were non-Hispanic Caucasian, 25.9% non-Hispanic blacks, 22.1% Hispanics, and 11.9% Chinese. The median time of walking to places was 150 minutes/week, and the median time for exercise walking was 90 minutes/week.

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics for the measures of objective and self-reported land use and residential development intensity. Neighborhoods had an average population density of 153.2 people per hectare. Forty-one percent of respondents had no retail land uses in their neighborhood, and only one quarter of the sample had ≥10.6% of the parcel area in the neighborhood devoted to retail uses. The entropy measure revealed substantial variability in the land-use mixes around the homes of participants. The percentage of participants agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statements In my neighborhood it is easy to walk to places and There are stores within walking distance of my home were 79.8% and 76.5%, respectively. On average, 62.1% of participants reported having schools or community centers with recreational facilities available for free to the public or YMCA/YWCAs available within a 20-minute walk from their home.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45–54</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–74</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–84</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2856</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Caucasian</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic black</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate/GED</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>2595</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/professional school</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income (thousands $)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to &lt;40</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to &lt;75</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥75</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OUTCOMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking to places (min/wk)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;150</td>
<td>2253</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥150</td>
<td>2497</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking for exercise (min/wk)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;90</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥90</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages do not add to 100 because of rounding.
*A measure of collinearity among variables.
MESA, Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis; NA, not applicable; VIF, variance inflation factor.

**Walking to Places**

Adjusted associations of the objective and self-reported land-use/intensity variables with walking to places are shown in Table 3. When models were estimated for each exposure separately, higher levels of population density and the highest quartile of the percentage of parcel area devoted to retail were each associated with higher levels of walking to places after adjustment for age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, income, and street connectivity. Being in the top quartile (≥10.6% of parcel area in retail) relative to the baseline category of having no retail was associated with 1.81 higher odds of some walking (≥0 but <150 minutes/week) and 2.57 higher odds of walking to places ≥150 minute/week. None of the entropy measures was associated with walking to places.

For self-reported measures, people reporting that it was easier to walk to places had higher odds of walking to places, and those reporting more stores within walking distance had higher odds of walking to places ≥150 minute/week, after adjustment. Other land-use characteristics (availability of institutional uses) were not related to walking to places. When all the exposures were included in a single model, density remained positively associated with walking to places for both walking levels relative to no walking, and the third and top quartiles of retail area were positively associated with more walking. Those with more stores within walking distance had higher odds of walking to places ≥150 minute/week, after adjustment. Entropy was not associated with walking.

**Walking for Exercise**

Table 4 shows adjusted associations for the exercise walking outcome. When models were estimated for each exposure separately, density and all self-reported measures were related to exercise walking for >90 minutes/week, and ease of walking to places was the only variable related to some walking (>0 and <90 minutes/week), relative to no walking. For the measures of land-use mixtures, the third and top quartiles of retail area and the top quartile of entropy were positively associated with walking >90 minutes/week. When all the exposures were included in a single model, density, the top quartile of entropy, and ease of walking to places remained positively related to exercise walking for >90 minutes/week. Ease of walking to places remained significantly associated with some walking (>0 and <90 minutes/week).

Figure 1 portrays how density and retail uses were jointly related to the probability of walking to places based on the parameters estimated, while holding constant all continuous variables at their means and all categorical variables at their modes. The values of density vary from the 5th to the 95th percentile in the data. The values for retail represent the indicator variables in quartiles used in the models. The probability of walking to places for <150 minutes/week relative to no walking increased from 75.7% to 98.2% when density and retail increased jointly from the 5th to the 95th percentile. For similar changes in density and retail, the probability of walking for exercise for >150 minutes/week relative to no walking increased from 66.4% to 95.2%.

**Discussion**

In a diverse population sample of middle-aged and older adults, objective and self-reported measures of land use and residential density were consistently associated with higher odds of walking. In adjusted models examining each measure separately, higher population density and a higher percentage of parcel area devoted to retail land uses were each associated with higher odds of walking to places and walking for exercise. Weaker evidence was found for self-reported measures.
Table 2. Objective and self-reported land-use/intensity characteristics around the home of participants included in analyses, MESA, 2000–2002 (n=5529)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective/Derived Measures</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density (hundreds of people/hectare)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% parcel area devoted to retail use</td>
<td>5529</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First quartile (=0)</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>41.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quartile (&gt;0 and &lt;1.43)</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quartile (1.43 and &lt;10.61)</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quartile (≥10.61)</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entropy²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First quartile (&lt;0.022)</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>25.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quartile (0.022 and &lt;0.26)</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quartile (0.26 and &lt;0.54)</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quartile (≥0.54)</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of 400-m buffer from home accessible via roads (0–1)</td>
<td>5529</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Reported Measures

Easy to walk to places³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stores within walking distance (20 min)²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Availability of institutional uses (schools, YMCA/YWCAs) within walking distance (20 min)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2093</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3436</td>
<td>62.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entropy was calculated among residential, institutional, retail, and office uses using the formula presented by Cervero and Kockelman.²⁴ For parcels with mixed uses, if they contained any retail uses they were considered retail use. Those having any office uses (but no retail) were considered office uses. Any institutional uses (but no retail or office uses) were considered institutional uses. Higher values represent a more even proportion of area devoted to each land use.

Measures with a Likert-type scale ranging between 1 and 5, with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Scale shown in table and used in analyses is reversed so that higher values mean more support for walking, consistent with the objective measures.

MESA, Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis

of ease of walking, presence of stores, and availability of institutional uses.

In models that included both objective and self-reported measures, higher population density and higher percentage of parcel area devoted to retail uses remained significantly associated with higher odds of walking to places. The estimates for the percentage of parcel area in retail uses suggest a dose-response relationship between exposure to retail uses and walking to places. In addition, higher density, being in the top quartile denoting the most proportional distribution of land among various uses, and self-reported ease of walking to places remained associated with walking for exercise after adjustment for other objective and self-reported land-use measures.

By focusing on land use and residential density in six diverse urbanized areas in the U.S., this study extends prior evidence to older-age adults. Although measures of neighborhood perceptions were limited, the results suggest that objective features of neighborhoods may influence residents' behaviors independently of their perceptions. Interestingly, perceived presence of stores within walking distance remained significant for the highest level of walking to places even when objective measures were controlled.

Density was the measure most consistently related to walking. Few studies have included as much variation in density as the present study, and fewer have focused on middle-aged and older adults. The strength of density in predicting walking activity has been previously noted,²⁴,²⁸,³⁰–³² but studies of older adults remain rare. The results suggest that the importance of density for physical activity promotion goes beyond the connectivity and access to destinations that density brings.

Figure 1, showing the joint contribution of density and retail to explaining the probability of walking to...
Table 3. Adjusted OR (95% CI) of walking to places (in three levels) associated with neighborhood land-use and density variables, MESA, 2000–2002 (n=5529)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE/DERIVED MEASURES</th>
<th>Models for each exposure separately(^\text{a,b})</th>
<th>Full model with all exposures included(^\text{a,b})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2 vs Level 1 OR (95% CI)</td>
<td>Level 3 vs Level 1 OR (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (hundreds of people/hectare)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% parcel area devoted to retail use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First quartile</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quartile</td>
<td>1.15 (0.81, 1.64)</td>
<td>1.09 (0.67, 1.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quartile</td>
<td>1.44 (0.94, 2.20)</td>
<td>1.68 (0.92, 3.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quartile</td>
<td>1.81 (1.12, 2.93)</td>
<td>2.57 (1.28, 5.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First quartile</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quartile</td>
<td>0.84 (0.42, 1.66)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.30, 1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quartile</td>
<td>0.76 (0.40, 1.45)</td>
<td>0.53 (0.25, 1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quartile</td>
<td>1.26 (0.71, 2.24)</td>
<td>1.36 (0.63, 2.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-REPORTED/PERCEIVED MEASURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to walk to places</td>
<td>1.15 (1.03, 1.24)</td>
<td>1.26 (1.06, 1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores within walking distance</td>
<td>1.13 (0.98, 1.30)</td>
<td>1.29 (1.07, 1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of institutional uses</td>
<td>1.06 (0.85, 1.35)</td>
<td>1.18 (0.87, 1.60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Walking to places measure categorized into level 1 (none); level 2 (≥0 and <150 min/wk); and level 3 (≥150 min/wk)
\(^b\)Adjustment factors are age, gender, education, race/ethnicity, family income, and proportion of 400-m buffer from home accessible via roads

Robust SEs with clustering on each site are shown. All objective measures are calculated for a 900-m radius around each participant’s home. Bolded coefficients are significant at a 95% level of confidence.
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Table 4. Adjusted OR (95% CI) of walking for exercise (in three levels) associated with neighborhood land-use and density variables, MESA, 2000–2002 (n=5529)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE/DERIVED MEASURES</th>
<th>Models for each exposure separately(^\text{a,b})</th>
<th>Single model with all exposures included(^\text{a,b})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2 vs Level 1 OR (95% CI)</td>
<td>Level 3 vs Level 1 OR (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (hundreds of people/hectare)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% parcel area devoted to retail use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First quartile</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quartile</td>
<td>0.96 (0.83, 1.12)</td>
<td>1.16 (0.90, 1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quartile</td>
<td>1.05 (0.90, 1.22)</td>
<td>1.34 (1.07, 1.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quartile</td>
<td>0.98 (0.87, 1.10)</td>
<td>1.49 (1.06, 2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First quartile</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quartile</td>
<td>1.10 (0.89, 1.37)</td>
<td>0.79 (0.62, 1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quartile</td>
<td>1.03 (0.74, 1.43)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.62, 1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quartile</td>
<td>1.05 (0.87, 1.27)</td>
<td>1.29 (1.08, 1.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-REPORTED/PERCEIVED MEASURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to walk to places</td>
<td>1.12 (1.07, 1.18)</td>
<td>1.30 (1.20, 1.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores within walking distance</td>
<td>1.04 (0.95, 1.13)</td>
<td>1.18 (1.07, 1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of institutional uses</td>
<td>1.08 (0.98, 1.18)</td>
<td>1.18 (1.05, 1.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Walking for exercise or leisure measure categorized into level 1 (none); level 2 (≥0 and <90 min/wk); and level 3 (≥90 min/wk)
\(^b\)Adjustment factors are age, gender, education, race/ethnicity, family income, and proportion of 400-m buffer from home accessible via roads

Robust SEs with clustering on each site are shown. All objective measures are calculated for a 900-m radius around each participant’s home. Bolded coefficients are significant at a 95% level of confidence.
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places increases when density and retail increase jointly from their 10th percentile to their 80th percentile, the uncertainty around the estimates is such that the predicted change in walking to places is no different from zero at a 95% level of confidence.

Results for the entropy variable were not entirely consistent. The highest quartile of entropy was associated with walking for exercise in models adjusted for individual-level characteristics. However, entropy was not associated with walking to places. This contrasts with other studies, and may be the result of measurement differences. Although mean entropy in this study is almost identical to values in other studies, the figures cannot be compared directly. Further, the theoretic reasons to expect similarity in the proportion of land devoted to different uses to be related to walking are unclear. An instance in which a residential house-

hold is surrounded by walkable nonresidential destinations yields a disproportionate distribution of land uses in an environment supportive of walking to places. The evidence provided here, in addition to theoretic limitations, and the difficulty in correctly interpreting and communicating its meaning, suggests that caution should be used in applying entropy as a neighborhood environmental measure in future studies.

Compared to other studies, the neighborhood-area definition of a 200-m circle is small. Measures drawn from circles of 400-m and 800-m radii were tested by examining model fit using the Bayesian information criterion (BIC). It has been suggested that evidence favoring one model over another is weak, positive, strong, or very strong if the absolute difference in BIC for two models is 0–2, 2–6, 6–10, or >10, respectively. With the exception of the single model with all exposures explaining exercise walking that exhibited weak evidence favoring the 400-m buffer, all models with exposures measured for the 200-m circle were strongly or very strongly favored over larger circles. In contrast, another study found no pattern in model fit at various buffer sizes.

One explanation for the results favoring the smallest circle is that for an older population, proximal land uses may be more relevant than uses that are more distant. Another explanation is that the retail and entropy measures are neighborhood-scale dependent, a phenomenon known as the modifiable areal unit problem. As the neighborhood area definition increases, neighborhood heterogeneity increases, thereby decreasing variation in the entropy and retail measures.

Limitations of this study include the use of self-reported walking, the reliance on land-use information collected from diverse sources, and potential residual confounding. Bias caused by the cross-sectional design is also a possibility, because people who enjoy walking are more likely to move to areas that support walking. Misspecification of the relevant geographic area could also have affected the results.

Conclusion

Taken together, the results of this study provide support for the relationship of retail, land-use mix, and residential density with walking behaviors. The findings support calls for policies that guide new development and changes in already-developed areas to intensify density and mixed land uses. Further, these policies may be more effective in areas with established levels of development density and retail land uses, rather than in areas with very low density and residential-only land uses. Prospective studies and evaluation of natural experiments can further inform this discussion. The relationships of neighborhood characteristics with walking underscore calls for collaborative efforts among traffic engineers, city planners, and health professionals to understand how
urban areas can be improved to address the welfare of residents.
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Johnston, Phillip

From: margie prather [margiewriter2003@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 7:24 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: bill.horn@sdcounty.ca.gov
Subject: Meeting Friday 12/17/10 - Item 13

Dear Mr. Johnston:

I would like to see a greater portion designated for transit development for the I-5 plan.

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Margie Prather
140 Encinitas Blvd
Encinitas, Ca 92014
December 17, 2010

San Diego Association of Governments
SANDAG Board of Directors
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Revenue Constrained Network Strategies – Support for Public Transportation Investment and the Hybrid Scenario

Dear Honorable Board of Directors:

We appreciate your serious consideration of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan’s revenue constrained transportation network scenarios. The selected scenario must not only allow the region to hit its greenhouse reduction target of 13 percent by 2035, but also create a more prosperous economy, healthy environment, and an outstanding transportation system that functions for all San Diegans. We respectfully request that SANDAG include the following recommendations in the final Revenue Constrained Network Strategy.

1) Focus discretionary funds on fast, convenient public transportation

In order to address the region’s long-term economic, environmental, and mobility challenges, first-class public transportation is necessary. Investments in public transportation cuts pollution, oil-dependence, and saves residents thousands of dollars that can be reinvested into the local economy. For this reason, we call for fast, reliable projects that connect people from where they live to where they work, shop, and learn. We appreciate that SANDAG listened to stakeholders and expanded the list of transit projects that are in the fusion alternative. Projects we support include an expansion of the trolley system, the Kearny Mesa Guideway, rapid bus and express trolley service to downtown, rapid bus service to Sorrento Valley, and 10-minute frequency bus service in the urban area.

The committed projects in the region’s RTP provide the highest percentage of highway expansion dollars of any major region in California. By focusing discretionary funds on public transportation projects, it will create better overall balance in SANDAG’s transportation investments. Although the network strategy represents a small portion of the budget, it is an opportunity to create a better balance in transportation investments.

2) Prioritize projects that support regional goals

Because TransNet has sizeable flexibility in the sequencing and timing of projects, all projects in the TransNet ordinance should be ranked according to their ability to effectively meet multiple goals, such as reducing vehicle miles traveled and cutting pollution. High-ranking projects should be prioritized for inclusion in the 2020 and 2035 time frames.

A number of freeway projects that were not in the 2030 RTP, and that we believe are sprawl inducing, are supposedly phased during in the later part of this RTP, post 2035. These include the Hwy 78, Hwy 94, I-8, Hwy 67 and I-5. We would like to see a clear policy that these projects should not advance into the TIP over the next four years, and will be re-evaluated as part of the next RTP in 2015.

3) Increase funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects (Active Transportation)

Bicycle and pedestrian projects are essential tools to improve biking and walking safety for all residents, encourage non-motorized access to nearby destinations, promote active, healthy communities, and complement SANDAG’s smart growth centers and 2050 RTP goals. We
support fully funding the Active Transportation program at $2.58 billion, which is less than 3% of the total RTP.

4) Produce a Strong Sustainable Communities Strategy

As part of the Sustainable Communities Strategy element of the RTP, we would like to note the following:

- TransNet projects that work against SCS objectives should be scheduled late in the TransNet period (2035-2048) so they are not built prematurely.
- Toll Road widenings on I-15 to Riverside County and I-5 to Orange County work at cross purposes to SCS objectives.
- SANDAG can inspire smart growth by investing more in Metropolitan, Urban and Town Centers. This will leverage private dollars to help make “Smart Growth Smarter” and bring near term, on the ground improvements resulting in livable communities.
- We urge that further projects/funding be identified in order to meet and exceed the SANDAG transit ridership goals identified for key transit corridors, especially the urban core. No scenario analyzed actually meets transit ridership goals thus we must find ways to create additional riders.
- We ask for an SCS element that provides additional details on how the proposed transit projects relate to the Smart Growth centers identified by the individual jurisdictions, with 2030 and 2050 land uses. This element should adequately describe how transit interfaces with density in key urban corridors that will bring a strong return on investment.
- Enhance the Public Participation Outreach to include the residents of the Environmental Justice communities so that they fully grasp the impact on their neighborhoods and inform them how this plan will create greater access to the region.

A transit emphasis in the revenue constrained network, as is included in the hybrid scenario, is an opportunity to create a more multi-modal transportation system that cuts pollution and oil-dependence. Furthermore, numerous studies by SANDAG and the San Diego Foundation indicate the public’s support for improving public transportation. Please give residents an alternative to traffic and their cars by prioritizing public transportation. We believe the recommendations outlined in this letter will help the Board better meet its RTP goals and objectives for improving quality of travel, livability and sustainability.

Sincerely,

San Diego Regional Coalition for Transit Solutions and Sustainable San Diego.

Elyse Lowe          Jaafar Rizvi          Hannah Cohen
Move San Diego      CalPIRG          Sustainable San Diego

Susan Riggs-Tinsky    Executive Director
San Diego Housing Federation

Matthew Jumper       President
San Diego Interfaith Housing Foundation

Stephen M. Haase, AICP       President
Century Coordinate Three
John Fanestil  
Executive Director  
Foundation for Change

Jennifer Vanica  
CEO  
Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation

Kathy Keehan  
Executive Director  
San Diego County Bicycle Coalition

Dr. Harry S. Watkins  
Professor, Strategy & Sustainability  
Fermanian School of Business  
Point Loma Nazarene University

Kathleen Ferrier  
Acting Executive Director  
WalkSanDiego

Greg Konar  
Principal  
Konar Associates

Myles Pomeroy  
Retired Urban Planner (City of San Diego)

Norma Chavez-Peterson  
Executive director  
Justice Overcoming Boundaries (JOB)

Jessica Meaney  
California Policy Manager  
Safe Routes to School National Partnership - CA State Network

Nancy Maddox Lytle, AICP  
Vice President of Projects & Development  
South Eastern Development Corporation

Kendell Tylee  
Community Organizer  
Justice Overcoming Boundaries (JOB)

Jim Peugh  
Conservation Chair  
San Diego Audubon Society
From: Jesse Giessow [jessgiess@cox.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 9:24 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: pam.slater@sdcounty.ca.gov; jstocks@ci.encinitas.ca.us
Subject: Comments for 12/17/2011 meeting. ITEM 13: Defer decision on Hybrid Scenario for Stronger Public Transit Option
Attachments: LettertocSANDAG Board Re 2050 RTP J.Giessow 12_2010.pdf

Attn: Phillip Johnston
Please distribute the attached letter with comments to the SANDAG Board
Please designate for ITEM 13 for meeting on 12/17/2010.

Thank-you
Jesse Giessow
Via Electronic Mail

Vice Chair Jerome Stocks and
Members of the Board of Directors
SANDAG
410 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario

Dear Board Members

I am submitting this letter to comment on the Board of Director’s decisions on the preferred alternative for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. Please defer further consideration of the Hybrid Scenario and investigate options that place a heavy emphasis on regional public transit.

My understanding is that the Transportation Committee is recommending that the Board choose the Hybrid Scenario as the preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Scenario. However, I am concerned that this scenario focuses too heavily on regional highway capacity. Our efforts need to be focused on a regional transit system that will enable us to create a truly sustainable system for San Diego County. Highway expansion seriously decreases the value of our communities, and also does not provide a sustainable or long-term solution to our transit needs.

Please be forward thinking on this issue and defer further consideration of the Hybrid Scenario. Instead SANDAG should consider something like the 50-10 Plan, which envisions 50 years of transit within a 10 year period. Los Angeles has spent years building up it highways, and it now realizing that it needs to focus on public transit and has adopted a 30/10 initiative.

Thank-you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jesse A. Giessow
From: Greg Thomsen [thomsen99@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 7:33 AM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.ca.gov; chilliard@delmar.ca.us; Lheebner@cosb.org; jstocks@ci.encinitas.ca.us; council@carlsbad.ca.gov
Subject: Comments on Proposed I-5 Expansion
Attachments: I.5EIRcomments.doc

Please distribute my attached letter to the SANDAG board on the proposed I-5 expansion, item 13 in the upcoming meeting.

Thank you,
Greg Thomsen

12/17/2010
November 15, 2010

Shay Lynn Harrison  
Environmental Analysis Branch Chief  
California Department of Transportation – District 11  
4050 Taylor Street, MS242  
San Diego, CA 92110

Subject: Impact from I-5 Widening

Dear Shay Lynn Harrison,

I live at 7155 Linden Terrace in the Sea Cliff community, within the City of Carlsbad. My home abuts the banks of the west side of the community that slope down to I-5 and Caltrans property. All of the alternatives being considered for widening the I-5 freeway will have major impacts on my home. I do not feel that an adequate range of alternatives has been fully analyzed in the EIR. I am also very concerned about the impact to the quality of life in coastal northern San Diego County.

The main reason we bought our house many years ago was the open 180 degree ocean view and coastal feeling, including regular ocean breezes that cool our home. Any changes to that amenity is a taking of our property values. What project modifications/mitigations is Caltrans considering to address this concern?

- Will the soundwall (S736) location be changed to prevent loss of my property and Sea Cliff common areas? A more acceptable alternative would be to move it west onto Caltrans property.
- Will the soundwall be moved west onto Caltrans property to mitigate adverse air quality so the “dead air” region west of the wall that traps fine particulate does not extend onto our patios? Will it be moved west to allow the ocean breeze to continue to flow to our home?
- Who will pay for the cost of designing the wall to be visually acceptable and not block our views? Who will pay for the cost of maintaining the wall and other “improvements”? Isn’t it reasonable for the project proponent, Caltrans, to bear these costs? They are responsible for the project and its impacts.
- I understand that the soundwalls may be considered a improvement that would increase my property tax. If so, who will pay for this tax? Since Caltrans is the project proponent, should it not pay for this tax, since it wants the project and I do not see this as an improvement, but rather a negative impact to my property?

As per the California Environmental Quality Act, a project proponent must analyze a reasonable range of project alternatives. This has not been done in the I-5 EIR. There are several cheaper and simpler ways to meet Caltrans’ purpose and need without causing the massive earthwork and ever escalating costs of its proposed I-5 expansion.

- The EIR includes a No Build Alternative for baseline to compare impacts with the action alternatives, and essentially disregards the No Build as not meeting the project’s purpose and need. Then it fully analyzes several massive action alternatives that would all significantly impact a whole suite of natural and human resources in coastal northern San Diego County. The
EIR up front rejects a reasonable alternative of 8 + 2, adding 2 HOV lanes to the existing 8 freeway lanes, that WOULD provide a reasonable range of alternatives. Why has the 8 +2 alternative, which would stay within the existing I-5 footprint and avoid the billions of dollars of costs to Californians and the unprecedented significant impacts to northern San Diego County residents and visitors not been fully analyzed? Without this lower end alternative, the EIR is legally deficient.

- The EIR also fails to analyze a package of transportation modes to meet Caltrans’ purpose and need. Why has Caltrans not considered a combination of incentives to telecommute, vary work schedules and other low cost means to reduce traffic congestion? Why has the EIR not included a rail/monorail system that among other aspects could remove truck freight traffic from I-5 and provide an appealing alternative to driving the freeway for passenger vehicles.

Coastal northern San Diego County is known for a high quality of life based in large part on its beautiful coastal views and unique blend of human and natural environmental values. Arguably the number one potential impact to these iconic features is visual, what people can see. One of the five objectives of the EIR is to improve human and natural conditions along the I-5 corridor. Does the proposed project and alternatives do just the opposite, i.e. degrade these desired conditions?

- This proposed massive freeway expansion is replicated almost nowhere else in the world, especially in a beautiful natural setting. Is the expansion completely out of scale and out of character for the I-5 corridor? How have the EIR authors been able to conclude that a wide swath of concrete in a high-walled concrete canyon, even with “mitigation”, is an acceptable impact?
- How has the EIR concluded that such an unprecedented, massive project fits the carrying capacity or character of this world class coastal viewshed?

I look forward to my comments/concerns being fully considered and analyzed in the EIR process.

Sincerely,

Greg Thomsen
7155 Linden Terrace
Carlsbad, CA 92011
Johnston, Phillip

From: Jackie [jhavighurst@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 11:57 PM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Subject: RE ITEM 13

I hope I have the correct contact - anyway:

1) In regard to the I5 Coastal Corridor I would like to know what was the timeframe in which this study took place? I attended a couple of meetings and was not able to get an answer to this question. If this study took place during the 2001-2007 period it seems it could be an anomaly.

2) I do frequent the I5 from Del Mar to La Jolla and beyond Mon-Fri. I had an occasion to take the 805 at the "Merge" and found that very quickly this freeway went down to 3 lanes (going South). Are you working on this before the I5 Coastal Corridor?

3) As things stand I find that the problem is around Manchester. The most recent addition around Del Mar and Solana Beach have added to the problem by adding a HOV land (that a lot of people don't get) and on/off ramps that don't "flow". I have lived in the area for a while and you have added to the pollution, noise and have made a one mile area dangerous.

4) Have you read the MIT report/study on traffic flow?

5) Visited Los Angeles lately?

Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinion.

Jackie Havighurst
Solana Beach
I am really disappointed in the position SANDAG has taken on the I 5 expansion increasing our dependence on the automobile is the wrong way to go. The 210 freeway was built right behind the house I grew up in and forever changed the neighborhood and town. To not focus on mass transportation is just plain nuts. Where's the vision for the future and where is the water for all the people your planning for going to come from. I'm a born and raised 2nd generation Southern Californian and I'm sick at the destruction mass building has caused throughout California and building the largest freeway in all of California is not the answer to traffic woes integrated mass transit is what the area needs not more one person per vehicles. Please go back to the drawing boards and leave peoples homes alone. We need to move pass 1960's thinking the rest of world is lets lead not follow. Michael Murphy
Johnston, Phillip

From: Cotton, Robert [rcotton@opiaudio.com]
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 6:20 AM
To: Johnston, Phillip
Cc: Lesa Heebner; jkellejian@cosb.org; sachiko.kohatsu@sdcounty.ca.gov; senator.kehoe@sen.ca.gov; assemblymember.garrick@assembly.ca.gov; sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; senator.wyland@sen.ca.gov; bob.hawkins@signonsandiego.com; Chris Nichols; esanchez@ci.oceanside.ca.us; pam.slater
Subject: SANDAG Public Comment
Attachments: SANDAG 12.17.10 rev2.doc

Dear Phillip,

I will be presenting the attached text, see below, at the public comment period for today's, 12.17.2010, board meeting. If you could please publish it for the record. Thank you.

--
Signed,

Robert M Cotton
858-353-2417

Privacy & Confidentiality Notice:
This message is confidential and intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information.
If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, copy, distribute, discuss or take any action in reliance on it.
If you have received this information in error, please notify me as soon as possible on the above telephone number. Thank you.
December 17, 2010

I have in no way seen how our public statements or presentation of facts have influenced your opinions in any way as to the direction of the 2050 RTP, and particularly the recent decision to significantly expand the coastal I5 freeway. I have personally experienced, at a number of City Council and SANDAG meetings, what I would characterize as a measured tolerance of public opinion. Board members that have held freeway expansion opinions have been consistent and unwavering in their support for an expansion, even in the face of highly credible arguments, public polls and requests by the public to reconsider that decision. One member of the SANDAG board made the valid comment “I will be dead and gone long before this project is completed”. I say exactly to the point. That comment made me open my eyes as to the make-up of the board. I wish there were a few younger members that could accurately represent the age demographic that will be experiencing this radical transformation of our city and county for generations to come. This is not just about a freeway or traffic; this is about permanently changing the character of THE most significant asset of San Diego City and County, the California Costal Corridor.

Certain SANDAG board members cannot or will not be persuaded to reconsider their opinions, even in the face of highly credible evidence, and particularly if the facts conflict with their previously held positions. We could have saved a lot of money on tax payer funded research if we knew it would not make one bit of difference in your judgment or decisions.

I spent 10 years travelling to an industrial city in China that grew in size from under one million to over twelve million people in that same decade. I experienced city and infrastructure growth on fast forward. The city went from low rise to high rise over night. It went from a centralized downtown to urban sprawl in years as opposed to decades. The highways and infrastructure were put in place until they reached capacity and then ultimately grid lock. The government responded with public transit and then ultimately above and below ground mass transit. The only reliable and quick way to get across town in that same city today is mass transit rail. This fast forward experience in China took Los Angeles five decades to experience and today L.A. is moving as quickly as possible towards mass transit rail. Why does the SANDAG board continue to adopt a system that has repeatedly proven to fail domestically and worldwide? You have a fiduciary responsibility to your shareholders, the tax payers, to act responsibly and consider all of these facts when making your choice for the 2050 RTP. I believe the board is not acting

Robert M Cotton rcotton1@san.rr.com
responsibly, or in the public’s best interest, with their latest decision to support the expansion of the coastal I5 freeway. I suggest that mass and public transit solutions should be the first priority and future freeway expansion the last, least desirable, most costly and most damaging alternative. Please reconsider your decision today.

I can promise you that if the board continues to go down a freeway expansion path, many of us will continue to fund and build a strong and growing resistance to any decision to continue to expand the coastal I5. It will be a well organized coalition of legal defense. We owe that effort to our unique coastal treasure.

My weather forecast for SANDAG in 2011 is for increasingly strong head winds.

Robert M Cotton rcotton1@san.rr.com
From: jgraboi@earthlink.net
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 8:46 AM
To: JStocks@ci.encintas.ca.us
Cc: Johnston, Phillip; Pam.Slater@sdcounty.ca.gov
Subject: Jerome Stocks' Invitation for Public Participation regarding the 2050 SD County Transportation Plan

Attachments: Jerome Stocks Letter.doc

Please consider this letter at today's meeting in response to Mr. Stocks' invitation for public participation.

Thank you,
Julie Graboi
Olivenhain, CA
Julie Graboi
1314 Desert Rose Way
Olivenhain, CA

Mr. Jerome Stocks
Encinitas City Hall

December 16, 2010

Dear Mr. Stocks;

As the new head of SANDAG, I am writing to remind you of a comment that you made 2 years ago in an interview with the Coast News when you were running for Encinitas City Council:

"I’m poised to become the first vice-chairman of SANDAG," he said. For four years, Stocks has been a voting member, representing the city in such things as funds for transportation initiatives. "With Encinitas scheduled for the (I-5) freeway widening in the next four to five years, I want to be able to make sure they know our needs as a community," Stocks said.

Because you have pledged to use your new role to represent Encinitas and its residents, as an Encinitas voter, I am writing to follow up on your invitation for the people you represent to communicate their views to you. I wish to express my support of the 50-10 Plan proposed by Duncan McFetridge of Save Our Forest and Ranchlands. In fact, I have been a homeowner in Encinitas for 20 years, and was a resident of Solana Beach prior to that, and I don’t know a single citizen outside of people in the transportation or housing industries who are in favor of the plan for simply widening I-5 that you recently wrote about in the Encinitas Patch.

I have been to a number of meetings regarding the proposed widening of I-5, and it was my understanding that the taxes that we voted for would direct roughly 1/3 of the funds towards widening I-5. I believe that the McFetridge Plan is much more in alignment with what voters were promised than the plan for a simple widening of I-5 that was presented at the Kehoe meeting in Solana Beach.

Let’s work towards a solution that is respectful of voters’ wishes, which preserves our natural resources, and which looks towards solutions of mass transit in a world where gas is becoming more and more expensive, and Southern California as a region has more and more people with lower incomes who NEED affordable mass transit.

Thank you for your consideration.

Julie Graboi
December 16, 2010

SANDAG Board of Directors

RE: RTIP Friday December 17, 2010

Dear Honorable Board,

Our organization is dedicated to the restoration, enhancement, and conservancy of the Chollas Creek, a watershed that drains major parts of San Diego’s urban core and large portions of the La Mesa and National City. The Chollas Creek water shed is a listed impaired water of California and drains its polluted waters into San Diego Bay.

The Chollas Creek is home to a significant portion of San Diego County's population; is the site of much of San Diego’s industrial and naval complexes, and contains significant recreational and sensitive environmental habitats.

A very significant portion of the Chollas Creeks (and San Diego Bay’s) impairing pollutants come from metals generated by motor vehicles Road wash from the I-5, I-805, SR-94, and SR-15 and local streets pollutes the Chollas Creek and Bay. The new San Diego Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) could and should be part of the solution to environmental quality improvements; economic development; and our quality of life challenges.

The new RTIP needs to promote and enhance pedestrian, bicycle, and transit in and about the Chollas Creek watershed. We are requesting that the plan invest proportionally in this area based on its residential population and proportionally for the modes of transportation demonstrated in the 2010 census data, issued this week. We believe that review of census data will demonstrate that the Chollas Creek water shed is a very significant regional population and economic impact area. The data will also demonstrate that pedestrian, bicycle and transit actual usage and demand is greater in the Chollas basin.

Please consider the 2010 census data and the San Diego Storm Water permit when allocating RTIP funding and projects. We believe that consideration of the facts will indicate that the regions environment, economic development, and quality of life will be better served by providing RTIP invests other than roadways.

Happy Holidays and thank you for your service.

Respectfully,

John W. Stump, President

Copy: Councils of Cities of La Mesa, National City, and San Diego via City Clerks
From: Johnny Pappas [mailto:jpappas@seasandiego.com]
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 9:15 AM
To: Polinsky, Mark
Subject: RTP 2050

Dear Mr. Polinski,

Please facilitate delivery of the attached letter to Vice Chair Stocks and the Board. Thank you.

Johnny Pappas

sustainable environment advocates
po box 502764
san diego, ca 92150

p: 619.537.6732
December 17, 2010

Vice Chair Jerome Stocks and Members of the Board of Directors
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario

Dear Board Members:

Regretfully I cannot be with you today. On behalf of Sustainable Environment Advocates, please include this letter of support for the comments previously submitted by SOFAR and CNFF regarding the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario. We hereby join SOFAR/CNFF in respectfully requesting that the Board defer further consideration of the Hybrid Scenario. Instead, please direct SANDAG staff to evaluate the merits of a 50-10 Plan, to implement 50 years of transit within a 10-year period, to truly embrace a smart growth solution for our region.

This plan would include: (1) transit infrastructure and operational service improvements fully built-out prior to any consideration of highway capacity projects; (2) a comprehensively designed and fully integrated transit network; (3) an initial emphasis on the urban core and the Sprinter and Coaster lines.

For further information, please thoroughly review and consider the letter and materials submitted on behalf of SOFAR and CNFF.

Very Truly Yours,

Johnny Pappas
Principal and Founder

sustainable environment advocates, po box 502764, san diego, ca 92050
My name is Christian Chaffee.

I am a long time resident of San Diego, and I love our beautiful city.

I have been buying and selling antiques and fine art, for over 40 years.

I am a former Vice President, and life member, of the San Diego Electric Railway Association.

The "Regional Transportation Plan" includes plans for streetcar lines in some historic areas of San Diego, so I would like to take this opportunity to inform you, of the benefits the historic Class 1 Streetcars can bring to our city.

The Class 1 streetcars were designed in 1910, by order of John D. Spreckels by his engineers at the San Diego Electric Railway Co. to provide a unique transportation experience for the large crowds of patrons that would be attending the up coming Panama-California Exposition at Balboa Park in 1915.

Built in the Arts & Crafts style, the Class 1 streetcars were built to be big, roomy, fun, and beautiful inside and out.

The exteriors were painted in a sunny warm yellow, with forest green trim, and are decorated with fancy golden car numbers, golden company logos, and golden oak leaves with ruby red pin striping. Because there is so much gold inside and out, the routes the Class 1 streetcars operate on in the future, should be called "The Gold Line".

The interiors are equally beautiful, with the walls made with old world craftsmanship, walls made of hand-polished cherry wood, with ceilings supported by arched trusses, with corbels... just like Gustav Stickley's Mission furniture.

Even the ceilings are decorated with classic Arts and Crafts decorations of golden oak leaves with ruby red pin striping.

The hardware is made of bronze, and push buttons, are inlaid with mother of pearl.

I know that the Class 1 streetcars are the best option, for many reasons:

1) Safety First People Movers: The Class 1's were designed to move large crowds fast, and with safety as the highest priority. They seat 44, but were commonly known to carry up to 100 with standing room during peak periods. The “center-entrance”
design of the Class 1’s, also provides for very fast boarding and debarking... from both sides of the car.

I would like to read to you, a paragraph from the Electric Railway Journal, dated June 1st 1912:

A New Center-Entrance Car for San Diego.

The San Diego Electric Railway has been using the "California" type of car for a number of years. Increased traffic and faster schedules have, however, made this type of car undesirable, particularly on account of step accidents, and the management decided about a year ago to try another style of car.

After looking over most of the types of cars in use, it was decided that the company would have to depart from the accepted designs and develop a car which would be suitable to the peculiar conditions existing in San Diego.

As is well known by those who live in Southern California, or who have visited that country, the closed car can not be used for the reason that 90% of the passengers on surface lines prefer to ride in the open. Many of them, particularly those who have only a few blocks to go, would rather walk, than to ride inside of a closed car.

It was, therefore, decided that the new car should be designed with one half open, and the other half closed, and drawings in conformity with this idea, were made up by the mechanical department of the railway.

The first cars of the new type consisted of a lot of 19 which were built by the St. Louis Car Company, and placed in service on June 1st of this year, and the fact that the first objections to them have yet to be heard demonstrates the approval with which they have been received in San Diego.

2) **People will use Class 1 streetcars:** If you want people to use mass transit, you better make it fun! People of all classes, will enjoy riding the fun open-air historic streetcars, because people like to be surrounded with beauty, and don't like to feel encapsulated. If you want to motivate people who own multiple cars to leave them at home, you better offer them something better than a bus.

3) **ADA Compatibility:** The Class 1 streetcars have a twin beam frame construction, which lends itself to the easy installation and maintenance of ADA equipment, on both sides of the car. This doubles the capacity of boarding those with limited mobility, and provides a backup system. In addition, the center well, can accommodate up to 4 wheelchairs at a time. All this, without altering the historic appearance of the Class 1 streetcar. As our population ages, we need to be ready to serve the future needs of our people.

4) **Reduced Construction Costs:** The Class 1 streetcars are double ended, and double sided, eliminating the need for constructing and maintaining expensive loops, or "Y"s. In addition,
a double-ended car can be used on a expanding system, which is built in increments.

5) Historic Significance & benefits: The unique Class 1 streetcars are the only San Diego streetcars, that can ever meet the strict criteria for Historic Landmark status. The Class 1 streetcars were designated as San Diego City Historic Landmark #339 in 1997.

Once the Class 1 streetcars are running on the original route to Balboa Park, they will meet the final criteria for state and national historic landmark status. This will open the doors to federal funding, which can pay to expand the entire system into all the historic neighborhoods that they once operated in. Historic is not just a fancy word for old....it requires that the resource meets all the criteria, which must be met, to be granted official Landmark status. These are the streetcars that embody the fabric of our past.

Just about every famous San Diegan rode in these very cars, from politicians to artists, to developers, and business men. Teachers, students, and even our own servicemen, all rode in these very streetcars. Our own ancestors rode them, and if we act, our descendants can ride in them too!

6) Upcoming Centenial Celebrations: Our city has an important event coming in just 4 short years... the 100 year anniversary of Balboa Park, and the Panama-California Exposition. We all know that Balboa Park is the Jewel of our city, and I aim to see our jewel, mounted in a golden bezel of Class one streetcars, serving along The Gold Line, which will provide an exciting and enchanting transportation system, for all the visitors who attend the year long, city wide party at Balboa Park.

7) To honor John D. Spreckels, for without his vision, we would not have the Balboa Park we have today, nor would San Diego be the city it is. It's time to honor JD for stepping up and donating the first $100,000 (2.3 million in today's money, to kick off the funding drive to build Balboa Park, and for his donation of the Spreckels organ pavilion, and for the neighborhoods around Balboa park and the development of the infrastructure of our young city almost 100 years ago. What more fitting way to honor John D. Spreckels, than to restore to our streets, the custom made Class 1 streetcars system, that he brought to San Diego so long ago, and was almost lost to the jaws of time.

8) Green Transportation: The Class 1 streetcars can serve our future as clean green fun transportation, replacing the busses along the busiest bus routes in the city. By replacing the fossil fuel burning busses with electric streetcars, our inner city air will be cleaner.

9) Reducing Traffic Congestion: The Class 1 streetcars can reduce future traffic congestion, by connecting downtown to decentralized parking structures all along The Gold Line. This way people can leave their cars in uptown areas, and take a fun trolley ride to downtown. When the festivities are concluded, a fun streetcar ride back to their parking structures... and coffee shops waiting to serve them is sure to reduce traffic accidents.

10) Advertising our modern red trolley: The Class 1 streetcars will be advertising for the modern red trolley...and a connect people along The Gold Line, to the Modern red trolley.
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Also, those living in out lying areas, will be able to use the modern red trolley to visit the Historic streetcars districts, to get around downtown, and to visit Uptown.

**11) Creation of Historic Districts:** The Class 1 streetcars will create national historic districts where ever the Class 1 streetcars operate. This will finally give San Diego's historic districts guide lines for growth, and more importantly, open opportunities for property owners to apply for money for improving and restoring historic property, all along The Gold Line! The streetcar lines extended to many areas of San Diego including: Ocean Beach, Coronado, North Park, Hillcrest, Mission Hills, Banker's Hill, University Heights, Golden Hills, South Park, Downtown, Kensington, little Italy, Old Town, and elsewhere.

**12) A New National Historic Landmark for San Diego:** The Class 1 streetcars will become a National Historic Landmark, and be a new tourist attraction advertising our city, in the same manner the iconic San Francisco cable-cars are advertising, and help to make it a tourist destination.

**13) Downtown Continues to Prosper:** Downtown will be one of the biggest winners, as the Class 1's will be a fun easy way to get all around the National Historic Gas Lamp Quarter, and throughout the downtown area, linking all parts of downtown to all areas of uptown, insulating downtown from the effects of a downturn in the economy. In addition, by easing traffic congestion, and adding revenue from patrons in uptown, downtown is sure to continue to grow and prosper!

In conclusion, I would like to invite you to visit our website: sandiegohistoricstreetcars.org

I want you to know that the future of our beautiful city is in your hands, and that the future quality of life for our citizens depends on the decisions we make in the very near future.

I have faith, that the MTS will bring our citizens a fixed rail system that we can all use, will make our people proud, and bring us all, a brighter future.

Thank you,
Hello Board Members and County Supervisor,

After looking over the proposals for the 2050 San Diego County regional transportation plan I strongly encourage you to choose the 50-10 Plan with a greater emphasis on transit rather than freeway expansion.

Thank you for your service,

Tess Radmill
Encinitas Resident
Mr. Johnson,

I would like to submit a comment in support of a greater emphasis on transit for the 2050 transportation plan as is outlined in the 50-10 plan. Please share my comments with the board of supervisors.

I am a 10 year Encinitas resident and believe a massive highway expansion program is a detriment.

Thanks.

Peace, Love & Gratitude
Todd LeVeck
Epic PhotoJournalism
Documenting Your Journey
todd@epicphotojournalism.com
www.epicphotojournalism.com
(760)815-6177
-----Original Message-----
From: Yoga Swami [mailto:info@yogaswami.com]
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 11:31 AM
To: council@carlsbad.ca.gov; Lheebner@cosb.org; chilliard@delmar.ca.us;
sherrilightner@sandiego.ca.gov; pam.slater@sdcounty.ca.gov; Johnston, Phillip;
jwood@ci.oceanside.ca.us
Subject: Proposals for the 2050

Hello Board Members and County Supervisor,

After looking over the proposals for the 2050 San Diego County regional transportation plan I strongly encourage you to choose the 50-10 with a greater emphasis on transit rather than freeway expansion.

Thank you for your Service,
Resident of Encinitas
Darrow, Dayna

From: Johnston, Phillip  
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2010 7:49 AM  
To: Darrow, Dayna  
Subject: FW: Opposition to Freeway Expansion

From: Linda Hart [mailto:harrel@gmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 5:45 PM  
To: Johnston, Phillip  
Subject: Opposition to Freeway Expansion

Dear Mr. Johnston,

I and my husband and daughter (John Reis and Amanda Reis, respectively), are strongly opposed to the widening of I-5 from La Jolla Village Drive to Camp Pendleton! With California facing all it’s budget issues, it is unconscionable to pledge billions of dollars to this.

WE NEED PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, not more and more freeway lanes to encourage more cars!!

Please vote against ITEM 13, and please distribute my opposition to the Board.

Thank you,

Linda Hart

978 Santa Florencia

Solana Beach, CA. 92075
Vice Chair Jerome Stocks and  
Members of the Board of Directors  
SANDAG  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101  

Re: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario  

Dear Board Members:  

On behalf of my wife and myself, please include this letter of support for the comments previously submitted by SOFAR and CNFF regarding the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario. We hereby join SOFAR/CNFF in respectfully requesting that the Board defer further consideration of the Hybrid Scenario. Instead, please direct SANDAG staff to evaluate the merits of a 50-10 Plan, to implement 50 years of transit within a 10-year period, to truly embrace a smart growth solution for our region.  

This plan would include: (1) transit infrastructure and operational service improvements fully built-out prior to any consideration of highway capacity projects; (2) a comprehensively designed and fully integrated transit network; (3) an initial emphasis on the urban core and the Sprinter and Coaster lines.  

For further information, please thoroughly review and consider the letter and materials submitted on behalf of SOFAR and CNFF.  

Thank you,  

Stanley Keniston, AIA  

Keniston Architects  
5354 Adams Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92115  
619.582.2900  

12/20/2010
December 1, 2010

Vice Chair Jerome Stocks and Members of the Board of Directors
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Via Electronic Mail
mpo@sandag.org

Re: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario

Dear Board Members:

On behalf of the Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation (CERF), please include this letter of support for the comments previously submitted by SOFAR and CNFF regarding the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario. CERF is a nonprofit environmental organization founded by surfers in North San Diego County and active throughout California’s coastal communities. CERF was established to aggressively advocate, including through litigation, for the protection and enhancement of coastal natural resources and the quality of life for coastal residents. These goals necessarily include implementation of true smart growth infrastructure.

Additionally, CERF hereby joins SOFAR/CNFF in respectfully requesting that the Board defer further consideration of the Hybrid Scenario. Instead, please direct SANDAG staff to evaluate the merits of a 50-10 Plan, to implement 50 years of transit within a 10-year period, to truly embrace a smart growth solution for our region.

This plan would include: (1) transit infrastructure and operational service improvements fully built-out prior to any consideration of highway capacity projects; (2) a comprehensively designed and fully integrated transit network; (3) an initial emphasis on the urban core and the Sprinter and Coaster lines.

For further information, please thoroughly review and consider the letter and materials submitted on behalf of SOFAR and CNFF.

Thank you for your consideration of these important issues for our region.

Sincerely,

COASTAL ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION

[Signature]
SARA S. HONADLE
Programs Director
December 16, 2010

*Via Electronic Mail*

Vice Chair Jerome Stocks and  
Members of the Board of Directors  
SANDAG  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA  92101

Re: **2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario**

Dear Board Members:

Save Our Forest and Ranchlands ("SOFAR") and the Cleveland National Forest Foundation ("CNFF") submit this letter to comment on the Board of Directors’ deliberations on the preferred alternative for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan ("2050 RTP"). While the Transportation Committee is recommending that the Board of Directors accept the Hybrid Scenario as the preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario, we are concerned that this Scenario, if implemented, would continue to place an unacceptable emphasis on regional highway capacity. Although the Hybrid Scenario is certainly a step in the right direction because it includes about $24 billion in transit investment, the Scenario also includes about $21 billion for highway expansion. Increasing highway capacity at the same time as the region is trying to grow its transit mode share is an inherently flawed approach to regional transportation mobility. Moreover, such an ill-fated approach will sabotage the potential to create a truly sustainable land use for the San Diego region.

SOFAR and CNFF respectfully request that the Board defer further consideration of the Hybrid Scenario and instead direct SANDAG staff to evaluate the merits of a 50-10 Plan. The 50-10 Plan, which envisions 50 years of transit within a 10-year period, would include the
following components: (1) transit infrastructure and operational service improvements fully built-out prior to any consideration of highway capacity projects; (2) a comprehensively designed and fully integrated transit network; (3) an initial emphasis on the urban core and the Sprinter and Coaster lines.\(^1\)

### 1. Background

For much of the last decade, SOFAR has participated in SANDAG’s regional transportation planning processes, advocating that SANDAG pursue a comprehensive transit network for the San Diego region. To this end, SOFAR participated in the 2003 RTP (referred to as 2030 RTP) and the 2007 RTP planning processes. With each iteration of the RTP, SOFAR has consistently advocated that SANDAG allocate the vast majority of the region’s transportation funding to expanding transit infrastructure and operational service instead of highway infrastructure.

Notwithstanding these requests, SANDAG directed the lion’s share of revenue in the 2007 RTP to expanding the region’s highway network while directing a relatively minor portion toward public transportation. Indeed, the 2007 RTP called for adding more than 800 total-lane miles to the region’s highways which, when constructed, would result in a 52 percent increase in daily system-wide vehicle miles traveled (“VMT”) compared to 2007 conditions. DEIR at 7-3 and 7-12. SANDAG’s environmental impact report (“EIR”) for the 2007 RTP confirmed the RTP’s alarming implications for global climate change -- the Plan was projected to cause a cumulatively considerable contribution to the worldwide increase in greenhouse gas (AGHG) emissions, adding 5.3 million tons of GHG emissions to the atmosphere every year. DEIR at 4.7-34 and 4.7-38. SANDAG’s highway-centric approach to regional transportation in the 2007 RTP also prompted a sharp response from the California Attorney General who criticized SANDAG because it had not analyzed an RTP alternative that would greatly reduce the extent (and cost) of freeway lane expansion projects, and therefore allow investing more funds in urban core transit, walking and biking improvements that would reduce VMT.

SOFAR’s participation in the 2007 RTP process culminated in a settlement agreement with SANDAG.\(^2\) The 2008 SOFAR/SANDAG Settlement Agreement required SANDAG to “develop a regional long-range transit plan, and five-year and ten-year transit action plans, with emphasis given to the urban core.” 2008 Agreement at 3. According to the Settlement Agreement, the purpose of the “transit plan with urban core emphasis” was intended to investigate “regional, corridor, local, and neighborhood transit services (e.g., transit capital improvements; operational changes; fare restructuring; design of intermodal transfer facilities) that would make transit time competitive with the private car. Id. (emphasis added). SOFAR and CNFF agree with this purpose. It is important to note, however, that SOFAR also intended that the purpose of the urban core plan was to design a transit program that allocated the vast majority of the region’s transportation resources to transit and that these resources be allocated

---

\(^1\) The “urban core” is the geographic sub-area that includes the downtown San Diego Trolley Ring and National City.

\(^2\) SOFAR’s participation in the 2003 RTP also culminated in a Settlement Agreement with SANDAG.
primarily to projects within the urban core. SOFAR’s vision of the urban core plan thus never included funding for the expansion of highways. Thus far, SANDAG has not developed or studied an urban core alternative as envisioned by SOFAR.

2. SANDAG’s Hybrid Scenario Would Not Result in a Sustainable Region.

With this iteration of the RTP, we are pleased that SANDAG recognizes the importance of transit as a viable component in the region’s transportation network. Yet, the Hybrid Scenario contains serious flaws which would result in a failure to advance the region’s smart growth goals. First, the Hybrid Scenario would continue to fund massive increases in highway infrastructure concurrently with the expansion of the region’s transit network. Funding both highway expansion and transit is an ill-fated approach that will not allow the region to achieve its sustainability goals.

Investing in highways will undermine the region’s attempt to promote infill development within the region’s urban communities. Continued emphasis on facilitating highway travel also perpetuates development patterns that are inherently unsuited to alternative modes. Investing in transit capital and operational improvements, on the other hand, creates transit certainty which in turn is a critical factor for supporting the growth of compact communities. Moreover, as discussed below, substantial increases in highway capacity perpetuate auto-oriented development and significantly impact transit patronage, since the presence of congestion is an incentive to transit usage.

In addition, while the Hybrid Scenario contemplates investing about $24 billion in public transportation, certain of the transit projects are proposed in locations, or along relatively low-density development corridors, that would not achieve optimal ridership. By funding transit projects over such a dispersed geographical area, the effectiveness, and therefore benefits, of transit become diluted. Without a concentrated and integrated transit system, the region will never achieve optimal transit mode share goals. Transit investment must be targeted for areas that already have relatively intense land use or which have planned intensified land uses. In other words, it is not just the amount of transit, but the location of that transit that will ultimately affect land use that will, in turn, lead to major changes in travel habits.

As discussed above, SOFAR has repeatedly emphasized the importance of implementing a comprehensive transit system in the region’s urban core. See e.g., the alternative SOFAR provided to SANDAG in the context of the 2007 RTP, February 16, 2007. The infrastructure in the urban core, coupled with this community’s demographics, suggest that this location has tremendous potential for increased transit mode share. Roadways within the urban core were developed on a grid system which inherently supports the efficient movement of transit vehicles. In fact, some of the heaviest traveled bus routes in the trolley ring area were once served by streetcars. It is important to note that, in addition to concentrating transit in the urban core, SOFAR and CNFF wholeheartedly endorse SANDAG’s proposals to double track the Sprinter and the Coaster lines.
In sum, SANDAG’s proposed Hybrid Scenario would not ensure that the region meets its sustainability, transportation or environmental goals. SANDAG should follow the precedent being set by urban regions around the world by: (a) committing to a future of **smart growth**, and (b) funding a transportation network that will support the mobility needs of this **smart growth**. Alternative transportation approaches to the Hybrid Scenario are available and should be examined. Set forth below is a sketch of an approach — referred to as the 50-10 Plan — that would achieve this important goal. We respectfully request that SANDAG work with this sketch to formulate a revised alternative for the 2050 RTP.

3. **The 50-10 Plan Would Result in Considerable Benefits Compared to SANDAG’s Hybrid Scenario.**

SANDAG should develop a 50-10 Plan for the San Diego region. A 50-10 Plan, which envisions 50 years of transit implemented within a 10-year period, would include the following components: (a) full buildout of the region’s public transportation network prior to funding any additional highway expansion; (b) the regional transit network would be a comprehensive, well-integrated system; and (c) an initial focus on the **urban core**, the Sprinter and the Coaster. In developing this 50-10 Plan, we encourage SANDAG to look to the plans prepared by two cities: Bordeaux and Los Angeles.

In just six years, Bordeaux completed a transit revolution, changing the car-dominated nature of the city center, by building 3 tram lines with total length of 27 miles and 88 stations. Sustainable transportation mode share is expected to increase to 17% city-wide by 2010 (37% for the city centre), compared to 9% in 1998. These transit investments have supported housing revitalization, walk-ability and business activity in downtown Bordeaux. The average time gain on every transit trip with the tram network was estimated to be eight minutes. This significant improvement was accompanied by an urban revitalization of an unequalled magnitude in France, transforming a much neglected downtown area.³

Los Angeles is also undertaking what appears to be an equally ambitious approach to fund a comprehensive transit program. The 30/10 Initiative would use the City’s 30-year sales tax revenue (which allocates ½ cent to transit projects) to leverage federal funding and complete a robust transit plan in ten years. According to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, the 30/10 Initiative will:

- Create 160,000 new jobs
- Result in 77 million more transit boardings
- Generate 521,000 fewer pounds of mobile source pollution emissions
- Use 10.3 million fewer gallons of gasoline
- Result in 191 million fewer vehicle miles traveled

Set forth below is a summary of the components, and overall goals, of a 50-10 Plan.

A. **The 50-10 Plan Would Implement Transit Projects Prior to Highway Capacity Projects.**

If transit is to succeed in the region, it must now be the region's highest priority. SANDAG must build out its public transportation network before funding any additional highway projects. Highway expansion is not unlike a treadmill. Decades of highway expansion projects have encouraged decentralized development patterns supported by easy highway access. In turn, this decentralized development has encouraged massive traffic growth, leading to congestion, and the demand for further highway expansion. Consequently, for at least the last 30 years, San Diego's legacy has been a devotion to the automobile. The sprawling pattern of land development and the extensive highways have contributed to a region that is almost entirely automobile dependent. Not surprisingly, vehicle miles traveled ("VMT") has grown exponentially. Moreover, the San Diego region has more than its fair share of freeways. According to the Texas Transportation Institute Urban Mobility Study, the San Diego region ranks as having the most per capita freeway lane miles of the country's fifteen largest regions.

A confluence of factors is contributing to a dramatic shift in our development patterns: the economy, an aging population, global climate change, and concern about our dependence on foreign oil are contributing to an escalating shift in residential market demand. The public is now seeking smaller homes, shorter commutes and more urbanized living. Developers and jurisdictions are reacting to this demand by intensifying land uses in our urban areas. This shift in development patterns results in a corresponding shift in transportation needs. Residents of more compact development - such as that in the urban core - have much less need for automobiles compared to their suburban counterparts. SANDAG must acknowledge this fundamental land use shift and plan its future transportation network accordingly. The region no longer needs wider highways to the suburbs. Instead, the region's highest priority must be enhanced mobility for urban residents.

There are two additional reasons why the 50-10 Plan should not include any highway widening projects. First, increases in highway infrastructure undercut transit ridership. Traffic congestion provides a significant incentive to seek alternative modes of transportation. High quality public transportation tends to attract travelers who might otherwise drive. Once highways are widened, however, traffic congestion eases, travel speeds increase (at least for some period of time), and travelers again begin to drive. Thus, a comprehensive transit program would be essentially guaranteed to fail if a massive increase in highway capacity were to accompany the Plan's public transit investments. Second, as discussed further below, intensive land use tends to follow transit development. Improving transit thus provides further incentive for the growth of compact communities. Funding highways, on the other hand, would only contribute further toward decentralized, low density development patterns.
Now is the time to shift directions in transportation mobility and this simply cannot be accomplished in a half-hearted manner. Instead of committing $21 billion toward highway expansion projects, as the Hybrid Scenario contemplates, SANDAG must commit this funding to transit. In any event, SANDAG must not fund increases in highway capacity at the same time as it proposes a substantial commitment to transit. Put simply, a comprehensive transit system must be fully implemented prior to considering any further increases in highway capacity.

B. The 50-10 Plan Would Be Based on a Compact Development, High Density Land Use Plan.

The foundation of the 50-10 Plan must be the development of a preferred regional land use plan – a smart growth land use plan – and the development of a transportation mobility network that supports the needs of this smart growth plan. This is a vitally important point. The region’s historical land use patterns must change in order to ensure a sustainable future. This shift is already underway. SANDAG must be at the forefront of this change and lead the region in this new direction. The fact that the San Diego region has traditionally experienced a low-density, decentralized development pattern should not be an excuse for a continuation of unsustainable land use practices.

San Diego, like many urban regions around the country, is undergoing a fundamental shift in residential development patterns toward more compact, infill, multi-modal development. Not surprisingly, residents of these urban areas are seeking transit-oriented homes. As one study shows, in the San Francisco Bay Area, about 600,000 households are located within a half-mile of an existing rail transit or bus station. Over the next 25 years, an estimated additional 250,000 households will be seeking transit-oriented homes, an increase of 40 percent. See Transit Oriented Development, New Places, New Choices in the San Francisco Bay Area, November 2006, available at: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/tod/TOD_Book.pdf.

At the same time, this compact, infill development has the potential to make public transportation more efficient. People living or working close to high-quality transit use it with much greater frequency than people farther from transit. One study found that California transit station area residents are about five times more likely to commute by transit as the average worker in the same city. See Land Use Impacts on Transportation, Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, (citing Lund, Cervero and Willson (2004)), December 7, 2010 at 24. These higher levels of transit use can improve the cost-effectiveness of transit investments, bolster the financial stability of transit systems and support higher-quality transit. In turn, proximity to higher quality public-transit infrastructure such as rail, trolley or bus lines and stations tends to further encourage compact, mixed, multi-modal development. See Evaluating Transportation Land Use Impacts, Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, at 16.

The planning principles of transit oriented development or communities are not new – indeed they represent a return to the development patterns common to older cities throughout the world. Siting homes, jobs, shops and services within walking distance of mass transit hubs was the typical pattern of development as American cities expanded along railroad corridors and
streetcar lines in the 19th and early-20th centuries. See Transit Oriented Development, New Places, New Choices in the San Francisco Bay Area at 3. Indeed, in the 1970s, San Diego led the nation by being the first to build a low-cost rail line. Dozens of other cities have since followed, using rail transit as the foundation for their transit systems. Unfortunately, over the last 40 years, San Diego seems to have lost its way.

Despite the San Diego region’s unsustainable past, ample opportunity exists to develop compact, infill, multi-modal development within the County’s urbanized areas. SOFAR and CNFF recently commissioned an analysis of the infill development potential within the County’s 18 cities. See Infill Scenario Study, prepared by GreenInfo Network (submitted previously). Using SANDAG’s 2030 Employment and Residential Land Inventory (“SANDAG Inventory”), the Infill Study determined that the County can more than meet its need for new housing over the next several decades by concentrating development in existing cities. The SANDAG inventory projects that the County will require 230,000 new housing units by 2030. Using this figure as a starting point, the Infill Scenario Study concluded that, based on the incorporated cities’ existing General Plans and zoning, there is ample development capacity to accommodate approximately 400,000 new homes in the incorporated cities of San Diego County. Thus, all of the region’s projected housing needs for 2030 could take place as infill development (within the incorporated cities of San Diego). Moreover, the cities would still have 170,000 additional units available for development beyond 2030.

The implications of this Infill Study are profound. Beyond the obvious benefits to transportation (such as reduced commute trip lengths, reduced VMT and increased potential for a viable public transportation system), focusing development in the County’s urbanized areas or cities and developing in a compact manner would reduce unnecessary land consumption and allow for the preservation of the back-country’s environmentally sensitive lands. A land use plan such as that described in the Infill Study would reduce the waste of natural resources including energy and water, as well as the impacts of development on air and water quality. According to the draft EIR for the San Diego County General Plan Update, the proposed General Plan would result in 22 significant and unavoidable environmental impacts including impacts to aesthetics, agriculture, air quality, biological resources, hazards, hydrology/water quality, minerals, noise, public services, traffic, and utilities. Many of these environmental impacts could be reduced or avoided altogether if the County directed the vast majority of its projected residential development to the County’s 18 cities.

C. The 50-10 Plan Would Fund a Comprehensive, Integrated Transit System that Focuses Initially on the Urban Core.

SANDAG’s proposal to commit $24 billion to transit, while ambitious, is unlikely to result in a substantial increase in transit mode share. The problem with the Hybrid Scenario’s approach extend beyond the ill-fated proposal to commit $21 billion in highway expansion while also funding transit. The second fundamental flaw is that the transit projects that are contemplated by the Hybrid Scenario are simply spread over too large a geographical area and planned for inappropriate transportation corridors.
The SANDAG urban region is enormous, comprising about 800 square miles. The Hybrid Scenario proposes transit investment over an area that is roughly 200 square miles. In contrast, the urban core area is about 40 to 60 square miles. In order to be successful, the region’s transit system must be initially focused in a discrete geographical location that allows for the development of a comprehensive and well-integrated system. We strongly encourage SANDAG to initially build-out transit in the urban core (along with double-tracking the Coaster and Sprinter). The goal of such a transit system is that it would allow mobility within the geographical limits of the Urban Core without an automobile; efficient transitions between various public transit modes (e.g., light rail, trolley and bus service); and connections to other modes (e.g., pedestrians and bicyclists should have safe, accessible routes to transit stops. Indeed, the work that SANDAG did conduct on the Urban Area Transit Study shows that there is tremendous potential to increase transit mode share within the urban core.

Once the urban core public transit system is fully built out, as well as the Coaster and Sprinter, the second phase of the 50-10 Plan would be designed, working outward from the urban core.

4. Conclusion

SOFAR and CNFF are encouraged by SANDAG’s willingness to allocate $24 billion of the region’s relatively scarce transportation resources to public transportation. Yet SANDAG should not commit this funding to a transit plan while concurrently increasing the capacity of the region’s highways. In addition, SANDAG should design a geographically focused and well-integrated transit program beginning with the urban core, the Sprinter and the Coaster. SANDAG owes it to the residents of the region to plan for the future, and not just perpetuate the unsustainable transportation policies of the past. We urge the Board to direct SANDAG staff to design and study the 50-10 Plan.

Sincerely,

Duncan McFetridge
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...almost all cities in San Diego County have substantially more residential capacity than demand by 2030, ... [this] leaves the cities of the County with 158,000 units of residential capacity for future growth beyond 2030.

-An Alternative Development Scenario for San Diego County, July, 2010
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True mobility is about moving people, not vehicles. These graphics depict the amount of street space that cars consume vs. the amount of space consumed by transit. With transit we can significantly decongest urban streets, lessen the amount of space needed for vehicles, and increase space for business, civic, and pedestrian uses.