TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, May 21, 2010
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- RIDING TO 2050: SAN DIEGO REGIONAL BICYCLE PLAN - FINAL DRAFT
- 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES
- NAVY TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STUDY INITIATIVE
- INTERSTATE 805 CORRIDOR UPDATE

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

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

MISSION STATEMENT

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

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 Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Transportation Committee meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Transportation Committee 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.
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Friday, May 21, 2010

ITEM # RECOMMENDATION

+1. APPROVAL OF MAY 7, 2010, MEETING MINUTES APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

CONSENT (3)

+3. AGREEMENT WITH STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD CONCERNING IMPLEMENTATION OF TransNet PROJECTS (Richard Chavez) APPROVE

SANDAG has had an agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board (Water Board) since 2007 to provide Water Board staff participation in the project development process, expediting the issuance of project conformity permits. SANDAG staff proposes to enter into a new agreement with the Water Board which would extend the services through June 2012 as well as allow cities and the County similar access for their projects should they choose to participate. SANDAG costs under the new agreement would not exceed $410,000. The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the Executive Director to execute an agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board to expedite the delivery of TransNet projects in substantially the same form as Attachment 1. The new agreement would extend the scope of services currently delivered through an existing agreement which expires in June 2010 and would additionally allow cities and the County similar access for their projects should they choose to participate.

CHAIR’S REPORT (4)

4. BIKE TO WORK DAY 2010 INFORMATION

Today, Friday, May 21, 2010, is National Bike to Work Day. Each year SANDAG sponsors the regional Bike to Work Day event to create public awareness about the benefits and opportunities of bicycling to work.
+5. RIDING TO 2050: SAN DIEGO REGIONAL BICYCLE PLAN – FINAL DRAFT  (Chris Kluth)

The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Plan) is being developed to support implementation of both the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan. On March 19, 2010, the Transportation Committee accepted the Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and Preliminary Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan for public distribution and comment. The 30 day public review period concluded on April 26, 2010. This report presents an overview of the changes to the Draft IS/MND and Preliminary Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan that were developed in response to comments received during the public review and comment period of these documents. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) adopt the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Attachment 1); and (2) approve the Final Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Attachment 2).

+6. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES (Scott Strelecki)

Staff will address comments received on the Draft Performance Measures for the 2050 RTP. The Transportation Committee will be asked at a future meeting to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the 2050 RTP Performance Measures at its June 25, 2010, meeting.

+7. NAVY TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STUDY INITIATIVE (Dan Martin, SANDAG, Navy Representative)

The United States Navy, as one of the largest employers in the San Diego Region, has partnered with the Metropolitan Transit System and the SANDAG iCommute Program to provide an analysis of commuter travel activity between the major naval housing areas and naval bases/facilities in the San Diego metropolitan area. A study to evaluate transportation demand management alternatives specific to the Navy’s Murphy Canyon Housing has been completed. Staff will provide an overview of the study and propose a pilot service for recommendation by the Transportation Committee to the Board of Directors. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the implementation of a proposed pilot limited express transit service from the Murphy Canyon military housing area to Naval Base San Diego for a period of one year beginning in fall 2010.
+8. **INTERSTATE 805 CORRIDOR UPDATE, PROPOSED BUDGET INCREASE, AND SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT (Joel Haven, Caltrans)**

Staff will present an update on the Interstate 805 corridor, including the status of environmental clearance for the North and South segments, a request to fund the design phase for two high occupancy vehicle lanes on the North segment, and a request to delay the schedule for the Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service project. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board of Directors that $16 million of TransNet funding be allocated to the design of the initial phase of the I-805 North Segment. The Transportation Committee also is asked to move the baseline schedule for the open-to-public date for the Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service project to May 2011.

+9. **AGREEMENT WITH PORT OF SAN DIEGO FOR FIBER OPTIC PROJECT (John Haggerty)**

The Transportation Committee is asked to: (1) authorize the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with the Port of San Diego to accept an amount not to exceed $300,000 from the Port of San Diego for services and construction related to installation of fiber optic cable as part of the MTS Blue Line improvements; and (2) increase budget CIP No.1210001 from $114,695,000 to $114,995,000.

+10. **FY 2011 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (Phil Trom)**

SANDAG is responsible for determining if the transit agencies have made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvement recommendations adopted by the Board of Directors for the current fiscal year. This item discusses the transit agency productivity improvements associated with the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim for FY 2011. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors find that the Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District made a reasonable effort to implement productivity improvements during FY 2010 and to concur that the productivity evaluation process fulfills TDA requirements.

11. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, June 4, at 9 a.m. Please note that a portion of the meeting will be held jointly with the Regional Planning Committee.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF MAY 7, 2010

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Jack Dale (East County) at 9:05 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Vice Chair Matt Hall (North County Coastal), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the April 16, 2010, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

CHAIRS REPORT (3)

3. URBAN AREA TRANSIT STRATEGY: BRIEF STATUS REPORT (INFORMATION)

Significant input on the Urban Area Transit Strategy has recently been received from the Peer Review Panel, the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan public workshops, the Web site, the SANDAG working groups, and other forums. The Chair provided a brief status report and highlighted the schedule of upcoming steps. A more detailed report will be provided in early June at the proposed joint Transportation/Regional Planning Committees meeting.

Action: This item was presented for information.

REPORTS (4 through 10)

4. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT TRIENNIAL PERFORMANCE AUDIT (APPROVE)

The Triennial Transportation Development Act (TDA) audits of Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), North County Transit District (NCTD), and SANDAG have been completed and were presented to the Transportation Committee. The reports include a compliance review of state requirements for each agency, a review of management control and reporting, and performance trends. Under state law this performance audit must be completed every three years. The reports include recommendations for each agency.
Brian Lane, Associate Regional Planner, introduced the item.

Mark Chang, Booz, Allen, Hamilton, presented the item.

Chair Dale directed staff to review the audit findings for SANDAG and strengthen to language to reflect the comments made by the Transportation Committee members.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Chairman Bob Campbell (North County Transit District [NCTD]) and a second by Chairman Harry Mathis (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), the Transportation Committee authorized the Executive Director to: (1) transmit the performance audit report of SANDAG to the Director of the California Department of Transportation as required; (2) certify in writing to the Director of the California Department of Transportation that the performance audits of operators located in the area under its jurisdiction have been completed; (3) implement the performance audit recommendations pertaining to SANDAG TDA activities; and (4) transmit the other recommendations to the transit operators for implementation.

5. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR HIGHWAY CORRIDORS, TRANSIT SERVICES, AND CONNECTOR PROJECTS (RECOMMEND)

At the April 16 Transportation Committee meeting, SANDAG staff presented the draft evaluation criteria for highway corridors, transit services, and connector projects. The Transportation Committee directed staff to meet with the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group and clarify descriptions of several criteria.

Scott Strelecki, Regional Planner II presented the item.

Duncan McFetridge, (Save Our Forests and Wetlands), SOFAR made comments regarding changes SOFAR would like to see in the RTP.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Vice Chair Hall and a second by Mayor Jim Desmond (North County Inland), the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria for highway corridors, transit services, and connector projects in substantially the same form as attached to the report.

6. INTERSTATE 5 SOUTH MULTIMODAL CORRIDOR STUDY ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION (RECOMMEND)

SANDAG, in collaboration with the City of Chula Vista and Caltrans, is conducting an Interstate 5 (I-5) South Multimodal Corridor Study to examine potential transportation improvements between State Route 54 and Main Street in the City of Chula Vista. On September 18, 2009, the Transportation Committee approved three alternatives for further study. Staff presented the results of this analysis.

Rachel Kennedy, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Roberts and a second by Vice Chair Hall, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the I-5 South Multimodal Corridor Study Alternative 2 for inclusion in the development of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan.
7. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM AMENDMENTS FOR THE CITIES OF ENCINITAS, SAN DIEGO, AND SAN MARCOS (APPROVE)

The fiscal year 2009 Transportation Development Act (TDA) compliance audits are complete, and projects determined to be complete during the audit process require an allocation reduction. In addition to the audit, the Bicycle - Pedestrian Working Group completed its review of bicycle and pedestrian projects and recommends that the Transportation Committee reduce the allocation of the Cities of San Diego and Encinitas projects.

Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, Senior Accountant (Acting), presented the item.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Desmond and a second by Vice Chair Hall, the Transportation Committee approved Resolution No. 2010-10, as shown in Attachment 1, approving revisions to TDA Article 3.0 claims for various City of Encinitas, San Diego, and San Marcos completed bicycle and pedestrian projects.

8. UNDERSTANDING TRANSIT’S IMPACT ON PUBLIC SAFETY (INFORMATION)

SANDAG recently completed a study analyzing public transit's impact on neighborhood safety. The study compared the crime rates between similar neighborhoods with and without a transit station (COASTER or Trolley), as well as crime rates before and after the implementation of the Green Line Trolley extension. Additional analyses were included to determine if station design or features of the surrounding areas were related to the amount of crime found near a station. Staff provided an overview of this study and the results.

Kristen Rohanna, Senior Research Analyst, presented the item.

Action: This item was presented for information.

9. 2010 TransNet PLAN OF FINANCE UPDATE (INFORMATION)

SANDAG updates the TransNet Plan of Finance on an annual basis in conjunction with the development of the annual SANDAG Budget. Staff updated the Transportation Committee on work to date on the Plan of Finance (POF), including updated revenue and cost projections.

Kim Kawada, TransNet / Legislative Affairs Program Director, introduced the item and reviewed the TransNet Program in general and details of the Early Action Program (EAP).

Marney Cox, Chief Economist, presented the updated revenue projections.

Richard Chavez, Principal Engineer, reviewed the cost projections and updates on the POF for the EAP.

Duncan McFetridge, SOFAR, commented regarding SOFAR’s position on this item.

Action: This item was presented for information.
10. TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FUNDING RECOMMENDATION
(RECOMMEND)

At the March 19, 2010, Transportation Committee meeting, staff identified additional Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds that, under California Transportation Commission (CTC) rules, need to be programmed and allocated this fiscal year to avoid a delay in the region’s access to the funds. Staff committed to report back to the committee on options for further allocating the funds; adding these funds to existing construction funding for the Bayshore Bikeway will meet the CTC requirements and enable SANDAG to complete an additional section of the bikeway.

Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner presented the item.

Supervisor Greg Cox, County of San Diego, Chair of the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group stated his support for this item and requested that the full amount of funding be approved.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Chairman Mathis and a second by Chairman Campbell, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve a $750,000 increase in TE funding for the Bayshore Bikeway from $1,611,000 to $2,361,000, including approving Amendment No. 26 to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (Attachment 3) as well as amending the FY 2010 SANDAG Budget to increase the Bayshore Bikeway project CIP No. 1143700 from $2,206,000 to $2,956,000 in substantially the same form as Attachment 4.

11. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, May 21, 2010, at 9 a.m. Please note that a portion of the June 4, 2010 meeting will be held jointly with the Regional Planning Committee.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Dale adjourned the meeting at 10:41 a.m.
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San Diego Association of Governments

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

May 21, 2010

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: APPROVE

AGREEMENT WITH STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
CONCERNING IMPLEMENTATION OF TransNet PROJECTS

File Number 1200100

Introduction

On May 4, 2007, and June 20, 2008, the Transportation Committee authorized the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board (Water Board) to expedite the delivery of TransNet projects. This agreement allows Water Board staff to participate in the project development process, expediting the issuance of project conformity permits. Staff is proposing to enter into a new agreement with the Water Board extending these services. Funds would be made available through the TransNet Project Office, work element 1200100. The new agreement would provide similar access to the cities and the County for their projects should they chose to participate.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the Executive Director to execute an agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board to expedite the delivery of TransNet projects in substantially the same form as Attachment 1. The new agreement would extend the scope of services currently delivered through an existing agreement which expires in June 2010 and would additionally allow cities and the County similar access for their projects should they chose to participate. SANDAG costs under the new agreement would not exceed $410,000.

Discussion

The TransNet Major Corridors program includes transportation improvements to Interstate 5 (I-5), I-15, I-805, State Route 52 (SR 52), SR 76, SR 905, Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit, Orange and Blue Line Trolley, Mid-City Rapid Transit, South Line Rail, and Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency (LOSSAN) rail. Before construction can begin, the Water Board must issue permits certifying project conformity with water quality regulations. Transportation improvement projects are linear by nature and often require working in bodies of water resulting in water quality impacts. Project construction techniques also can produce pollutants that are transported to bodies of water from wind or storm water runoff. By law, these project-related water quality impacts must be properly managed and mitigated.

The current $410,000 two-year agreement with the Water Board will expire June 30, 2010. The agreement has resulted in improved communication and cooperation between the Water Board, SANDAG, and Caltrans staff for developing and implementing required water quality measures for TransNet projects. Water Board staff now participate in project delivery meetings, providing the team with important detailed and technical information that is used to ensure the projects will meet water quality laws and regulations. This has resulted in an expedited permitting process.
SANDAG and Caltrans staffs meet with the Water Board staff on a quarterly basis to review and document the goals established by the agreement. Staff is recommending that the agreement be extended for an additional two years.

The agreement also is available for cities and County improvement projects should the cities or County chose to participate. Approval of this item in no way commits any city or the County to participate in this program. Participation is strictly voluntary. Should a city or the County chose to, participation would be facilitated through the SANDAG Service Bureau. An agreement with the County of San Diego is currently being developed so they may participate in the agreement between SANDAG and the Water Board.

The terms of the new agreement would be in effect until June 2012. The Water Board would invoice SANDAG for reimbursement for the hours of work actually performed under the terms of this agreement up to $410,000 during FY 2011 and FY 2012. TransNet funds from the TransNet Project Office budget, work element 1200100, would be used for the majority of this expense. Should cities or the County chose to participate in this program, city or County funds would be used for those expenses.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachment: 1. Agreement Between State Water Resources Control Board and SANDAG

Key Staff Contact: Richard Chavez, (619) 699-6989, rch@sandag.org
AGREEMENT NO. XX-XXX-XXX-X  
BETWEEN 
THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD  
AND 
THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS 

The State Water Resources Control Board, (State Water Board), on behalf of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (Regional Water Board) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), enter into this agreement as follows: 

EXHIBIT A-SCOPE OF WORK 

1 Scope of Agreement 

1.1 The State Water Board agrees to perform work in accordance with the terms and conditions contained herein. 

1.2 The work performed under the agreement shall be under the direction of the State Water Board. SANDAG shall provide funding only. The State Water Board retains complete discretion to act as provided by law. The only limitation this agreement makes on the State Water Board is the category of projects to which the resources from SANDAG will be dedicated as set forth in paragraph 4 of this agreement. 

2. Term 

2.1 The duration of this agreement shall be July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2012, if approved by the State Department of General Services, unless terminated sooner by either party upon thirty (30) days written notice. This agreement may be amended upon mutual written agreement of the parties. 

3. Contract Managers 

3.1 The Contract Manager for the State Water Board shall be Chiara Clemente, Senior Environmental Scientist of the Regional Water Board. The Contract Manager for SANDAG shall be Richard Chavez, Principal Transportation Engineer. A party may change its Contract Manager at any time upon written notice to the other party. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Water Resources Control Board</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Chiara Clemente</td>
<td>Name: Richard Chavez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 9174 Sky Park Court, #100 San Diego, CA 92123</td>
<td>Address: 401 B Street, Suite 800 San Diego CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: (858) 467-2359</td>
<td>Phone: (619) 699-6989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: (858) 571-6972</td>
<td>Fax: (619) 699-1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Work to be Performed**

4.1 Within the *TransNet* Early Action Program with transportation improvements to the I-5, I-15, I-805, SR 52, SR 76, and Mid-Coast Transit corridors, or other areas approved by SANDAG, such as the Goods Movement Program, the State Water Board agrees to perform the following work pertaining to environmental reviews for transportation projects:

4.1.1 Participate in scoping meetings and other inter-agency meetings that occur during the preliminary phases of projects.

4.1.2 Identify and assist with the development of project design necessary to ensure protection of water quality and provide input to project planners and engineers.

4.1.3 Identify projects that will require environmental mitigation, and the appropriate mitigation measures, and provide input to project planners and engineers.

4.1.4 Review project Notice of Exemption, Negative Declaration, Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement documents and provide comments on water quality issues to lead agencies.

4.1.5 Review project environmental documents and recommend that the Regional Water Board either support or challenge those documents within the statutory deadlines.

4.1.6 Coordinate permitting activities (Clean Water Act Section 401 Certifications or Waste Discharge Requirements) with results from environmental reviews to ensure identified environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures are addressed in subsequent permits.

4.2 In coordination with the SANDAG Contract Manager on a project-by-project basis, the State Water Board agrees to perform the following work pertaining to environmental reviews for local agency planning projects:

4.2.1 Participate in scoping meetings and other inter-agency meetings that occur during the preliminary phases of projects.

4.2.2 Identify and assist with the development of project design necessary to ensure protection of water quality and provide input to project planners and engineers.
4.2.3 Identify projects that will require environmental mitigation, and the appropriate mitigation measures, and provide input to project planners and engineers.

4.2.4 Review project Notice of Exemption, Negative Declaration, Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement documents and provide comments on water quality issues to lead agencies.

4.2.5 Review project environmental documents and recommend that the Regional Water Board either support or challenge those documents within the statutory deadlines.

4.2.6 Coordinate permitting activities (Clean Water Act Section 401 Certifications or Waste Discharge Requirements) with results from environmental reviews to ensure identified environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures are addressed in subsequent permits.

5. Meetings and Reports

5.1 State Water Board agrees to conduct quarterly meetings with SANDAG and local agency staff to review and coordinate ongoing activities performed in accordance with this agreement. The State Water Board will submit monthly or quarterly reports to SANDAG and any applicable local agencies describing the Regional Water Board activities, progress made, and time expended using the agreement resources.

6. Access to Facilities, Premises and Records

6.1 At all reasonable times during the term of this agreement and for three (3) years following final settlement, the Bureau of State Audits, SANDAG or any designated representatives shall have access to the records of the State Water Board related to the work performed under this agreement and the State Water Board shall make such records available for inspection, audit, and copying by the Bureau of State Audits, SANDAG or any designated representative.


7.1 Each party agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the other party’s Board of Directors, officers, contract management and staff, agents, and member agencies from any and all liability, claims, damages or injuries to any person or property, including injury to the other party’s employees, arising from or connected with the other party’s performance of or failure to perform its obligations under this agreement. The
indemnification provisions of this agreement shall survive termination of the agreement.

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

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

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

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

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

FULL NAME OF PERSON SIGNING
Title

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Office of General Counsel

Legal Counsel
EXHIBIT B-BUDGET

1. **Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Staff Costs (including salaries, wages, benefits, etc.)</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $410,000

2. **Cost and Payment**

2.1 Upon completion of the foregoing, SANDAG agrees to reimburse the State Water Board for cost of performance. Actual reimbursement shall be based on the hours of work actually performed. In no event shall the total amount paid to the State Water Board under this agreement by SANDAG exceed four hundred ten thousand dollars ($410,000.00).

2.2 SANDAG shall reimburse the State Water Board in arrears, upon receipt of an itemized invoice. Invoices shall be submitted to:

Richard Chavez  
SANDAG  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101

2.3 The State Water Board shall pay its employee's necessary and reasonable travel expenses and per diem allowance incurred during the performance of work under this agreement from funds provided in this agreement at rates not to exceed those amounts paid to the State’s represented employees under collective bargaining agreements currently in effect. Reasonable travel expenses and per diem allowances incurred shall be reimbursable.

2.4 The State Water Board shall provide written notice to SANDAG thirty (30) days in advance of any proposed rate changes to salaries, wages, benefits, or operating expenses associated with the work to be performed under this agreement.

2.5 The total contract amount shall not exceed $410,000.00. The total amount is conditionally agreed to by SANDAG contingent upon approval of the pertinent fiscal years’ budget by the SANDAG Board of Directors.

2.6 In the event that budget appropriations are not approved, this agreement shall terminate when the appropriated funds are depleted or at the beginning of the fiscal year for which such appropriation is not approved, whichever occurs first, unless this agreement is otherwise amended.
Introduction

The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Plan) has been developed to support implementation of both the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RCP calls for more transportation options and a balanced regional transportation system that supports smart growth and a more sustainable region. The RTP calls for a multimodal regional transportation system that includes a regional bicycle network. The Plan, which will be incorporated into the 2050 RTP that currently is under development, will provide that network, as well as the programs that are necessary to support the bicycle component of the region’s multimodal future. Integrating the Plan into the 2050 RTP also will allow the Plan to become part of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) mandated by Senate Bill 375. Implementation of the Plan will help the region meet its goals in reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and improve mobility. It also will provide benefits to public health by encouraging more people to adopt a physically active mode of transportation for at least some of their trips.

This report presents an overview of the changes to the Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Preliminary Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan that were developed in response to comments received during the public review and comment period of these documents.

Discussion

Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

The Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and addresses potential environmental consequences of the implementation of the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. On March 19, 2010, the Transportation Committee accepted the Draft IS/MND and Preliminary Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan for public distribution and comment. The 30 day public review period concluded on April 26, 2010.

Comment letters were received from the following agencies:

- The County of San Diego
- The Department of Fish and Game
- The Department of Toxic Substances Control
- The California Department of Transportation
- The California Public Utilities Commission
The Final IS/MND incorporates changes made to the Draft IS/MND as a result of comments received during the public review period and minor changes made to the Plan. Changes made in the IS/MND did not result in any new significant impacts that were not already addressed in the Draft IS/MND. The Final IS/MND includes copies of all the IS/MND comments received and responses to the comments.

The IS/MND determines the impacts of San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan to range from “no impact” to “impacts less than significant with mitigation incorporated.”

**Final Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan - Proposed Modifications**

The Preliminary Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Plan) was released concurrently with the IS/MND by the Transportation Committee on March 19, 2010 and public review has resulted in 73 comments from 13 individuals, groups or government agencies, submitted via e-mail and letters. Comments received were used to prepare changes to the Final Plan. A complete list of all Preliminary Draft Plan comments and responses is in Attachment 3.

Staff worked with agencies, organizations, and individuals in an effort to address their concerns. Minor edits were made to text, tables, and figures to clarify or expand explanations of the policies, programs, facilities, and network development that were included in the Preliminary Draft Plan. The notable changes proposed for the Final Plan as a result of comments received during the review period are discussed below. Issues raised by the Transportation Committee at the March 19 meeting are addressed as well.

The Network - The most notable changes in the Plan are related to the regional bicycle network. As part of the planning process two bicycle network alternatives were developed to reflect alternative future funding scenarios. The network alignments associated with each funding scenario are identical. What differs between the two are the types of facility improvements proposed in some corridors and the resulting cost difference associated with those improvements. For example, some sections of the regional corridor network that were proposed as Class II bike lanes under the former “revenue constrained” scenario, are proposed as Class I bike paths in the Final Draft Plan. This has a significant impact on the cost since the amount of Class I facilities is the single most influential factor in determining the overall cost of each network scenario.

The Preliminary Draft Plan focused on the “revenue constrained network” which assumed a funding scenario in which only currently known federal, state, and local transportation revenues are available, supplemented with additional resources that may become available through 2030.

The Final Draft Plan presents the former “unconstrained revenue” network alternative as the proposed preferred regional bicycle network (Attachment 4). The alternative network unconstrained by 2030 financial conditions was selected as the regional bicycle network for three principal reasons. First, the regional bicycle network in the Final Draft Plan accurately reflects bicycle system needs and is consistent with direction from policy makers and citizen input showing a preference for facilities separate from the roadway, whereas the revenue constrained network underestimates need. It should also be noted that this was the network alternative that was featured during the presentation of Preliminary Draft Plan to the Transportation Committee on March 19, 2010. Second, the regional bicycle network provides a blueprint for developing a comprehensive regional bikeway system to be complete in 2050 corresponding with the 2050 RTP. Finally acknowledging the region's actual bicycle system needs broadens the scope of funding opportunities to pursue for system development.

At the request of the City of Chula Vista one new segment was added to the regional bicycle network. The new segment is a 1.8 mile Class I facility along the I-805 from Bonita Road to Telegraph Canyon Road that would provide a direct connection to existing Class I regional bikeway facilities and to a future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) station. It is shown as Corridor 39 – I-805 Connector in Attachment 5.
Safety – Improving safety for bicyclists is one of the primary goals of the Plan. Chapter 2 of the Final Draft Plan includes the following goal:

**Goal 2: Improve Bicycling Safety**

Improve bicycling safety by increasing education and training opportunities for cyclists, pedestrians, motorists, and professionals whose work impacts the roadway environment, and by promoting enforcement of traffic laws to reduce bicycle-related conflicts.

The first phase of Plan implementation, which will establish project priorities and a financing strategy, will also address the funding needs necessary to implement the programs included in the Plan that address safety. Chapter 4, Section 4.1 of the Plan describes four potential Education Programs, three of which will help to ensure that bicyclists, pedestrians, and motorists understand how to travel safely in the roadway environment and are cognizant of the regulations that govern these modes of transportation. The four programs featured are:

- Complete Streets Education
- Driver’s Education and Diversion Classes
- Safe Routes to School – Phase 1
- Cycling Skills and Safety Courses (Adult & Youth)

In addition Section 4.2 of the Plan describes three potential Awareness Campaigns that are intended to impact the attitudes and behavior of the general public. Public awareness campaigns are high profile efforts that rely on materials, media outreach, and special events to convey a clear message aimed at promoting bicycling and/or improving safety. The three programs featured are:

- Bike to Work Month
- Share the Road Campaign / Street Smarts
- Share the Path Campaign

Maintenance – Maintenance of bicycle facilities and its funding are significant issues for all public rights of way whether it is for general roadways or separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Historically, the funding that has been administered by SANDAG for bicycle and pedestrian projects has not been available for maintenance, and the Plan does not include specific provisions for maintenance of the facilities proposed in the Plan. This issue will be addressed as part of the first phase of the Plan implementation where it can be evaluated in conjunction with the project prioritization and financing discussion. SANDAG staff is currently collecting information from studies and from the experience of local jurisdictions to develop an estimate of the cost of maintaining bicycle facilities and will present potential funding options at a future meeting of the Transportation Committee.

**Next Steps**

Should the Board of Directors approve the Final Draft Plan on May 28, 2010, the regional network and other key elements of the Plan would be incorporated into the 2050 RTP. The first phase of implementation would begin during the summer of 2010. During this period the Transportation Committee will be presented with a list of proposed project and program priorities along with funding options to implement them.

The Plan represents a significant step forward in bicycle planning for the region and will serve as a cornerstone for the SANDAG Active Transportation Program. It includes more comprehensive and detailed recommendations for the regional bikeway network and supporting programs than were
developed previously through the regional transportation plan process, and it establishes ambitious goals to make bicycling a significant contributor to the region’s transportation system. With this new and ambitious plan comes the opportunity to re-evaluate the region’s approach to bicycle project development and financing.

CHARLES "MUGGS" STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan: Final Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (the full report in electronic format can be downloaded at www.sandag.org/Bicycle)
2. Final Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (the full report in electronic format can be downloaded at www.sandag.org/Bicycle)
3. Final Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan Comments and Responses
4. Proposed Regional Bicycle Network with Facility Classifications
5. Updated Regional Bicycle Network

Key Staff Contact: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, ckl@sandag.org
Attachment 1

San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan: Final Draft Initial Study/
Mitigated Negative Declaration

(the full report in electronic format can be downloaded at www.sandag.org/Bicycle)
Attachment 2

Final Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan

(the full report in electronic format can be downloaded at www.sandag.org/Bicycle)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/18/10</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Cheryl Laskowski - County of San Diego, Devon Muto - Chief, Advance Planning Department of Planning and Land Use, County of San Diego</td>
<td>I noticed a rather large error in their calculations. Page 51, bottom, the report states that: “The 6.4% mode share would result in an estimated decrease of 25,805 tons/weekday of particulate matter (PM10), 101,816 tons/weekday of reactive organic gasses (ROG), and 311,127,545 tons/year of carbon dioxide (CO2).” The number 311,127,545 tons CO2/year is in error. I can see how they came to the error. (Page 53) The number is in fact the POUNDS of reduction, not tons. The metric tons would be something more like 141,100 MT CO2. I was only interested in the CO2 so I didn’t check the other values.</td>
<td>The air quality benefits model has been re-run using Alta’s newest version of the model to address this error and present the most current estimates. All estimates in Table 5.2 and referring text in Chapter 5 have been revised to reflect this modification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3/24/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Cheryl Cox - Mayor of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Please consider this correspondence as a letter of support for including the I-805 bike path, Telegraph Canyon Road to Bonita Road, in the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. I understand that a support letter is required even though the Bicycle/Pedestrian Working Group supported it at the June 2009 meeting. SANDAG should include the facility for the following reasons: 1) Given that a major portion of SANDAG’s 2050 regional housing needs are being satisfied by Chula Vista, the bikeway will help relieve congestion associated with new housing; 2) This bicycle path will provide a non-freeway option for those residents seeking to use the BRT.</td>
<td>This segment has been added to the Regional Bikeway Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/27/10</td>
<td>Public comment</td>
<td>Frank Paiano - Ocean Beach, Avid Bicyclist, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition Member</td>
<td>I am disappointed that there is not more emphasis on working toward getting the message across to the public that cyclists have a right to use the roads. The plan seems to come from the viewpoint that, “Of course, cyclists have a right to road. Here is what we are going to do to make it easier to use those facilities. That will increase ridership.” They are not acknowledging the undercurrent of animosity from the 5% to 15% of motorists who do not believe we have a right to use the roads and sometimes act accordingly. To be truthful, the experiences of being harassed for just being on the roads are decreasing. For example, I have noticed that more and more motorists are willing to acknowledge my signaling to cross the lanes of traffic to make a left turn. But the anger still exists from some motorists. I believe if we work toward making sure that everyone understands we have a right to use the roadways -- however difficult it is for them to accept this fact -- that will increase ridership far more than yet-another-bike-line-or-bike-path.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The Plan proposes a broad variety of education and awareness programs described in Chapter 4 that can begin to lay the groundwork for improving the way bicyclists and cars interact on roadways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3/27/10</td>
<td>Public comment</td>
<td>Frank Paiano - Ocean Beach, Avid Bicyclist, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition Member</td>
<td>We in the Coalition have discussed this situation at length and have varying ideas about the need, methods, and effectiveness of trying to increase public awareness of the right of bicyclists to use the roadways. Suffice to say, I believe this is the number #1 reason why many people will not ride bikes. They are simply too scared. If motorists and bicyclists understood and acknowledged the rights and responsibilities already given to them by our vehicle code, I believe bicycle ridership will increase greatly. (Of course, $12 per gallon for gasoline would help a whole lot more, but who wants that?!)</td>
<td>Comment noted. The Plan proposes a broad variety of education and awareness programs described in Chapter 4 that can begin to lay the groundwork for improving the way bicyclists and cars interact on roadways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/28/10</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>Derek Hofmann</td>
<td>Page 95 shows a picture of a series of 5 U-racks (incorrectly labeled as U-locks), but the biggest problem with these is they are spaced so close together in series (rather than in parallel) that you wouldn’t be able to fit more than 3 bicycles total in the 5 bike racks if the bicycles were locked up such that each bicycle’s frame is supported in 2 places. So even though they are inverted U racks, they were installed in such a way to make them no better than a wave style rack.</td>
<td>The photo has been replaced and correctly labeled (see p. 109).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3/28/10</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>Derek Hofmann</td>
<td>The picture of a bike locked up to a Post and Loop rack on the previous page shows a similar problem. (see comment #12) If the bicycle were to be locked correctly (with the rack supporting the frame in 2 places), the bicycle would block the sidewalk and part of the road. Please modify the second guideline on page 95 to explain that the 15 inches between racks is between racks installed in parallel, not in series.</td>
<td>The post and loop rack photo has been replaced on page 108 and text in the second bullet on page 109 has been revised to clarify rack positioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/7/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan - Executive Director, San Diego County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 10 – Goal 3 should include the word ‘all’ in the text, so it reads “Promote the integration of Complete Streets principles into roadway planning, design, and maintenance policies so that all roadways safely accommodate all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, children, older people, and disabled people, as well as motorists.”</td>
<td>Goal 3 has been revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4/7/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan - Executive Director, San Diego County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 11 - The last bullet point recommending support for Board Policy No. 031, Rule #21. This policy should be expanded to include routine accommodation on all projects in the Regional Transportation Plan, not just those funded with TransNet sales tax revenues.</td>
<td>SANDAG encourages the concept of Complete Streets for all applicable roadways, but does not have the authority to mandate accommodation on roadways that are not funded by TransNet. Chapter 4 proposes funding for Complete Streets education at the regional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/7/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan - Executive Director, San Diego County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 20 - Figure 3-3. Corridor 29, the San Diego River Bikeway, should include the bikeway all the way through Santee and Lakeside, following the San Diego River itself, not Mission Gorge Road.</td>
<td>Figure 3-3 has been revised to reflect the correct alignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Final Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan - Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4/7/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan - Executive Director, San Diego County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 33 - Programs. Setting regional priorities can help clarify how to move forward with projects. But in the case of the recommended programs it is probably premature to assign regional priorities since we have not yet determined a process for establishing prioritization. If regional priorities are to be established in the Regional Bicycle Plan, they should conform to the results of the user surveys taken as part of the public outreach for the plan. As such, we suggest that in Section 4.2, if a regional priority is to be established it should be the Share the Road Campaign/Street Smarts rather than the expanded Bike to Work Month proposed. Similarly, the priority for encouragement program(s) should probably be the San Diego Region Bike Map, or Identification and Way-finding Signage, rather than a Bike Sharing Program. We also believe that the Pilot Smart Trips Program is a good choice for a regional priority since it covers both encouragement and education in one program. This is also true for the University-Based Bike Orientation program. We strongly support the proposed Enforcement and Monitoring and Evaluation procedures.</td>
<td>All references to regional program priorities has been removed from the executive summary, introduction, and Chapter 4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4/7/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan - Executive Director, San Diego County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 50, Chapter 5 - This chapter should probably be renamed the &quot;Air Quality Benefits of Regional Bicycle Network Implementation&quot;, since the chapter does not include information on the health, economic, and community benefits of the regional bike network (which are significant and should someday be quantified!)</td>
<td>Chapter 5 has been renamed &quot;Air Quality Benefits of Regional Bicycle Network Implementation.&quot; The first paragraph of Chapter 5 references the benefits discussion in the Introduction (see p. 59). Section 1.2.1 references Chapter 5 (see p. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4/7/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan - Executive Director, San Diego County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 55, Table 6.1 - Are the unit costs for Class III Bike Route installation in this table the costs for 'enhanced Class III' routes as specified in Table 3.4?</td>
<td>The Class III unit costs are based on an average unit cost of Class III bikeways with route and wayfinding signage and Class III bikeways with sharrows and a basic traffic control estimate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/7/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan - Executive Director, San Diego County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 69 - The &quot;Bike Lane with On-Street Parallel Parking&quot; should include 'minimum' for the 5' bike lane width designation. On the 'Bike Lane with No On-Street Parking' the bike lane sign should include the no parking restriction sign as well as the bike lane sign. Ideally we would have a diagram with bike lane, then painted buffer, then parked cars as well as these two design diagrams. Also, a diagram of a street with a bike lane and back-in diagonal parking would be helpful as well.</td>
<td>Two graphics have been modified and two additional photos have been added to address this request (see p. 83 and p.84).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4/7/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan - Executive Director, San Diego County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 71 includes a discussion of intersection and signal issues for cyclists. It would be helpful to reward these discussion points to be design solutions rather than challenges for cyclists. For example, instead of saying &quot;Signals may not be timed to allow slower-moving bicyclists to travel across the intersection;&quot; the bullet could be worded 'Signals should be timed to allow slower-moving bicyclists to travel across the intersection per the recommendations in the California Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices.'</td>
<td>The text has been revised to present design solutions rather than challenges (see p. 85).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Final Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan - Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4/7/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan - Executive Director, San Diego County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 72 shows designs for Typical Class III Bike Routes. Should these show 'Enhanced' Class III route designs instead? On page 73, please show a diagram of shared lane markings behind back-in diagonal parking as well.</td>
<td>The title has been changed to read &quot;Enhanced Class III - Shared Lane Arrow Markings (SLM) (see p. 87). A graphic illustrating SLM with back-in diagonal parking has not been incorporated because this configuration is not currently one of the approved applications of the SLM in the MUTCD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4/7/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan - Executive Director, San Diego County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 98 – quick correction – The Padres, not the Coalition, provides bike parking at Sunday afternoon Padres games, and we applaud them for doing so. We do provide valet bike parking at other community events.</td>
<td>The correction has been made (see p. 112).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4/14/10</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Carol Dick - Community Development Director, City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Page 29, 2nd Paragraph, 2nd sentence – City of Lemon Grove has a Municipal Ordinance that mandates specific bike parking requirements: LGMC 17.24.010D.F. - Bicycle Parking Facilities. In all projects with ten or more required parking spaces, a rack or other secure device for the purpose of storing and protecting bicycles from theft shall be installed. Such devices shall be provided with a minimum capacity of one bicycle per ten required parking spaces. Such devices shall be located so as not to interfere with pedestrian or vehicular traffic.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Thank you for the information. The City of Lemon Grove has set a good example for the region in your efforts to accommodate bicycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4/14/10</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Carol Dick - Community Development Director, City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Page 56-58 Table 6.2. Reference Figure 3-3 and Legend corridor numbers in the table for quick reference.</td>
<td>Table 6.2 has been revised accordingly (see p. 66 - 69).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4/14/10</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Carol Dick - Community Development Director, City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Page 63, 1st paragraph last sentence – Plan update at intervals of every 5 years conflicts with Page 64, 2nd paragraph last sentence states four year cycle.</td>
<td>The Bike Plan will be updated in conjunction with the RTP which runs on a four year cycle. The text in section 6.4.2 has been revised accordingly (see p. 77).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4/19/10</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Carol Carr - North County Cycle Club</td>
<td>Sections of the draft Regional Bike Plan that cover the Inland Rail Trail, identified as Regional Bike Corridor #20. While the Regional Bike Plan identifies the &quot;cost of unbuilt portion&quot; (page 57) at $38 million, a surprisingly high cost, I believe this is an important facility for all North County bicyclists. We need more Class 1 Bike Paths, and especially for traveling east-west. Only a small part of the Inland Rail Trail exists now, at the eastern end. Some cities along the proposed route are moving ahead slowly on designing their portion. However, there are no provisions or plans for the west end, through Oceanside. Bicyclists traveling east or west through Oceanside must now contend with overcrowded streets, such as Oceanside Blvd., which could scare off even the most seasoned bicyclist.</td>
<td>The Inland Rail Trail will provide a key east-west connection. The Regional Bicycle Network (Figure 3-5) proposed the Inland Rail Trail as continues Class I Bike Path from Escondido to Oceanside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4/19/10</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Carol Carr - North County Cycle Club</td>
<td>We need the Inland Rail Trail in Oceanside, and the long process of identifying a specific route and preparing plans needs to be started as soon as possible. Some small portion of that projected $38 million cost needs funding now, so that the planning process can get started.</td>
<td>The Inland Rail Trail will provide a key east-west connection. The Regional Bicycle Network (Figure 3-5) proposed the Inland Rail Trail as continues Class I Bike Path from Escondido to Oceanside. SANDAG will continue to coordinate with the City of Oceanside on the Oceanside Blvd Improvement Study to integrate the Inland Rail Trail into those planning efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Patrick Murphy - Director of Planning and Building, City of Encinitas</td>
<td>1. Page 13, Objective 5, 2nd bullet. I would recommend the following language: Develop a region-wide Complete Streets policy and guidelines manual - Although the Designing for Smart Growth, Section 5.2, published by SANDAG, discusses the Complete Street, I feel it would be good to expand with a guideline on Complete Streets/Complete Neighborhoods, and provide implementation tools (i.e., sample bike ordinance) to assist cities. This would be helpful to jurisdictions, particularly smaller jurisdictions and those jurisdictions that might need to focus more on local solutions to create a more ‘smarter’ city and reduce GHG. In many cases the RTP will not be of great value to many cities that don’t have the density or intensity (population/employment) and, as such, further regional transportation investments are not warranted. For example: Encinitas has the downtown coaster stop in the 2050 plan but the bus rapid transit along El Camino Real is eliminated. This will require local solutions (not regional) to get people around. As such, I believe the suggested policy should not say “Consider development of …”, but say “Develop … We agree a region-wide Complete Streets policy would be a useful tool, but would need to secure additional resources to commit to implementing a full Complete Streets Program. SANDAG will seek funding to develop a program and will continue to monitor Federal Complete Streets policies and programs to identify opportunities for resources and funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Patrick Murphy - Director of Planning and Building, City of Encinitas</td>
<td>2. Page 5-1 of the 4/15/10 TWG agenda talks about Demand Criteria. In the first paragraph, the last two sentences talks about the gravity model concept where demand is based on higher land use intensity of an SGOA which results in the greater estimated demand along a segment. In addition, the shorter the distances between any two SGOAs the higher estimated demand. - Encinitas is classified as a Town Center but is not really close to high employment or other high intensity SGOAs. Yet Encinitas, as I understand it, has consistently had one of the higher bicycle counts in the region, although this might be weekend trips. It seems like the Demand Base Criteria should also recognize existing high bike trips (not just estimated demand tied to land use intensity) to appropriately prioritize phasing plan and priority bicycle projects.</td>
<td>The principle approach behind using the Smart Growth opportunities areas as identified in the Smart Growth Concept Map is to integrate the Regional Bicycle Plan with other SANDAG planning efforts. The data for existing is not extensive enough at this point to be able to use it as a factor in the transportation model developed for analyzing the Regional Bicycle Network. The Plan proposes a monitoring program that will provide the data necessary to develop this capacity. The Plan proposes a monitoring program that will provide this type of data in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>public comment</td>
<td>Paul Nevins - North County Cycle Club Member, City of Oceanside Bicycle Committee Member</td>
<td>I agree with the need for safer routes to get more people cycling. Parents and their children are afraid to compete with autos and trucks while riding to and from school. Combining sidewalks and cycle tracks to form mixed use pathways would offer most reluctant cyclists the security needed to get out and ride.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Thank you for your support of the Cycle Track concept. We believe it has the potential to be a useful and practical solution when thoughtfully designed within the proper context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>Paul Nevins - North County Cycle Club Member, City of Oceanside Bicycle Committee Member</td>
<td>Del Dios is a death trap, Class III routes are only acceptable on calmed side streets with speed limits of 25 MPH or less. Class II routes are unsafe on streets with speeds over 35 MPH and/or heavy traffic and all truck routes.</td>
<td>Given the development patterns and topographic constraints in that part of the region Del Dios Highway is the only roadway that can provide continuous access for bicycle travel. Improvements to the roadway targeted at improving bicyclist safety combined with effective awareness programs described in Chapter 4 can make Del Dios Highway a safer place to ride.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>Paul Nevins - North County Cycle Club Member, City of Oceanside Bicycle Committee Member</td>
<td>There is a dearth of parking racks at schools, churches, universities, community colleges, strip malls, grocery stores, post offices, city halls, etc. Without a safe place to lock up a bike few people will ride to run errands. Taking children to school and running short neighborhood errands cause a disproportionate amount of pollution, safer routes through neighborhoods would help get people on their bikes.</td>
<td>As noted adequate bicycle parking is paramount to an effective bicycle network. Installation of bicycle parking is an integral part of the implementation of the Regional Bicycle Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>Paul Nevins - North County Cycle Club Member, City of Oceanside Bicycle Committee Member</td>
<td>Mixed use pedestrian/cycle pathways with barriers separating autos parked on the street from the pathway are the best solution for local feeder streets.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>Paul Nevins - North County Cycle Club Member, City of Oceanside Bicycle Committee Member</td>
<td>Bike/bus lanes are great in busy urban areas, Some may be only restricted during rush hours.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>Paul Nevins - North County Cycle Club Member, City of Oceanside Bicycle Committee Member</td>
<td>One way streets offer room on one side for pedestrian/cycle pathways.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>Paul Nevins - North County Cycle Club Member, City of Oceanside Bicycle Committee Member</td>
<td>Commercial blocks with restaurants and shops that have wide sidewalks and outdoor seating should have lots of bike racks as well as a shared bike pedestrian pathway before the street parking.</td>
<td>Chapter 7 introduces bicycle parking concepts such as the bike corral and bike oasis which are effective strategies for accommodating bicycles in commercial areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>Paul Nevins</td>
<td>Bicycles were incorporated into the California vehicle code when the predominant mode of vehicular transportation was either horse drawn or on rails. The idea that bikes and cars/trucks mix is ludicrous, roads should have bike/pedestrian shared tracks well separated from cars &amp; trucks. The method of separation would be determined by the speed of the cars, volume of traffic, and the historical accident rates. All intersections should have enlarged curb cuts to allow bikes to access the signal buttons and the intersections should have a safe zone with barriers to prevent right turning cars from hitting bikes and pedestrians. It is safer for a driver to walk across a bike lane than for a cyclist to dodge cars pulling in and out of parking or doors suddenly opening.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Potential design solutions are not limited to those presented in the Regional Bicycle Plan. The best design for the given context will be sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Husam Y. Hasenin</td>
<td>Class III bike routes are not correctly reflected in Table 3.2 and Figure 3-1 in the main report and in Figure 3-3, Table 3-3 and Table 3.5 in Appendix A. Class III bike routes exist in the City of Vista at the following locations: - South Melrose Drive (Hacienda Court – Breeze Hill Drive), west side - South Melrose Drive (Hacienda Court to SR-78), east side - Sycamore Avenue (Green Oak Road to SR-78) - Grapevine Road (Hill Drive to Planet Drive) - Thibodo Road (Mar Vista Drive to Sycamore Avenue)</td>
<td>Comment noted. Changes have been incorporated into the Existing Conditions Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Husam Y. Hasenin</td>
<td>Figure 3-7A, Table 3-6, Table 6-1, Figure 6-1A and discussion on page 48 of Appendix A do not reflect what is planned for the Inland Rail Trail in Vista and easterly into the County (this was discussed at our October 7, 2008 meeting).</td>
<td>These figures and tables were a part of the Existing Conditions Report that was used as a preliminary assessment of the region in terms of relative priority for bicycle improvements. The analysis was done at a corridor level. Figure 3.3 - Updated Regional Bicycle Network depicts the alignment that is currently under study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Husam Y. Hasenin</td>
<td>Table 3-6 of Appendix A is not clear. The report states that these are planned upgrades or planned new parallel facilities, but there is no distance applied to the Vista Way Corridor. A portion of the corridor is planned-unbuilt and it should qualify as an upgrade since there is no parallel facility.</td>
<td>Vista Way cannot show a planned upgrade because the criteria used to display planned upgrade was if there was an existing facility on the road with a proposed facility of “higher classification” overlapping it. Vista Way is an existing Class II in the southern portion and an unbuilt proposed Class II in the northern portion. Therefore there is no upgrade planned. The reason no parallel facilities are shown is because there were no parallel facilities evident when reviewing the City of Vista proposed bicycle network’s map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Husam Y. Hasenin - Principal Engineer, City of Vista</td>
<td>The weighting factors used in Table 5-2, Bicycle Attractor Input Variables, in Appendix A raise concerns. For the first two Attractor Land Uses, Major Universities and Beaches/Coastal Parks, the drop in weighting from 6 to 4 for an additional half mile is too great and perhaps the drop for all four distances is also too great. We do not believe that distances of a half-mile for these two land uses factor into decisions of whether or not to ride a bicycle.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The attractors analysis was an existing conditions exercise, it played no role in assigning one area priority over another. The analysis was used to inform decisions about realigning certain corridors and that was all. The weighting factors remain unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Husam Y. Hasenin - Principal Engineer, City of Vista</td>
<td>On page 48 of Appendix A, the unbuilt-planned facilities assigned to Vista (3.3 miles) does not correlate with any other discussion of the City’s regional facilities (Inland Rail Trail or E. Vista Way).</td>
<td>The mileage totals in Table 3-3 were updated to be consistent with Figure 3-3 in the Existing Conditions Report (Appendix A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Husam Y. Hasenin - Principal Engineer, City of Vista</td>
<td>As part of the San Luis River Bike Path, there appears to be a missing segment of either Class I bike path along the river or Class II bike lanes along SR-76. Is there anything planned by the County to complete this link? Any planned segments should be shown on Figure 3-7A in Appendix A.</td>
<td>The newly constructed portion of the San Luis Rey River Trail was included as a revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Husam Y. Hasenin - Principal Engineer, City of Vista</td>
<td>It is surprising that neither the Inland Rail Trail nor the Vista Way Corridor appear in Table 7-1 of Appendix A as Potential Projects. It seems that this is simply a reflection of lower North County participation in the public survey. These are both critical projects for North County as there are no consistent parallel routes. We request that this table is reevaluated and that these two extremely critical links be added to the Potential Projects list.</td>
<td>A vast majority of the surveys collected were from the City of San Diego, though several North County jurisdictions had a higher per capita response rate than San Diego in the Regional Plan survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Husam Y. Hasenin - Principal Engineer, City of Vista</td>
<td>The word “totally” on page 48 should be “totaling”.</td>
<td>This has been corrected in the Existing Conditions Report (see p. 48).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Husam Y. Hasenin - Principal Engineer, City of Vista</td>
<td>The following comment was submitted to SANDAG on November 24, 2008 on a document titled “Proposed Regional Bicycle Corridor Alignments and Classifications &amp; Regional Bicycle-Related Programs”, which no longer appears to be part of the proposed Plan in its current form. However, this comment is still applicable to the proposed regional bicycle network: To improve the connectivity and access of the regional network in North County, we suggest adding a regional facility to connect the Vista Way Corridor to the Coastal Rail Trail via Vista Village Drive and West Vista Way and a regional facility to connect the Vista Way Corridor to the Encinitas-San Marcos Corridor via Melrose Drive.</td>
<td>The corridor alignments are based on the adopted Regional Bikeway Network from the 2030 RTP and were updated utilizing criteria that optimizes connections between smart growth opportunity areas. An additional component that was used to identify potential corridors was the bicyclist input obtained through the public outreach process. Corridors were added to the network that were identified as having high demand. Future updates to the Regional Bicycle Plan may consider adding corridors to the Regional Bikeway Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 41  | 4/23/10  | emailed letter | Husam Y. Hasenin - Principal Engineer, City of Vista | The following comments were submitted to SANDAG on January 27, 2009 on a document titled “Technical Memorandum, Segmenting and Prioritizing the San Diego Regional Bicycle Network”. This document is no longer part of the proposed plan in its current form since SANDAG decided to move project prioritization and funding discussion out of the Plan and into the RTP process at a later date. However, according to our discussion, the model presented in the document cited above will still be used for project prioritization:  
- The focus on Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs) seems to result in a long range bicycle “commuter” plan and seems to ignore recreational/fitness riders.  
- Where is any weight given to existing employment centers or special recreational attractions such as beaches, regional parks, historical sites, etc.?  
- Giving the top three densest Smart Growth Place Types such a relatively higher weighting than Mixed Use Transit Corridors does not appear appropriate when considering bicycle routes and connections and should be reevaluated. | The principle approach behind using the Smart Growth opportunities areas as identified in the Smart Growth Concept Map is to integrate the Regional Bicycle Plan with other SANDAG planning efforts; despite prioritization criteria not explicitly addressing those land uses, many areas with those features still do well within the prioritization framework. The corridor alignments are based on the adopted Regional Bikeway Network from the 2030 RTP and were updated utilizing criteria that optimizes connections between smart growth opportunity areas. An additional component that was added to the network that were identified as having high demand. Future updates to the Regional Bicycle Plan may consider adding corridors to the Regional Bikeway Network. |
| 42  | 4/23/10  | emailed letter | Husam Y. Hasenin - Principal Engineer, City of Vista | Furthermore, the heavy weighting of the three densest Place Types (see comment #59) assumes that density of residents and employees is a much more important factor than current ridership routes and/or lack of connections/facilities. It also gives an enormous edge to the most urbanized areas of the region and not necessarily those areas from where the increased ridership will originate. | The most urbanized areas of the region have high demand and potential for bicycling and also suffer from lack of connections/facilities. There is no reliable or comprehensive data on bicycle ridership to justify its use as a weight. |
| 43  | 4/23/10  | emailed letter | Husam Y. Hasenin - Principal Engineer, City of Vista | Utilization of the Smart Growth Concept Map is a good start, but use of it as the sole analysis tool does not capture the full scope of what a regional plan should be. The following are new comments:  
- On page 57, Table 6.2 of the main report, the cost to complete the Vista Way Corridor is listed at $75,000. The portion of East Vista Way where bike lanes do not exist will require widening to accommodate bike lanes. The roadway widening including right-of-way acquisition, necessary to accommodate the bike lanes should be considered in the development of a cost estimate to complete this corridor.  
- On page 17, Section 3.4 of the main report, it is stated that the “system includes five classifications from the Caltrans Highway Design Manual”. This should be three classifications. | This correction has been made (see p. 25). |
<p>| 44  | 4/23/10  | emailed image | Jim Murray - Associate Engineer, Traffic Division, City of Carlsbad | (see marked drawings) Fig. 3-2: Corridor Alignment not per 2030 RTP, should be along Carlsbad Blvd | Figure 3-2 revised to reflect this comment. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Jim Murray - Associate Engineer, Traffic Division, City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>(see marked drawings) Fig. 3-3: Corridor Alignment not per 2030 RTP, should be along Carlsbad Blvd</td>
<td>Comment clarified with City of Carlsbad. No change necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Jim Murray - Associate Engineer, Traffic Division, City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>(see marked drawings) Fig. 3-4: Corridor Alignment not per 2030 RTP, should be along Carlsbad Blvd</td>
<td>Comment clarified with City of Carlsbad. No change necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Jim Murray - Associate Engineer, Traffic Division, City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>(see marked drawings) Fig. 3-4: Corridor is in Re-alignment with Rancho Santa Fe Road, as it exits today. You are showing the abandoned Old Rancho Santa Fe Road alignment</td>
<td>Figure 3-4 revised to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Jim Murray - Associate Engineer, Traffic Division, City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>(see marked drawings) Fig. 3-5: Carlsbad Blvd should be shown as Enhanced Class II</td>
<td>The preference for Regional Bicycle Network alignments is Class I where there is that option as in the case here. Future updates to the Regional Bicycle Plan may consider adding Carlsbad Blvd to the Regional Bicycle Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Jim Murray - Associate Engineer, Traffic Division, City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>(see marked drawings) Fig. 3-5: Corridor is in Re-alignment with Rancho Santa Fe Road, as it exits today, as Enhanced Class II. You are showing the abandoned Old Rancho Santa Fe Road alignment, which is Class I.</td>
<td>Figure 3-5 revised to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Jim Murray - Associate Engineer, Traffic Division, City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>(see marked drawings) Fig. 3-6: Carlsbad Blvd should be shown as Enhanced Class II</td>
<td>The preference for Regional Bicycle Network alignments is Class I where there is that option as is the case here. Future updates to the Regional Bicycle Plan may consider adding Carlsbad Blvd to the Regional Bicycle Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Jim Murray - Associate Engineer, Traffic Division, City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>(see marked drawings) Fig. 3-6: Corridor is in Re-alignment with Rancho Santa Fe Road, as it exits today, as Enhanced Class II. You are showing the abandoned Old Rancho Santa Fe Road alignment, which is Class I.</td>
<td>Figure 3-6 revised to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Jim Murray - Associate Engineer, Traffic Division, City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>(see marked drawings) Fig. 6.9: Footer is incorrectly labeled as 2030 RTP</td>
<td>Comment clarified with City of Carlsbad. No change necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>4/23/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Jim Murray - Associate Engineer, Traffic Division, City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>(see marked drawings) Page 75: Suggested note - &quot;The installation of Traffic claiming measures requires local government agency approval.&quot;</td>
<td>This note has been added (see p. 89).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>4/26/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>LeAnn Carmichael - Department of Planning and Land Use, County of San Diego</td>
<td>The County has reviewed the portion of the Regional Bicycle Plan located in the unincorporated portions of the County to determine if it is consistent with the draft Mobility Element proposed in the County General Plan Update (GPU) (see attached table) This table identifies the segments that are included in the GPU Mobility Element. When the Regional Bicycle Plan is adopted, the County will amend the General Plan Mobility Element to indicate the County Mobility Element road segments that are part of the Regional Bicycle Transportation plan to ensure adequate right-of-way is reserved.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Final Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan - Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4/26/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>LeAnn Carmichael - Department of Planning and Land Use, County of San Diego</td>
<td>The Regional Bike Plan (RBP) should list the criteria used in selecting the bicycle corridors and facilities. The RBP (Page 2) only provides a cursory statement identifying the selection process for the bicycle network.</td>
<td>Sections 3.3 and 3.4 provide additional information on the corridor alignment and facilities classification process. During the development of the Regional Bicycle Plan a technical memorandum entitled “Proposed Regional Bicycle Corridor Alignments and Classifications &amp; Regional Bicycle-Related Programs” provides a full discussion on this topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>4/26/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>LeAnn Carmichael - Department of Planning and Land Use, County of San Diego</td>
<td>The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) strives for a multimodal regional transportation network. Regionally significant arterials as shown on the Regional Arterial System of the 2030 RTP are identified in the current RTP. Bicycle facilities located along regionally significant arterials should be considered for inclusion in the RBP. (see Fig. 6 from 2030 RTP)</td>
<td>The corridor alignments are based on the adopted Regional Bikeway Network from the 2030 RTP and were updated utilizing criteria that optimizes connections between smart growth opportunity areas. An additional component that was used to identify potential corridors was the bicyclist input obtained through the public outreach process. Corridors were added to the network that were identified as having high demand. Future updates to the Regional Bicycle Plan may consider adding corridors to the Regional Bikeway Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>4/26/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>LeAnn Carmichael - Department of Planning and Land Use, County of San Diego</td>
<td>The County has an adopted Bicycle Transportation Plan/Bicycle Master Plan. Bicycle facilities identified in the document should be considered for inclusion in the Bicycle Regional Plan, especially those located along regionally significant arterials. These include roads such as: South Mission Road in Fallbrook, Lake Jennings Road in Lakeside, Dye Road in Ramona, and Valley Center Road in Valley Center.</td>
<td>The corridor alignments are based on the adopted Regional Bikeway Network from the 2030 RTP and were updated utilizing criteria that optimizes connections between smart growth opportunity areas. An additional component that was used to identify potential corridors was the bicyclist input obtained through the public outreach process. Corridors were added to the network that were identified as having high demand. Future updates to the Regional Bicycle Plan may consider adding corridors to the Regional Bikeway Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4/26/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>LeAnn Carmichael - Department of Planning and Land Use, County of San Diego</td>
<td>The RBP provides a brief synopsis of the project prioritization process and the demand-bases criteria. On page 28, RBP includes additional criteria for prioritization process. Many jurisdictions have prepared and adopted Bicycle Master Plans that were based upon an assessment of bicycle needs and demands. Compliance with adopted Bicycle Master Plans should also be considered as a prioritization factor. Compliance with adopted Bicycle Master Plans is a requirement for many Bicycle Facility Grants.</td>
<td>The Regional Bicycle Network could be considered a subset of the combined local bicycle networks and is comprised primarily of routes that are already a part of a local network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4/26/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>LeAnn Carmichael - Department of Planning and Land Use, County of San Diego</td>
<td>The RBP should provide a discussion of the potential for cycling within Smart Growth opportunity areas in the unincorporated areas. While separated by large distances to other regional smart growth areas, the unincorporated area contains smart growth defined rural village centers such as Ramona, Alpine, Valley Center, Fallbrook, Lakeside, etc. which have the potential for increased bicycle usage, with enhanced facilities.</td>
<td>Unless expressly prohibited, all roadways should provide appropriate accommodations for bicyclists. Chapter 2 Goals, Objectives, and Policy Actions supports this concept in Goal 3: Encourage the Development of Complete Streets and Objective 5: Institutionalize Complete Streets principles in roadway planning, design, and maintenance policies. SANDAG funds local bicycle plans, and through competitive grants provides funding opportunities to local jurisdictions for the design and construction of enhanced facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>The Executive Summary, the Introduction, and the Goals and Objectives should all state that the purpose of the work is to reduce driving. That’s the only goal or objective that is reasonable given our climate crisis. Having other goals dilutes the goal of reducing driving. Less VMT is the proper metric to use to evaluate proposals. Human-caused, CO2 emissions will eventually amount to a self-inflicted genocide and therefore must be reduced and stopped as soon as possible. The June 2008 issue of Scientific American (The Ethics of Climate Change, by Professor John Broome) reports that the levels of GHG expected in 20 years will result in a 5% chance of a 14.4 degree Fahrenheit increase in the earth’s temperature and this would be an “utter catastrophe” and create the possibility of a “devastating collapse of the human population, perhaps even to extinction”.</td>
<td>Increased levels of bicycling activity has many benefits. To help achieve these benefits it is advantageous to adopt a range of focused goals and objectives. The aim of the Regional Bicycle Plan is to offer practical transportation options for improved mobility. Reductions in VMT will be a byproduct of successfully implemented projects and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>Having the single goal and objective of reducing driving will enable you to consider competing proposals using the metric of VMT reduction. By doing this, you will have estimates of VMT reductions for each program, and these can easily be added into the RTP’s SCS, if they are feasible; APS, if they are not.</td>
<td>All of the programs in the Regional Bicycle Plan have merit and will contribute to the improvement of the overall bicycling environment. The programs should be considered as complementary to the implementation of the network facilities. Potential reduction of VMT is a significant consideration, but should not be the only goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>Please request the Board to adopt the direction of having only the goal of less driving. Not doing this will show a disregard for human safety, due to our climate crisis. This is deadly serious and your preliminary draft fails to reflect this reality.</td>
<td>Increased levels of bicycling activity has many benefits. To help achieve these benefits it is advantageous to adopt a range of focused goals and objectives. The aim of the Regional Bicycle Plan is to offer practical transportation options for improved mobility. Reductions in VMT will be a byproduct of successfully implemented projects and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>People would save money and get more exercise if they biked instead of driving, but they rarely do it because of: 1. social stigma, 2. fear of traffic, and in particular overtaking traffic, 3. lack of knowledge of bike accident statistics and car-bike accident statistics, 4. lack of information about how to cope with traffic, weather, and carrying large loads, 5. increased time required, and 6. irresponsible government that refuses to see its responsibility to stop practices that unfairly take money from those that drive less and give it to those that drive more (subsidized driving and parking)... Your programs should directly attach each of these impediments so as to decrease driving. It is shocking to me that the bullets in your Executive Summary fail to include programs such as “Effective Cycling”, the League program to help citizens learn to bike. Your Page 36 indicates that you know about these programs but you fail to grasp their importance. This is where most of your money should be spent.</td>
<td>The Education Programs described in Section 4.1 are intended to be used as a menu of options that can result in increased awareness for all road users about their responsibilities with respect to bicyclists. As noted the curriculum offered by the League of American Bicyclists is included in Section 4.1.4 and is eligible to receive funding through SANDAG’s Active Transportation Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>This report is oblivious to the economics of transportation and its potential to greatly reduce driving (and increase cycling). It would be wonderful if you considered people that use their bikes for transportation and decided to help them gain the full value of their choice. This would greatly reduce driving and this is well known and documented.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>Objective 1b advocates for “Low Carbon” modes of transportation. It has no plan for funding, at a time when transit funding is being cut. It leaves out the best way to promote bicycle usage, which is providing education of how to ride a bicycle in traffic. The paragraph does contain the word “education” but it does not bother explaining what that would be. The San Diego Bicycle Coalition has a program designed to teach riding in traffic. It is up and running. It could be expanded as required. Objective 1b contains no estimates as to the potential of GHG savings. This would be difficult since the description is so vague. SANDAG has money to promote bicycle usage but no money for transit. SANDAG wastes most of its bicycle money on recreational trails.</td>
<td>Comment noted. See response 63. Comments 65 to 72 are derived from the subject areas in Mr. Bullock’s letter that he indicated were pertinent to the Preliminary Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. This letter was also sent to SANDAG in response to the Preliminary Draft Regional Climate Action Plan. A copy of the letter in its entirety will made available online at <a href="http://www.sandag.org/bicycle">www.sandag.org/bicycle</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>Urban Sprawl: The dominance of the automobile is the primary reason for our sprawling, urban land-use patterns. For example, it is well known that a simple 4-lane freeway, with frontage roads, can consume 26 acres per mile. An acre of land can only park 117 cars. Sprawl has taken valuable farm land, wet lands, and wildlife habitat. It makes it more difficult to walk or to bicycle. It also makes it more difficult to provide or to use transit.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>The ability of low-income families to be able to drive to work and other essential family errands must be protected. However, given our challenge of global warming, this needs to be “constructive charity”. The features shown in Section II suggest that a billing computer will probably be involved. If so, that computer’s database can, perhaps at the individual’s discretion, be supported with information such as current housing details, current salary, job location, occupation and job skills to include a full resume, childcare, location of family and friends, hobbies, or recreational pursuits, and other items that could be related to the individual’s current need to drive. When the software determines that the person qualifies for a reduced multiplier of the full cost of driving (a subsidy), it could then also run various programs to offer, in creative, tailored, form letters, suggestions for changing circumstances to reduce driving. This could involve a search for jobs, a search for suitable housing, a search for daycare, and a search for better locations to pursue hobbies or recreational pursuits.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>The availability of transit would be considered in the software and would be offered. Job training could be suggested or offered at a discount. If circumstances support it, the person could also be asked if they would be interested in a class on riding a bicycle in traffic. Taking such a class could earn the person a financial award, perhaps to include a new or used bicycle. The software would put a high priority on helping the person achieve a lifestyle that requires less driving. As a last resort the software would take into account the congestion level of various routes and offer a driving route that requires a reduced subsidy. If no billing computer is involved, the person receiving the subsidy might be required to send in data to support the running of these programs to reduce driving and the subsidy to driving.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Connection to transit facilities is a key consideration of regional bicycle corridor alignments and project prioritization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed letter</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>For many reasons, including the climate crisis and the “AMRP” principle stated in the Introduction of this RES, the elements of this section need to be adopted, even if the computer model of the SCS shows that our CARP target reductions are going to be met without these measures. The criteria for spending money for bicycle transportation should be to maximize the resulting estimated reductions in driving. The following strategies will probably do this.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>Projects: Each of the smart growth place types, both existing and planned, shown in Figure 2 of Section 9, 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 the Regional Bicycle Plan should be used to fund the projects. They should be selected for implementation, from 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 described in the “Existing Planning Efforts” of Section 9.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Comment noted. See response 63.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1/27/10</td>
<td>emailed</td>
<td>Mike Bullock</td>
<td>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 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.</td>
<td>Comment noted. See response 63.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments received after the April 26, 2010 deadline

| 73  | 4/28/10 | email    | Jim Newton, P.E. - City of Coronado, Engineering and Project Development | The Proposed Regional Bicycle Network shows an uninterrupted Class I bicycle facility running along Glorietta Boulevard. As it exists today, there is a portion of Glorietta that only has a Class III facility. The Coronado City Council has discussed the idea of a Class I facility on Glorietta in the past and has voted against it. However, this idea is going to be revisited as we work on drafting a Coronado Bicycle Master Plan which is currently underway. Coronado will keep SANDAG staff up to date with our master plan progress, particularly with regards to Glorietta Boulevard. | During development of the Regional Bicycle Plan direction from policy makers and public input showed a strong preference for Class I type facilities. Therefore, potential opportunities for Class I facilities were maximized as was the case on Glorietta Boulevard. Future updates of the Regional Bicycle Plan will allow for refinements to the Regional Bicycle Network. |
FIGURE 3-5
REGIONAL BICYCLE NETWORK
CORRIDOR ALIGNMENTS
AND CLASSIFICATIONS

SAN DIEGO
REGIONAL BICYCLE PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASS I - BIKE PATH</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>CLASS I - BIKE PATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYCLE TRACK</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>CYCLE TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE BOULEVARD</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>BICYCLE BOULEVARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCED CLASS II - BIKE LANE</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>ENHANCED CLASS II - BIKE LANE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCED CLASS III - BIKE ROUTE</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>ENHANCED CLASS III - BIKE ROUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEWAY SHOULDER</td>
<td>Purple/Gray</td>
<td>FREEWAY SHOULDER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alta Planning + Design, March 1, 2010; Source: SANDAG
FIGURE 3-3
UPDATED REGIONAL BICYCLE NETWORK

NOTE:
Colors do not represent facility type. The color variations are intended to differentiate start and end of all corridors.
Introduction

As part of the development of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Executive Director and Chair of the Board of Directors established the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC). The TPEC is composed of representatives from a number of standing SANDAG working groups including the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, Cities/Counties Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and Tribal Transportation Technical Working Group. Partner agency representatives include Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), North County Transit District (NCTD), Port of San Diego, and San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA). The TPEC's responsibilities are to provide input on transportation project evaluation criteria and plan performance measures, which will support the goals and objectives for the 2050 RTP.

The Board of Directors is scheduled to consider approval of the transportation project evaluation criteria at its May 14, 2010, meeting. The evaluation criteria will be used to evaluate highway corridors, transit services, connector and freight projects, and to develop lists of ranked projects for each category. These ranked project lists, in turn, will be used to develop multimodal transportation network alternatives. The network alternatives will be evaluated using plan performance measures.

The Urban Area Transit Strategy (UATS) is evaluating three transit concepts. The evaluation of these concepts includes transit-related performance measures. Staff has coordinated and incorporated measures from the UATS where appropriate.

Discussion

The TPEC met twice in March and April to provide input on the draft plan performance measures. In addition to the input that has been provided by TPEC, SANDAG staff has made two presentations to SANDAG working groups including CTAC and SWG.

Staff is scheduled to make final presentations of the draft plan performance measures to the TransNet Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC), San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council (SANTEC), and TWG by May 13, 2010. Any pertinent input from these presentations will be provided as a verbal report to the Transportation Committee at its May 21, 2010, meeting.
**Plan Performance Measures - Process**

The Board of Directors established six policy goals for the 2050 RTP. These goals are structured into two overarching themes: Quality of Travel & Livability, and Sustainability. Quality of Travel & Livability relates to how the transportation system functions from the individual customer perspective (Mobility, Reliability, and System Preservation & Safety). Sustainability relates to making progress simultaneously in each of the Three “Es” (Social Equity, Healthy Environment, and Prosperous Economy) from a regional perspective. The draft plan performance measures are grouped within each of the six policy goals for the 2050 RTP.

The Board also discussed policy objectives to help reach these goals. The application of the performance measures is two-fold. First, the plan performance measures will serve as an aid for decision makers to select a preferred transportation network alternative for the 2050 RTP revenue constrained funding scenario among options that will be presented to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors. Second, plan performance measures will be used to compare the performance of the preferred transportation network alternative to other transportation network alternatives such as a current, future no build, and land use alternative and to measure how well the 2050 RTP is projected to perform.

**Plan Performance Measures - Existing and New Measures**

The draft plan performance measures are included in Attachment 1 and the draft methodology to estimate performance measures are included in Attachment 2. Revisions have been made to the current 2030 RTP performances measures to incorporate new data sources, technical tools, and analysis, and to coordinate and maintain consistency with other SANDAG plans and/or programs, and partner agencies.

Several new plan performance measures are proposed based upon input received from the Board of Directors and other stakeholders. The new performance measures have been developed taking into account the most recent data and work efforts. These include:

- Number of interregional transit routes
- Freight capacity
- Percent of transportation investments towards maintenance, rehabilitation, and operation improvements
- Percent of environmental justice (EJ) and non-EJ populations within 30 minutes of healthcare, schools, parks, and the San Diego International Airport.
- CO2 emissions
- Net benefits and return on investment (note that the methodology to estimate these performance measures are still to be developed)

The draft plan performance measures have incorporated indicators from the Urban Area Transit Strategy (UATS), and environmental justice and initial economic analysis work efforts.
Next Steps

Staff will address comments received on the Draft Performance Measures for the 2050 RTP. The Transportation Committee will be asked at a future meeting to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the 2050 RTP Performance Measures at its June 25, 2010 meeting.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Plan Performance Measures
2. Draft Methodology to Estimate Performance Measures

Key Staff Contact: Scott Strelecki, (619) 699-6954, sstr@sandag.org
## QUALITY OF TRAVEL & LIVABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
<th>Potential Plan Performance Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Mobility** - The transportation system should provide for convenient travel options for people and goods and maximize its productivity. The system should reduce both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel. | Tailor transportation improvements to better connect people with jobs and other activities | Average work trip travel time (in minutes)  
Average work trip travel speed by mode (in m.p.h.)  
Percent of work and higher education trips accessible in 30 minutes in peak periods by mode  
Percent of non work-related trips accessible in 15 minutes by mode  
Travel time (by mode) in key travel corridors/communities  
Peak-period mode share in key travel corridors/communities  
Out-of-pocket user costs per trip  
Number of interregional transit routes by service type |
| Provide convenient travel choices including transit, intercity and high-speed trains, driving, ridesharing, walking, and biking | Preserve and expand options for regional freight movement                        |                                                                                                       |
| Increase the use of transit, ridesharing, walking and biking in major corridors and communities |                                                                                   |                                                                                                       |
| Provide transportation choices to better connect the San Diego region with Mexico, neighboring counties, and tribal nations |                                                                                   |                                                                                                       |
| **Reliability** - The transportation system should be reliable so that travelers can expect relatively consistent travel times from day-to-day for the same trip by mode(s). | Employ new technologies to make travel more reliable and convenient | Percent of total travel in congested conditions (peak periods)  
Percent of total travel in congested conditions (all day)  
Daily vehicle delay per capita  
Daily truck hours of delay on the regional freight network  
VMT by travel speed (percentage of travel speed by mode) |
| Manage the efficiency of the transportation system to improve traffic flow |                                                                                   |                                                                                                       |
| **System Preservation & Safety** - The public’s investment in transportation should be protected by maintaining the transportation system. It is critical to preserve and ensure a safe regional transportation system. | Keep the region’s transportation system in a good state of repair | Annual projected number of crashes/fatalities per capita  
Freight network enhancements by mode  
Percent of transportation investments towards maintenance and rehabilitation  
Percent of transportation investments towards operational improvements |
| Reduce bottlenecks and increase safety by improving operations |                                                                                   |                                                                                                       |
| Improve emergency preparedness within the regional transportation system |                                                                                   |                                                                                                       |

Note: Bold performance measures were used in the 2030 RTP and nonbold performance measures represent potential new measures. Performance measures that compare metrics of different modes include the following: auto, transit, carpool, unless otherwise noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
<th>Potential Plan Performance Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Social Equity** - The transportation system should be designed to provide an equitable level of transportation services for all populations. | Create equitable transportation opportunities for all populations regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity or income  
Ensure access to jobs, services, and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices | Environmental Justice (EJ) and Non-EJ Populations  
(These measures will be estimated for “low-income and minority” “mobility” and “community engagement:” community types as identified in the environmental justice work effort):  
Average travel time per person trip (in minutes)  
Percent of work trips accessible in 30 minutes by mode  
Percent of homes within 1/2 mile of a transit stop  
Percent of population within 30 minutes:  
- schools (elementary, secondary, higher education - including vocational)  
- San Diego International Airport  
Percent of population within 15 minutes:  
- healthcare (hospitals, community clinics)  
- parks  
Distribution of RTP expenditures |
| **Healthy Environment** - The transportation system should lead to environmental sustainability and foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing, and employment choices and encourage future growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned development. | Develop transportation improvements that respect and enhance the environment  
Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles and continue to improve air quality in the region  
Make transportation investments that result in healthy and sustainable communities | Gross acres of constrained lands consumed for transit and highway infrastructure  
On-road fuel consumption (all day) per capita  
Smog forming pollutants (pounds/year) per capita  
Systemwide VMT (all day) per capita  
Transit passenger miles (all day) per capita  
Percent of peak-period trips within ½ mile of a transit stop  
Percent of daily trips within ½ mile of a transit stop  
Work trip mode share (peak periods including bike/walk)  
Work trip mode share (all day including bike/walk)  
Non work trip mode share (peak period including bike/walk)  
Non work trip mode share (all day including bike/walk)  
Total bike and walk trips  
CO2 emissions per capita |
| **Prosperous Economy** - The transportation system should play a significant role in raising the region’s standard of living. | Maximize the economic benefits of transportation investments  
Enhance the goods movement system to support economic prosperity | Net benefits (such as congestion management and enhanced mobility,)  
Return on investment  
Economic impacts (such as jobs, wages, value of goods and services produced in the region) |

Note: Bold performance measures were used in the 2030 RTP and non-bold performance measures represent potential new measures. Performance measures that compare metrics of different modes include the following: auto, transit, carpool, unless otherwise noted.

1 Community types include the following: low-income and minority (low-income households, minority population, severe overcrowding, poverty-100 percent), mobility (zero-car households, disabled, ages 0-4 and 75+), and community engagement (linguistic isolation and low educational attainment).
POTENTIAL METHODOLOGY TO ESTIMATE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Mobility-

(1) Average work trip travel time (all day) = work trip person hours of travel divided by work trips (all day by mode auto, transit, and carpool)

(2) Average work trip travel speed by mode (in m.p.h.) = work trip travel time divided by work trip vehicles miles traveled (VMT) (peak period by mode: auto, transit, and carpool)

(3) Percent of work and higher education trips accessible in 30 minutes in peak periods by mode = work and college trips within 30 minutes divided by total work and college trips (by mode auto, transit, and carpool)

(4) Percent of non work-related trips accessible in 15 minutes by mode = non work-related trips within 15 minutes divided by total non work trips (all day) (by mode auto, transit, and carpool)

(5) Travel time (by mode) in key travel corridors/communities = work trip person hours of travel divided by work trips (peak period by mode auto, transit, and carpool)

(6) Peak-period mode share in key travel corridors/communities = peak mode share (auto, transit, and carpool) as applied to corridors/communities

(7) Out-of-pocket user costs per trip = total auto and transit costs divided by total person trips

(8) Number of interregional transit routes by service type = total number of interregional transit routes multiplied by weighting factor (Rail/BRT equals five, arterial rapid equals three, and high frequency local equals two)

Reliability-

(1) Percent of total travel in congested conditions (peak periods) = VMT at Level of Service (LOS) E and LOS F (volume/Capacity > 0.85) divided by total VMT (peak periods)

(2) Percent of total travel in congested conditions (all day) = VMT at Level of Service (LOS) E and LOS F (volume/Capacity > 0.85) divided by total VMT (all day)

(3) Daily vehicle delay per capita = VMT at Level of Service (LOS) E and LOS F (Volume/Capacity >0.85) divided by population

(4) Daily truck hours of delay on the regional freight network = modeled roadway delay time multiplied by modeled truck volume (all day)

(5) VMT by travel speed = percent of VMT by Level of Service (LOS) A- F (volume/capacity)
System Preservation & Safety-

(1) Annual projected number of crashes/fatalities per capita = VMT by facility type (freeway, prime arterial, other) and by area type (urban, suburban, rural) multiplied by basic average accident rate divided by the total regional population

(2) Freight network enhancements by mode = total sum of freight capacity acreage (defined by rail yards, port terminals, and ports of entry)

(3) Freight network enhancements by mode = total sum of freight capacity mileage (defined by rail mainline, highway connectors to terminals, and highway truck routes)

(4) Percent of transportation investments towards maintenance and rehabilitation = sum of maintenance and rehabilitation transportation investments divided by all transportation investments

(5) Percent of transportation investments towards operational improvements = sum of operational improvement transportation investments divided by all transportation investments

Social Equity-

(1) Average travel time per person trip (in minutes, EJ and non-EJ) = person hours of travel divided by person trips (by mode auto, transit, and carpool)

(2) Percent of work trips (EJ and non-EJ) accessible in 30 minutes by mode = work trips within 30 minutes divided by total work trips (by mode auto, transit, carpool, and bike/walk)

(3) Percent of homes within ½ mile of a transit stop (EJ and non-EJ) = number of homes within ½ mile of a transit stop divided by total regional homes

(4) Percent of population (EJ and non-EJ) that can access within 15 minutes healthcare (hospitals, community clinics) = EJ and non-EJ populations divided by the total population within 15 minutes of healthcare

(5) Percent of population (EJ and non-EJ) that can access within 15 minutes parks = EJ and non-EJ population divided by the total population within 15 minutes of parks

(6) Percent of population (EJ and non-EJ) that can access within 30 minutes schools (elementary, secondary, higher education – including vocational) = EJ and non-EJ populations divided by the total population within 30 minutes of schools

(7) Percent of population (EJ and non-EJ) that can access within 30 minutes San Diego International Airport = EJ and non-EJ population divided by the total population within 30 minutes of the San Diego International Airport

(8) Distribution of RTP Expenditures = Total RTP expenditures divided by EJ and non-EJ population portion of RTP expenditures
Healthy Environment-

1. Gross acres of constrained lands consumed for transit and highway infrastructure

2. Total on-road fuel consumption (all day) per capita = VMT divided by on-road fleet fuel economy divided by the total regional population

3. Smog forming pollutants (pounds/year) per capita = daily pounds of reactive organic gases plus daily pounds of nitrogen oxides divided by the total regional population

4. Systemwide VMT (all day) per capita = total sum of vehicles on roadway segment multiplied by length of roadway segment (all day) divided by the total regional population

5. Transit passenger miles (all day) per capita = total sum of transit passengers on transit segment multiplied by length of transit segment (all day) divided by the total regional population

6. Percent of peak-period trips within ½ mile of a transit stop = number of trip origins and destinations within ½ mile of a transit stop divided by total peak-period trips

7. Percent of daily trips within ½ mile of a transit stop = number of trip origins and destinations within ½ mile of a transit stop divided by total daily trips

8. Work trip mode share (peak periods including bike/walk) = percent of work trips by mode (peak periods)

9. Work trip mode share (all day including bike/walk) = percent of work trips by mode (all day)

10. Nonwork trip mode share (peak periods including bike/walk) = percent of nonwork trips by mode (peak periods)

11. Nonwork trip mode share (all day including bike/walk) = percent of nonwork trips by mode (all day)

12. Total bike and walk trips = Total number of bike and walk trips

13. CO2 emissions per capita = daily tons of CO2 divided by the total regional population

Prosperous Economy-

1. Net benefits (such as congestion management and enhanced mobility) = TBD

2. Return on investment = TBD

3. Economic impacts (such as jobs, wages, value of goods and services produced in the region) = IMPLAN model
Introduction

The United States Navy, as one of the largest employers in the San Diego region, partnered with iCommute, the San Diego Association of Governments regional commuter assistance program, and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) to conduct an analysis of commuter travel activity between three regional Navy housing clusters and the eight San Diego area naval bases/facilities.

The purpose of the analysis was to identify demand-side strategies that the Navy could utilize for its service and civilian commuters. A range of transit and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies were analyzed. After a presentation to the Board of Directors in July 2009, the Board recommended that staff continue refining options for improving commuter travel for Navy personnel and to propose a pilot commuter service for implementation.

Discussion

A modeling analysis was conducted to determine levels of commuters from various areas in the San Diego region to the Navy facilities. The major origin target housing clusters identified in the analysis included Murphy Canyon/Tierrasanta, Otay Mesa, and Chula Vista East. The destination Naval facilities included: Navy Broadway Complex, Naval Air Station North Island and Naval Amphibious Base Coronado, Naval Base San Diego, and the Naval Base Point Loma and Point Loma SPAWAR. A travel time study was prepared from the target housing areas to each of the facilities as well.

The large number of personnel that move between the housing areas and naval bases suggested that large vans or buses would be the best mode of transport for a pilot program. Murphy Canyon was selected as the housing cluster to conduct a commuter TDM survey based on the location, the poor access to public transit, the high percentage of drive-alone commuters, and the route that would be competitive with drive alone times. Also, Murphy Canyon has the highest concentration of naval commuters from the three housing cluster areas to the metro naval bases.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the implementation of a proposed pilot limited express transit service from the Murphy Canyon military housing area to Naval Base San Diego for a period of one year beginning in fall 2010.
Commute Survey

The survey of Murphy Canyon residents indicated that the overwhelming majority of respondents (94%) drive to work alone. The most common response given for driving alone was that they did “not have the same start and end times everyday” (21% of responses). Most survey respondents (65%) were either very interested or somewhat interested in riding some type of express transit to work at least three times a week. Respondents that worked at Naval Amphibious Base and Naval Base San Diego tended to be the most interested in participating in the Navy express bus, at 55 percent and 38 percent, respectively.

Most survey respondents indicated muster times on base between 6:00 a.m. and 7:30 a.m. and stated they leave home between 5:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m. to get to the base. Additionally, most respondents indicated that they leave work between 2:30 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. The survey also indicated that the traditional vanpool model or buspool concept without a paid driver would not address this Navy personnel commute issue.

In an effort to explore options for the delivery of the service, discussions were initiated with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). These discussions confirmed that the development of a pilot option that strictly serves the military would be subject to charter regulation requirements. In consideration of the nature of the proposed pilot service it was determined that this option may not be the best service delivery method. Furthermore, a pilot option that serves the general public as well as the military would not be considered as a chartered service. As a result of these discussions, SANDAG, the Navy, and MTS studied the feasibility of a limited express transit option to serve the Murphy Canyon cluster area residents as the most efficient way to deliver a pilot service.

Comparative Analysis

To better evaluate a potential pilot service, a comprehensive comparison of Naval Base San Diego (NBSD) and Naval Air Station North Island (NASNI) alignment alternatives was conducted. These two destinations were determined to present the greatest potential for the pilot service from Murphy Canyon and warranted further study. Details on the commuters to each destination, survey results with respect to the commuters, and proposed route characteristics for each destination from the Murphy Canyon cluster were examined. Additionally, a more detailed estimation of travel time to each destination was performed. A comparison of the study results are shown in Table 15 of the Transportation Demand Management Study (Attachment 1).

Table 15 shows commuters destined for NBSD (3,251) from the Murphy Canyon cluster are significantly higher than those destined for NASNI (448), representing a greater potential to use the pilot service. Commuters to both destinations expressed a significant level of interest in the pilot service during the survey. The mileage and travel-time estimates to the first stop on base for the two alignment alternatives indicate that a service to NBSD is more likely to be successful than a service to NASNI.

The estimated annual cost of operations was calculated for route alternatives to both naval base destinations with the cost of operations for the NBSD service lower than the NASNI service. As a result, fewer riders are required to support the NBSD service when compared to the NASNI service. For the purposes of comparison within this report, the premium express fare in the region ($100 per month) was used to arrive at an estimate of the number of riders required to sustain the service. A
fare for the pilot service would be established in cooperation with MTS, SANDAG, and the Navy prior to initiating the proposed pilot service.

**Proposed Pilot Project**

The study establishes that the alignment to NBSD is the more favorable alternative to initiate a pilot service. Hence, it is proposed that a limited express transit service pilot be operated from the Murphy Canyon housing area to Naval Base San Diego (Attachment 2). Further refinements to the alignment within Naval Base San Diego are being explored to reduce the amount of time spent on base. If approved by the Board of Directors, the pilot service could begin in fall 2010, and continue for one year.

The estimated annual direct cost for operating the pilot service ranges from $170,000 to $190,000. SANDAG and the Navy intend to leverage the Navy’s Transportation Incentive Program (TIP) as the primary funding source for the service. TIP vouchers are used in lieu of cash to purchase a monthly pass to ride transit. A public fare would be established that is consistent with other fares in the region and falls within the funding capacity provided by the Navy TIP. The minimum threshold of TIP enrolled pilot participants necessary to sustain the proposed service has been calculated based on the estimated cost of operations. The level needed to initiate service is 150 registered participants. If this threshold is not met, implementation of the pilot study will be suspended.

During the pilot, in the event that the TIP enrollment of Navy sailors and public ridership falls below the level necessary to fully cover the costs of operation of the service, it is proposed that SANDAG would provide a limited subsidy toward the operation of the service. The limited subsidy for this pilot service would be in line with the subsidy offered to eligible vanpools in the region. SANDAG would provide a monthly subsidy of $400 for every ten participants enrolled in the Navy TIP program and riding the Limited Express Transit Service.

Interagency agreements will be required to establish funding and to provide for operations of the proposed pilot service. It is proposed that SANDAG would enter into an agreement with the Navy for funding the proposed service via the Navy TIP. In addition, SANDAG would enter into an agreement with MTS for operations of the proposed service. The agreements would provide the necessary framework to deliver the service and establish a means to terminate the pilot service if the service does not perform as anticipated.

**Next Steps**

Once the proposed pilot is approved for implementation, SANDAG, the Navy and MTS will initiate the following next steps:

- Finalize the operational details and promotional fare for the service.

- Enter into an interagency agreement between the Navy and SANDAG to fund the pilot service.

- Enter into an interagency agreement between MTS and SANDAG for pilot service operations.

- Initiate collaborative marketing efforts with the Navy and MTS to promote the service.
- Complete participant enrollment (Navy TIP, iCommute, Compass Card).
- Implement the pilot service (fall 2010)
- Monitor and evaluate pilot program performance

JIM LINTHICUM  
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments:  
1. Table 15 of Navy Transportation Demand Management Initiative Study  
2. Proposed Alternative Murphy Canyon to NBSD

The attachments are from the Navy Transportation Demand Management Initiative Study May 2010, and the entire study can be downloaded at www.sandag.org/navy_tdm_initiative_study_may_2010

Key Staff Contact: Dan Martin, (619) 699-6987 dma@sandag.org
Table 15
Comparison of Pilot Study Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Route Characteristics</th>
<th>Murphey Canyon Housing Cluster to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Commuters</td>
<td>3,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all the commuters traveling out of Murphy Canyon Housing Cluster&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of survey respondents who travel between the origin and destination</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey respondents who were “interested” in riding the Limited Express Transit Service&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey respondents who were “not at all interested” in riding the service</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated one-way pilot service route length (miles)</td>
<td>16.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated pilot service travel time to first stop on the base (minutes)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated pilot service travel time to last stop on the base (minutes)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of stops on the base</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total annual cost of operation</td>
<td>$189,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated monthly revenue required</td>
<td>$15,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of premium express bus passes required to be sold in a month</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated percent of available service occupied&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total commuters traveling to this destination who must purchase the express bus pass (to meet the revenue requirement)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Refer to Appendix 1-1 for an illustration of geographic locations included in the Murphy Canyon Housing Cluster

<sup>2</sup> Includes respondents who answered they were “very interested,” “somewhat interested,” or “slightly interested” in riding the Limited Express Transit Service

<sup>3</sup> Based on the operational constraint of seven trips per day
Figure 8
I-15 Route Configuration
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AGENDA ITEM NO.: 8

Action Requested: RECOMMEND AND APPROVE

INTERSTATE 805 CORRIDOR UPDATE, PROPOSED BUDGET INCREASE, AND SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT

File Number 1280500

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board of Directors that $16 million of TransNet funding be allocated to the design of the initial phase of the I-805 North Segment. The Transportation Committee also is asked to move the baseline schedule for the open-to-public date for the Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service project to May 2011.

Introduction

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are jointly working on the Interstate 805 (I-805) Corridor improvements that are included in the TransNet Early Action Program. This report provides an update on the progress, including a request for design funding for the I-805 North Segment and a request to delay the schedule for the Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service project.

Discussion

I-805 Corridor improvements extend from Otay Mesa to Sorrento Valley in San Diego County. The I-805 Corridor currently contains four project segments: the South Segment from Palomar Street in Chula Vista to State Route (SR) 15, including SR 94 between I-805 and Downtown San Diego; the North Segment from SR 52 to Interstate 5; South Bay Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); and the Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service project. Proposed project improvements consist of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, Managed Lanes, transit service, direct connectors, direct access ramps (DARs), and transit stations.

South Segment

Environmental studies have been completed for HOV/Managed Lanes on I-805 between Palomar Street and I-15. The draft environmental document is scheduled to be released in May 2010, with environmental clearance in October 2010. In July 2009 SANDAG allocated $15 million to complete the design of two HOV lanes between Palomar Street and SR 94. The design is scheduled to be complete in November 2011. A schedule for construction will be established once construction funding is allocated. The cost to complete the two HOV lanes is currently estimated at $140 million (2010 $s). The future four Managed Lanes would be built by 2020 according to the schedule in the Regional Transportation Plan.

The project study report (feasibility study) for HOV lanes on SR 94 between I-805 and Downtown San Diego was completed in April 2008. In July 2009 SANDAG allocated $1 million of TransNet
funding to conduct environmental and engineering studies. The $1 million was combined with $10 million of Transportation Congestion Relief Program funding, fully funding the environmental phase. The draft environmental document is scheduled to be complete in March 2012, with environmental clearance in March 2013.

Construction began in September 2009 on an I-805 auxiliary lane between SR 54 and Bonita Road/E Street. The new southbound auxiliary lane is scheduled to be open to the public in October 2010. The $7.4 million project is being funded in part by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. No TransNet funds were used on this project.

North Segment

Bids were opened on April 30, 2010, for the construction of HOV lanes on I-805 between Carroll Canyon Road and the I-5/I-805 merge. The project was jointly developed by Caltrans, the City of San Diego, and SANDAG. The project includes the extension of Carroll Canyon Road under I-805 and the construction of a north-facing DAR. The north-facing DAR will provide direct access between Carroll Canyon Road and the I-805 HOV lanes. The apparent low bidder is Coffman Specialties, Inc., with a bid of $50,474,442.50. The bid is 2 percent above the Engineer’s Estimate. The new HOV lanes and DAR are scheduled to be open to the public in June 2012.

Environmental studies have been completed for the HOV/Managed Lanes on I-805 between SR 52 and the I-5/I-805 merge. The draft environmental document has been completed, and the public hearing was held on February 23, 2010. Caltrans is in the process of incorporating comments received into the final environmental document. The design phase for initial phase construction must be fully funded before Caltrans can approve the final environmental document and environmentally clear the project.

Staff is proposing to fully fund the design of a portion of the planned improvement, including HOV lanes between SR 52 and Carroll Canyon Road and also the design of the south-facing DAR at Carroll Canyon Road. This would provide a 13-mile stretch of continuous HOV lanes on I-5/I-805 from Manchester Avenue to SR 52 and provide HOV access to Carroll Canyon Road to and from the south. The Carroll Canyon extension and DAR will provide a much-needed secondary HOV access to Sorrento Valley from I-805. The I-805 Mira Mesa Boulevard interchange is currently the primary access and is heavily congested. Staff is recommending that $16 million of TransNet funding be allocated to the I-805 North project for the initial design phase. This would provide a much-needed, shovel-ready project and allow Caltrans to environmentally clear all of the planned HOV/Managed Lanes improvements planned for the North Segment.

South Bay BRT

This new 21-mile BRT service will connect the Otay Mesa international border crossing with downtown San Diego via eastern Chula Vista. New transit access will be afforded to regional employment centers in downtown San Diego, the Otay Mesa Business Park, and the future Eastern Urban Center as well as to residential communities in Chula Vista and National City. Environmental studies are underway and the draft environmental document is scheduled to be complete in December 2010, with environmental clearance scheduled for August 2011.
Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service

In September 2008 SANDAG was awarded an $18 million grant from the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration to demonstrate lane-keeping adaptive cruise-control technology for commuter bus service between Chula Vista and Sorrento Valley. SANDAG matched this grant with $4.5 million of TransNet funds. In April 2009 Caltrans granted SANDAG permission to run the adaptive buses on the inside I-805 shoulders for a two-year demonstration period. SANDAG and Caltrans are currently in the process of procuring the technology needed to outfit the buses. The original baseline schedule called for opening to the public in September 2009. Obtaining the necessary permissions and procuring the technology have proven more challenging than originally estimated. Staff is asking that the baseline schedule be reestablished with a new open-to-public date of May 2011.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contact: Joel Haven, (619) 220-7277, Joel_Haven@dot.ca.gov
AGREEMENT WITH PORT OF SAN DIEGO
FOR FIBER OPTIC PROJECT

Introduction

SANDAG is implementing a light rail rehabilitation program for the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and also implementing regional freight capacity improvements. These projects include installing fiber optic cable on the Blue Line. The Port of San Diego (Port) also is implementing a fiber optic cable program in the same area. The Port is requesting SANDAG install a portion of the Port’s fiber optic cable as part of the SANDAG project. This action provides for a transfer of funds from the Port to SANDAG to fund the additional installation of the Port fiber optic cable. MTS has a separate agreement with the Port for installation and maintenance of the Port fiber cable.

Discussion

SANDAG is responsible for designing, bidding, and constructing improvements for MTS including a project to rehabilitate the light rail infrastructure on the Blue Line. SANDAG also is implementing a project to improve rail freight capacity on the Blue Line from downtown San Diego to the San Ysidro Freight Yard. Both of these projects require fiber optic cable to provide train control functions and both projects are funding installation of fiber optic cable on the Blue Line from San Ysidro to San Diego Trolley central control. The Port of San Diego also is developing a fiber optic cable system to provide fast and reliable communication to its facilities and agencies around San Diego Bay.

The Port, MTS, and SANDAG staff have worked together and determined that all agencies would benefit from placing a portion of the Port fiber optic cable in MTS right-of-way on the Blue Line. Benefits include reduced construction cost, reduced construction disruption and improved fiber communications redundancy and reliability. The Port is prepared to transfer funds to SANDAG to pay for the installation of specific fiber optic cables as part of the SANDAG Aerial Cable and Fiber Optic Cabling Installation Project. SANDAG has included the Port’s fiber cables in its bid package as a bid option. The estimate for SANDAG to install the fiber cables for the Port should not exceed $300,000 including design, administration, construction support and actual construction costs. With approval of this item the SANDAG Executive Director would be given authorization to enter into an agreement with the Port to accept the funds to implement construction of fiber optic cable for the

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to:
(1) authorize the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with the Port of San Diego to accept an amount not to exceed $300,000 from the Port of San Diego for services and construction related to installation of fiber optic cable as part of the MTS Blue Line improvements; and
(2) increase budget CIP No. 1210001 from $114,695,000 to $114,995,000.
Port on the MTS Trolley Blue Line and budget CIP Number 1210001 would be increased from $114,695,000 to $114,995,000.

MTS and the Port have already entered into a separate agreement allowing the installation and maintenance of the Port fiber optic cable in MTS right-of-way.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Implementation

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

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

Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Section 99244, an operator can be allocated no more in FY 2011 than it was allocated in FY 2010 unless SANDAG determines that the operator made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvement recommendations adopted by the Board of Directors for the current fiscal year.

Discussion

Productivity Improvement Recommendations

In FY 2008 SANDAG updated the Productivity Improvement Program to include all of the performance measures explicitly stated in the state TDA Manual Section 99246(d). Multiyear trend analysis also was included at that time since it was recognized that steps taken by the transit agencies to improve system performance often take several years to be fully realized. The Productivity Improvement Program for FY 2010 included the evaluation of the following TDA performance measures over a three-year (12 quarter) period:

- Operating Cost Per Passenger (adjusted for annual inflation) – measures cost effectiveness
- Operating Cost Per Revenue Hour (adjusted for annual inflation) – measures cost efficiency
- Passengers Per Revenue Hour – measures service productivity
- Passengers Per Revenue Mile – measures service productivity
- Revenue Hours Per Employee – measures labor productivity
- Farebox Recovery Ratio – measures service cost efficiency\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Based on the TDA Manual Sections 6633.2 and 6633.5, this measure includes the evaluation of the last four quarters of available data (Quarter 2 of FY 2009 through Quarter 2 of FY 2010).
These performance indicators are measured separately for fixed-route (MTS Trolley, MTS Bus, NCTD SPRINTER, NCTD COASTER, and NCTD BREEZE Bus) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Paratransit services (MTS ADA and NCTD ADA). These indicators help determine if the agency is obtaining the desired results from the system and if overall performance is improving based on updated regional strategies or service operation plans. Also, these indicators help the transit agencies determine where improvements can be made. These improvements can be incorporated into each operator’s Service Improvement Plan, which are included in the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan prepared by SANDAG.

Performance trends were evaluated in FY 2010 to determine whether the transit agencies improved their performance in light of external circumstances (e.g., fuel prices and loss of operating funds). To facilitate a greater understanding of each individual service (MTS Bus, MTS Paratransit, MTS Trolley, NCTD Breeze, NCTD COASTER, NCTD SPRINTER, and NCTD Paratransit), a composite index of the six TDA performance measures was developed and included in the Productivity Improvement Program to help determine overall trends.

Attachment 1 includes the composite evaluation of each service from Quarter 2 of FY 2007 to Quarter 2 of FY 2010. The overall composite charts are followed by charts that specifically illustrate the percent change through the reporting period as discussed below.

**MTS FY 2010 Performance**

The results of the FY 2010 MTS performance trend analysis indicate that:

- **MTS Trolley** performance slightly declined (-1%) based on the Quarter 2 FY 2007 to Quarter 2 FY 2010 analysis. The main reason for the slight decline was a drop in Trolley ridership. Between the first quarter of FY 2007 and the first quarter of FY 2010, ridership dropped by 17 percent over the three-year period. As a result, operating costs per passenger have increased, and passenger productivity (passengers per revenue hour and mile) also has declined. However, despite the drop in ridership, farebox recovery improved by nearly 16 percent to 67 percent, well above the 38 percent system average and far above the national light rail average of 27 percent. This was largely due to a 14 percent reduction in operating costs over the evaluation period.

- **MTS Bus** overall performance improved (+3%) through the First Quarter of FY 2010. Factors contributing to the improved performance include an increase in passengers (+5%), which yielded improvements in productivity. Overall improvements also were supported by decreased revenue miles and hours and stable farebox recovery as seen in the previous quarters’ analysis.

- **MTS ADA** overall performance declined by 3 percent over the past 13 quarters. The slight decline can be attributed to operating costs rising faster than ridership and revenue hours (reducing cost effectiveness), along with revenue miles and hours eclipsing increases in passenger volumes (reducing productivity). These factors are likely due to longer passenger trip lengths which MTS has no control over. Additionally, labor productivity has improved with the reduction in full-time equivalent employees (FTEs) matched by increasing revenue hours. Farebox recovery was static.
- MTS Farebox Recovery minimum TDA requirements were exceeded for fixed-route and ADA Paratransit services. TDA requirements include a minimum annual farebox recovery of: 31.9 percent for fixed-route (45.3% was achieved); 20.0 percent for Premium Express (55.1% achieved); and 10 percent for MTS ADA (15.3% was achieved) services. In addition to meeting the minimum requirements, farebox recovery was up nearly 4 percent for fixed-route service, unchanged for ADA, and up nearly 8 percent for Premium Express.

**NCTD FY 2010 Performance**

The results of the FY 2010 NCTD performance trend analysis indicate that:

- NCTD COASTER overall performance improved by 3 percent during the last 13 quarters, despite a reduction in passenger volumes. This can be linked to reduced operating costs (-16%) matched by a minor decrease in revenue car hours (-2.5%). Additionally, farebox recovery rates have increased (+4.5%), with fare revenues virtually unchanged from Quarter 2 FY 2007 (a result of fare increases over the past two years). Also, Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) reduction levels have outpaced revenue hour declines, yielding improvements in labor productivity.

- NCTD SPRINTER performance data was limited due to the fact that only six quarters of information was available given its startup the previous fiscal year. A year-over-year analysis showed that SPRINTER performance improved over this time period. A major reason for the improved performance over the one-year sample time period was the decline in operating costs, which outpaced declines in total ridership. This yielded improving results from a cost-efficiency standpoint. In addition, revenue hour and mile reductions outpaced passenger decreases, which improved service productivity. This was due to a reduction of rail vehicles from two-car trains to one-car trains in order to maximize efficiency. Farebox recovery also was up 5 percent in the year-over-year analysis.

- NCTD BREEZE overall performance improved by one percent over the 13-quarter evaluation period. The improvement can be attributed to improved productivity (passenger mile and hour declines outpacing ridership declines). The improvements outweighed minor cost-efficiency declines due to revenue miles and hour declines outpacing operating cost declines. Additionally, the farebox recovery rate held constant from the Quarter 2 FY 2009 to the Quarter 2 FY 2010.

- NCTD ADA service improved by 16 percent over the previous 13-quarter period. Improvements were seen in all categories (cost efficiency, labor and service productivity, and farebox recovery). The exception was one of the service productivity metrics where revenue hour increases slightly outpaced passenger increases. During the evaluation period, ridership increased by 24 percent, while costs were kept in check with an 8 percent increase.

- NCTD Farebox Recovery minimum TDA requirements were exceeded for fixed-route and ADA Paratransit services. TDA requirements include a minimum annual farebox recovery of: 18.8 percent for fixed-route (23.5% was achieved); and 10 percent for MTS ADA (13.0% was achieved) services. These results were similar to the NCTD farebox recovery statistics reported last year for FY 2009.
FY 2010 Productivity Improvement Program

Based on the results discussed above, it is staff’s opinion that both MTS and NCTD have made reasonable efforts toward achieving their FY 2010 productivity recommendations, most notably through the implementation of the MTS Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) and NCTD BREEZE service restructuring. NCTD also is currently undertaking an operations analysis similar to the MTS COA called the Mobility Plan.

It is proposed that the FY 2011 Productivity Improvement Program continue to evaluate three-year performance trends for each of the identified transit services.

TDA Triennial Audit Recommendations

In addition to the three-year performance monitoring associated with the annual TDA claim, the triennial performance audit commissioned by SANDAG included the development of improvement recommendations for the transit agencies. The most recent performance audit completed in April 2007 included some recommendations on possible strategies to improve efficiency and effectiveness for both transit operators. These recommendations and the associated MTS and NCTD action plans to implement them (from Form B of the 2010 TDA Claim) were updated by MTS and NCTD and are included in Attachments 2 and 3, respectively.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. FY 2010 Productivity Improvement Results - Composite Evaluation  
2. MTS 2007 Triennial Audit Recommendations and Operator Action Plans  
3. NCTD 2007 Triennial Audit Recommendations and Operator Action Plans  

Key Staff Contact: Phil Trom, (619) 699-7330, ptr@sandag.org
FY 2010 Productivity Improvement Results
Composite Evaluation

Figure 1: Fixed Route TDA Performance Composite Index

Figure 2: ADA TDA Performance Composite Index
Figure 3: Fixed Route TDA Performance Composite Index - Percent Change

Figure 4: ADA TDA Performance Composite Index - Percent Change
## STATEMENT OF EFFORTS MADE TO IMPLEMENT PERFORMANCE AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

**SANDAG Staff Member:** Philip Trom  
**Date Completed:** April 30, 2010  
**Operator:** Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)  
**Date of Last Performance Audit:** April 15, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Performance Audit Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Actions Taken to Implement Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V-5  | 1.1. Review and Consider Revising the Policy and Procedures for Discipline for Preventable Accidents | Bus Operations has made significant strides in monitoring, retraining, and removing unsafe bus operators since the last audit.  
- On a monthly basis, Operations runs a report which lists all preventable accidents, by operator, for the last 36 months. This report is used to identify operators in need of retraining and/or operators that need to be removed from service.  
- On a daily basis, the dispatch log is reviewed to discover any instance where a bus operator may have performed an unsafe act. If the bus is video equipped, supervisory staff will pull and review that video before scheduling any fact finding with the bus operator. MTS Bus is currently engaged in the procurement process to equip all buses with video recorders.  
- We will review a bus operator’s entire history in response to a passenger or motorist complaint alleging aggressive driving.  
- In June of 2009 MTS created a new policy, published as Transportation Bulletin 09-20, which advised all bus operators that a preventable accident with a fixed object will cause a three-day, unpaid suspension.  
- Bus Operations has been aggressive in its efforts to improve vehicular safety, during FY 09, MTS conducted 58 Skelly Hearings relevant to preventable accidents, sent 124 operators to Accident Remediation and 92 operators to the “Smith System of Defensive Driving” retraining.  
- These efforts have resulted in a noticeable decrease in the magnitude of the accidents we experience. Preventable accident frequency ratio (PAFR) decreased in two of the three years that are the subject of the current TDA Audit. While FY 09 experienced an increased PAFR, our long-term preventable accident trend continues to decrease. |
<p>| V-6  | 1.2. Identify Overtime/Straight Time Breakeven Point and use it in Staffing Decisions | The Scheduling and Finance Departments completed an analysis of overtime and straight time to determine the most cost-effective way to staff bus operators. The conclusion of this analysis was that the more overtime assigned to operators, the more cost-effective the service delivery would be. This is due to the fact that greater assignment of overtime would mean that fewer operators would be needed to deliver the service. The cost of providing additional operator benefits associated with each added operator position will always be higher than paying the higher rate for overtime worked. The constraints on scheduled overtime, therefore, are the 12-hour work day limit and any other nonfinancial operational concerns. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Performance Audit Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Actions Taken to Implement Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-6</td>
<td>1.3. Develop a Bus Fleet Management Plan</td>
<td>MTS Bus and MTS Contract Services have developed a bus fleet management plan that was accepted by the FTA in June 2009. This was an update of an ongoing effort to have a regionwide bus fleet management plan for MTS. The bus fleet management plan includes a bus inventory by operator, bus changes in a 12- to 24-month upcoming period, new bus acquisitions, old bus retirements, and spare ratio calculations. MTS Bus and Contract Services have worked diligently to retire old diesel buses and buses that have exceeded useful lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-7</td>
<td>1.4. Develop Additional Operator Performance Reporting</td>
<td>As listed in this category, MTS uses Ellipse or Excel to track all accidents, miss outs, sick leave use, Workers Compensation, and customer complaints per operator per year. This data is reviewed often and is used when considering candidate for promotion or operators involved in the disciplinary process. We have used these reports to good results and have greatly reduced our Workers Compensation experience and our customer complaints per 100,000 passengers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-8</td>
<td>1.5. Revise the Bus Operations Maintenance Plan</td>
<td>The 2009 vehicle maintenance plan provides standards for performance, facilities descriptions, employee ratios, and comprehensive preventive maintenance schedules. There are two facilities located throughout San Diego that perform preventive and/or corrective maintenance, cleaning and storage of vehicles. These facilities are Imperial Avenue Division (IAD) and Kearny Mesa Division (KMD). Both divisions provide repairs for all major components of the bus, including engine overhaul, transmission, and major body shop repair from accidents. The KMD facility is equipped with a state-of-the-art painting booth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-9</td>
<td>1.6. Re-evaluate the Adequacy of Service Operations Supervisor Staffing Levels</td>
<td>MTS increased supervisor staff size from nine to eleven during FY 07 and has since increased this staffing level to twelve. Adding FTEs to this critical function, combined with the anticipated service reduction, will increase the supervisor’s impact on the service. At the moment there is one supervisor budgeted for every 70,000 hours of revenue service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V-10 | 2. Rail operations should enhance the Fleet Management Plan | Rail operations has updated its fleet management plan to address the concerns cited in the FY 2004-2006 TDA Audit. The fleet management plan was revised in conjunction with a comprehensive rehabilitation plan for the oldest components of MTS’s rail infrastructure. This plan was approved by the Board of Directors in 2009. The highlights of the revised fleet management plan are:  
- Selection of the Siemens US-S70 for replacement of existing U-2 stock. MTS completed a procurement for a shorter, low-floor vehicle to replace its aging fleet in 2009. This new vehicle will permit the system to become entirely low-floor, while maintaining a train consist length operable within the City of San Diego block lengths. The operating plan was revised to create consists that would use at least one low-floor car per train consist throughout the system.  
- Creation of a fleet replacement plan. MTS has created a replacement plan and identified funding sources for its oldest U-2 fleet. The decision was made to replace all U-2s rather than rehabilitate them. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Performance Audit Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Actions Taken to Implement Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-10</td>
<td>2. Rail operations should enhance the Fleet Management Plan (cont’d)</td>
<td>▪ Revision of the current rail operating plan. MTS approved a revised operating plan in FY 2009 that would permit more efficient operation of the system, with a projected savings of $500,000 annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V-12 | 3. MTS should develop a workforce planning strategy | Recommendation #3 relates to MTS’s historical difficulty in hiring and retaining quality employees in both Bus and Rail operations. Low unemployment and the cost of living in the San Diego area and rigorous MTS standards have made it difficult to find quality staff to replace personnel who leave. With this in mind, MTS initiated a variety of strategies in keeping with an overall plan to develop its workforce to meet future agency needs. During the past several years, MTS’s financial challenges have forced a downsizing of management staff. Despite this development, MTS has enhanced its workforce and its succession position by implementing several management development initiatives.  
▪ Identified critical skills and competencies needed to achieve agency goals and key personnel to target for retention, development, and advancement.  
▪ Hired a full-time management development specialist to oversee all management development for the Agency, including, but not limited to, needs assessment, course development, and presentation.  
▪ Analyzed Agency’s key positions and developed an informal succession plan to increase the depth of the pool of possible replacements.  
▪ Sent management development specialist to be certified to present the “7 Habits of Highly Effective People” Signature Program course, who then trained all mid to senior management level employees.  
▪ Created a 16-week management course (which meets four hours twice per week) to shore up the skills of our existing front line supervisors in all departments.  
▪ Send newly promoted supervisors (mostly promoted from the union ranks) to receive intensive training to prepare them for routine supervisory challenges before they start their new jobs.  
▪ Researched, revised, and improved the entire MTS performance appraisal process.  
▪ Developed and presented training to all management employees on the new appraisal process.  
▪ Created an MTS management library so that management employees could check out resources.  
▪ Established a management development intranet site.  
▪ Developed and presented Myers Briggs Type Indicator workshops so that employees would understand themselves and deal with other employees better.  
▪ Developed new employee orientation program to improve the professionalism of the Agency and the initial impression of the new employee.  
▪ Offered several writing and e-mail etiquette courses.  
▪ Developed and presented communication training to management employees. |
3. MTS should develop a workforce planning strategy (cont’d)

- Developed “brown bag” lunch training in which employees bring lunch and watch interesting training videos.
- Presented self-development training (communication, dealing with conflict, etc.) to management employees.

MTS also has improved the way we recruit and train bus and train operators. Many prospective bus operators had expressed the desire to trade minor benefits for a higher starting wage. Accordingly, we negotiated a new pay and benefits scale for new hires. They now earn $14.57/hour (up from $10.87/hour). In exchange, they have sick leave capped at 8 days per year, vacation capped at 20 days per year, and their pensions capped at 2,150 hours per year (formerly unlimited).

Additionally, we take more time explaining the challenges of the position early in the recruitment process in an effort to weed out candidates that are unlikely to be successful. These efforts have improved the retention and the quality of the employees selected for hire. For example, we now

- Involve a member of the Training Department in the initial orientation presentation to prospective candidates.
  - Greater emphasis on the unpopular part of schedule, i.e., “splits,” weekends, holidays, etc.
  - Greater emphasis on the amount of memorization required.
  - Emphasis on the large number of routes that must be learned in a short amount of time.
  - Reference repeatedly throughout the orientation presentation the importance placed upon good attendance.
  - Greater emphasis on multitasking and giving examples:
    - Fare media
    - Radio communications, including ADA announcements
    - Following directions coming out of dispatch
    - Need to be constantly aware of surroundings
  - A successful candidate is expected to be able to operate a bus within five days of actual on-the-job training onboard the bus.
  - Greater emphasis on physical demands of job at orientation.
  - Discuss the operator’s lead role in safety evacuations.
    - Use the example of a bus fire so applicants unable to perform this work function will individually opt out of process.
    - Drivers might have to pick up passengers that are wheel chair-bound.

- Bus operator candidates selected for interview:
  - Encourage them to ride the bus so that they have a better understanding of the challenges of the position. Interviewers ask them questions regarding their bus riding experience.
  - Transportation division manager participates on interview panel and helps select candidates.

As a result of the above initiatives, we are fully staffed in all positions and have reduced employee turnover.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-14</td>
<td>4. MTS should monitor performance of MTS services in National City and provide regular progress updates to the Board</td>
<td>MTS, via the Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA), restructured services in National City in 2007. On March 4, 2007, the buses and some support equipment owned by MTS and leased to National City Transit (NCT) operations was transferred to MTS South Bay Division. All restructured services in the National City area were contracted by MTS to Veolia Transportation via the South Bay Division (large bus service), plus a couple minibus routes contracted to Southland Transportation. All equipment on MTS’s fixed asset inventory that was owned by MTS and leased to National City was recovered and turned over to Veolia Transportation South Bay Division on the March 4, 2007, turnover date. All National City Transit buses had been inspected and most of the repairs and defects had been corrected by National City Transit prior to transfer. Following March 4, 2007, Veolia Transportation inspected all 14 buses transferred from NCT and corrected any remaining defects or cosmetic work required, such as decals and painting. Many of the former National City Transit employees chose to accept positions at MTS. Consolidation of the National City bus services was seamless. The 40 percent increase in bus service in National City that was implemented under the COA provided customers with better connections throughout the region and better access to the entire MTS network. MTS's contractors continue to provide excellent service to the City. While in the initial months of implementation, staff provided regular updates on operations to the Board and Executive Committee. In a very short time the operation had been so well integrated that the reports were unnecessary. Performance on National City routes is now monitored and reported along with the entire network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-15</td>
<td>5. MTS should continue internal efforts to improve the accuracy of the performance data reported to SANDAG on B-10/11/12 forms and work with SANDAG to establish a process for “finalizing” the reports once audited data are available</td>
<td>MTS has internally improved its own data collection and auditing system. Data is being centrally input into an electronic database. Migrating to this improved collection method has provided better access to data when completing the B-10/11/12 forms. When new data is submitted on these forms, SANDAG is notified. There is better collaboration between the two agencies on data collection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Page 3 of 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Performance Audit Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Actions Taken to Implement Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-4</td>
<td>Improve procedures for capturing transit-related incidents at BREEZE bus stops and on BREEZE buses</td>
<td>NCTD regularly documents and reports crimes and incidents that occur on BREEZE buses and at NCTD transit centers. Bus stops other than at NCTD transit centers are the property of the city (or County of San Diego for unincorporated areas) that the stop is located in. As such, crimes and incidents occurring at those stops are handled and reported by the law enforcement agency for that jurisdiction. NCTD is now working more closely with these law enforcement agencies so that NCTD is notified of such activities and can include them in its reporting systems. NCTD also is working with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and law enforcement agencies to establish a centralized database containing summaries of transit crimes throughout the County. NCTD currently utilizes TransitSafe software to track train-related incidents. As part of its transition to full outsourcing of BREEZE services to First Transit (effective 7/1/2010), NCTD is currently evaluating whether to expand the use of TransitSafe for the reporting of BREEZE incidents or whether to utilize First Transit’s in-house software for tracking such incidents. Software systems will be in place when First Transit assumes responsibility for BREEZE operations on July 1, 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V-5  | Prepare a Business Plan to guide service delivery strategies in the post-SPRINTER service environment | 1. NCTD restructured BREEZE bus services concurrent with SPRINTER implementation to reduce service duplication and provide feeder service to the SPRINTER line.  
2. NCTD tracks performance of each of its services relative to specified performance objectives and reports summary performance data to its Board quarterly. Performance indicators reported are: passenger trips, revenue service hours, farebox recovery, and subsidy per passenger.  
3. NCTD prepared a new Service Implementation Plan (SIP) in 2009 for SANDAG, which reviews SPRINTER performance.  
4. NCTD will complete a Before-and-After Study, required by FTA as part of the post-SPRINTER evaluation, once two years of SPRINTER ridership data becomes available in March 2010.  
5. NCTD broadened the Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) scope as a recommendation form the SIP to evaluate NCTD services in the context of NCTD’s current fiscal situation and identify change to service types and delivery methods going forward.  
6. NCTD has prepared a Draft FY2011 Business Plan, which will be presented to NCTD’s Executive Committee in May and to the Board of Directors for approval in conjunction with the FY2011 Budget in June. |
| V-7  | Develop a policy to reduce no shows and improve efficiency and effectiveness on FAST | No longer applicable. Due to severe funding reductions by the state and reductions in sales tax revenues from the downturn in the economy, all FAST service was eliminated in August 2008. FAST services had low service productivity relative to other NCTD services. |
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Goal 2: Improve Bicycling Safety

Improve bicycling safety by increasing education and training opportunities for cyclists, pedestrians, motorists, and professionals whose work impacts the roadway environment, and by promoting enforcement of traffic laws to reduce bicycle-related conflicts.
Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors:
(1) adopt the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Attachment 1) for the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan; and
(2) approve the Final Draft San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Attachment 2).

Riding to 2050:
San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan

May 21, 2010
May 21, 2010

SANDAG Transportation Committee
401 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: ITEM 5, RIDING TO 2050: SAN DIEGO REGIONAL BICYCLE PLAN – FINAL DRAFT

Dear members of the Transportation Committee:

Move San Diego could not be at the hearing today as we are co-hosting a Bike to Work pit stop with the San Diego Regional Sustainability partnership in Hillcrest this morning.

The 2050 Regional Bicycle Plan gets San Diegans moving the right direction. The proposed Regional Bicycle Network consisting of 515 miles of bicycle facilities identified in this plan are sorely needed to improve our overall health and mobility in the region. We applaud SANDAG staff for bringing a comprehensive plan that works to achieve sustainable transportation and mobility options that protects the safety and well being of cyclists and drivers alike. This plan will also help achieve one of the most critical components of a Sustainable Communities’ Strategy by interlinking our transit and cycling networks which will substantially reduce our regional greenhouse gas emissions.

This plan puts the region in the right direction for improving health through active transportation. Forty years ago, more than half of children walked and bicycled to school, contributing to exercise and good health. Today, less than 15 percent of children walk or bike school, with the rest ferried by school buses or car. Children who have access to safe, convenient and ample walking and bicycling opportunities in their community develop active transportation habits that can last a lifetime.

Move San Diego asks that SANDAG’s next steps include taking a serious look at our funding options in order to enhance and preserve our expansive regional bike network. Investing into a sustainable transportation system identified in this plan will more than double our return on healthy communities, job creation, increased mobility, and enhanced neighborhood quality of life. Instead of continuing to throw money to highway widening projects and congestion relief policies, taxpayers want new investments (especially with our Transnet dollars) on sustainable transportation solutions such as increased access to high-performing transit and a
comprehensive and viable bicycle network such as the one before you today.

From the federal level to the state level, policy decisions are being made that positively impact bicycling. The time is now we become more bike friendly, and implement the Complete Streets policies that SANDAG and some of your cities have adopted. CCDC’s Centre City Green Program has a new Green Streets initiative that will support the Regional Bike plan efforts as well.

Recently DOT Secretary Ray LaHood has set out a new list of key recommendations for state DOTs and communities:

- Treat walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes.
- Ensure convenient access for people of all ages and abilities.
- Go beyond minimum design standards.
- Collect data on walking and biking trips.
- Set a mode share target for walking and bicycling.
- Improve non-motorized facilities during maintenance projects.

Move San Diego sincerely appreciates the time and effort spent on the 2050 Regional Bicycle Plan as it puts the wheels in motion for creating a truly mobile and sustainable community. We also look forward to coordinating with SANDAG and our other regional partners in producing long term funding solutions for these projects so we can continue heading in the right direction.

Sincerely,

Elyse W. Lowe

Elyse Lowe
Executive Director, Move San Diego

EL:nb
2050 RTP Goals

Reliability
Mobility
System Preservation & Safety
Prosperous Economy
Social Equity
Healthy Environment

2050 RTP
Proposed Plan Performance Measures

Goals and Policy Objectives

Plan Performance Measures

Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria

Network Development

Quality of Travel & Livability 2030 RTP Measures

- Average travel time by mode
- Average travel speed by mode
- Trip accessibility by mode
- Travel time & mode share (key travel corridors/communities)
- Out-of-pocket user costs per trip
- Congestion (peak and all day)
- Vehicle/truck delay
- Crashes/fatalities
Quality of Travel & Livability
Proposed New Measures

• Interregional transit routes by service type
• VMT by travel speed
• Freight network enhancements by mode
• Percent of transportation investments towards maintenance and rehabilitation
• Percent of transportation investments towards operational improvements

Sustainability
2030 RTP Measures

• Environmental Justice (EJ) and non-EJ Populations
  – Average travel time by mode
  – Trip accessibility by mode
  – Percent of homes within ½ mile of a transit stop
• Fuel consumption
• Smog forming pollutants
Sustainability
2030 RTP Measures (Continued)

- VMT per capita
- Transit passenger miles per capita
- Percent of trips within a ½ mile of a transit stop (peak-period and all day)
- Work trip mode share (peak-period & all day including bike/walk)

Sustainability
Proposed New Measures

- Percent of population (EJ and non-EJ) within 30 minutes of:
  - Schools
  - San Diego International Airport
- Percent of population (EJ and non-EJ) within 15 minutes of:
  - Healthcare
  - Parks
- Distribution of RTP Expenditures
- Non work trip mode share (peak-period and all day including bike/walk)
Sustainability
Proposed New Measures (Continued)

• Total bike and walk trips
• CO₂ emissions per capita
• Net benefits
• Return on investment
• Economic impacts

Next Steps

June 2010 – The Transportation Committee will be asked to recommend the 2050 RTP performance measures to the Board of Directors for approval
Target Housing Areas & Metro Naval Bases

MURPHY CANYON HOUSING

- Naval Station San Diego - 68% (3,251)
- Pt Loma Sub Base 16% - (792)
- NASNI - 13% (628)
- Downtown - 3% (139)
Murphy Canyon Housing Survey Results

- **Existing commuting patterns**

![Car](image)

- **94% Drive alone**
- **1% Currently use transit**

### 5:00 to 7:00 a.m.
- Leave Home

### 6:00 to 7:30 a.m.
- Start Time

### 2:30 to 5:00 p.m.
- Head Home

---

### Murphy Canyon Housing Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Slightly Interested</th>
<th>Not at all Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naval Air Station North Island</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Amphibious Base</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Mine and Anti-Submarine Warfare Command</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Base Point Loma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Base San Diego</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Hospital Balboa</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Murphy Canyon to Naval Base San Diego

Murphy Canyon to Naval Air Station North Island
Comparison of Pilot Alternatives

Murphy Canyon Housing Cluster to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Naval Base San Diego</th>
<th>Naval Air Station North Island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Commuters</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated One-way Route Length (Miles)</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>20.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time to First On-Base Stop</td>
<td>25-Minutes</td>
<td>33-Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Annual Cost</td>
<td>$189,000</td>
<td>$246,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TIP Participants Required to Fund Service</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of Naval Base San Diego

Security Protocols
- Operators
- Supervisors
- Mechanics

Entrance and Exit Gate Access Points

Refined On Base Alignment (Direct)
- Remain on base’s main arterial street
- 10-15 minute travel time
- ¼ mile maximum walk
Financial Framework

Navy Transportation Incentive Program

Express Service

Funding Agreement

Operating Agreement

Potential Start of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval to Proceed</th>
<th>September 5, 2010</th>
<th>MTS Shake-up</th>
<th>January 30, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/10</td>
<td>07/10</td>
<td>08/10</td>
<td>09/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP Issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Initial efforts needed for threshold participants
- Continuing efforts
Next Steps

- Finalize operational details and promotional fare for the service
- Enter into inter-agency agreements for funding and operations
- Initiate collaborative marketing efforts
- Complete participant enrollment
- Implement pilot service (fall 2010)
- Monitor and evaluate pilot program performance

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the implementation of a proposed pilot limited express transit service from the Murphy Canyon military housing area to Naval Base San Diego for a period of one year beginning in fall 2010.
I-805 Corridor Projects
Planned Freeway and Transit Improvements

SANDAG Transportation Committee
May 21, 2010
Background
- I-805 opened to traffic in the early 1970s
- Commuter route
- Intra-regional travel
- Inter-regional travel
- Goods movement via Otay Mesa Port of Entry

I-805 Corridor Projects
Project Need

Growth in Future Travel Demand
- Operates at LOS F during peak periods
- Population growth, job growth, travel growth
- Provide multi-modal alternatives
I-805 Corridor Projects
Project Description

- HOV/Express Lanes on I-805 from Palomar Street to the I-805/I-5 interchange (Torrey Pines area)
- HOV Lanes on SR 94 from SR 94/I-805 interchange to Downtown San Diego
- Improved interim Transit Only Lanes on I-805 from Telegraph Canyon Road to Mira Mesa Boulevard
- South Bay BRT route from the US/Mexico Otay Mesa Border to Downtown San Diego
I-805 Corridor Projects
South Bay Bus Rapid Transit

Improvements

• 21 mile Bus Rapid Transit route
• 12 new stations
• 10-15 minute frequency
• Premium service

I-805 Corridor Projects
South Bay Bus Rapid Transit

Project Progress

• Project Location:
  - Otay Mesa Port of Entry to Downtown San Diego via I-805/SR 94

• Project Schedule:
  - Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA/ED) complete mid-2011
  - Phased implementation starting in 2014
  - Complete 2020

• Project Funding:
  - Phase 1: TransNet
  - Phase 2: No programmed funding at this time
I-805 Corridor Projects
South Segment

2 HOV / 4 Express Lane System
• Direct Access Ramps
• In-Line Stations
• Intermediate Access Points
• HOV to HOV Direct Connectors
I-805 Corridor Projects
South Segment

Project Progress

- Project Location:
  - Palomar Street to SR 15

- Project Schedule:
  - Project approval and environmental document (PA/ED) complete Spring 2011

- Project Funding:
  - First phase of design currently funded
    (1 HOV in each direction & Palomar DAR)
  - Construction funding not programmed at this time
I-805 Corridor Projects
State Route 94
2 HOV Lane System
• Intermediate Access Points
• HOV to HOV Direct Connectors

Legend
- State Route 94
- 2 HOV lanes added to existing general purpose lanes
- South Bay Bus Rapid Transit and stops
- In-line transit stations
- HOV Direct Connector
Project Progress
- Project Location: Downtown to I-805
- Project Schedule: Project approval and environmental document 2013
- Project Funding: Preliminary Design and Environmental document funded with Transportation Congestion Relief Program funds
  - Design partially funded. Construction not programmed at this time

I-805 Corridor Projects
State Route 94

2 HOV / 4 Express Lane System
- Direct Access Ramps
- Intermediate Access Points
- HOV to HOV Direct Connectors
- Design Phase 1
  - South Facing Direct Access Ramp
  - 1 HOV in each direction

I-805 Corridor Projects
North Segment
I-805 Corridor Projects
North Segment

Legend

- North Segment: 4 Express Lanes added to Existing General Purpose Lanes
- Bus Rapid Transit Station
- Park & Ride lots
- Direct Access Ramp
- Localizer (BLI) on I-805
- HOV Direct Connector

I-805 Corridor Project
Carroll Canyon Extension Project
Looking Southwest at Proposed Carroll Canyon Road Extension
Project Progress

- Project Location:
  - SR 52 to north of Mira Mesa Blvd.
- Project Schedule:
  - Project approval and environmental document complete - late 2010
- Requesting design funding of $16 Million for Phase 1
- Project Funding:
  - Construction not programmed at this time
I-805 Corridor Projects
Vehicle Assist and Automation / Transit Only Lanes

Pilot Project
• Striped for Transit Only
• Variable cruise control
• Lane keeping
• Reliable service
• New Schedule – mid-2011
I-805 Corridor Projects
Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to:

Recommend to the Board of Directors that $16 million of TransNet funding be allocated to the design of the initial phase of the I-805 North Segment.

Move the baseline schedule for the open-to-public date for the Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service project to May 2011.
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

May 21, 2010

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 8

Action Requested: RECOMMEND AND APPROVE

INTERSTATE 805 CORRIDOR UPDATE, PROPOSED BUDGET INCREASE, AND SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT

File Number 1280500

Introduction

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are jointly working on the Interstate 805 (I-805) Corridor improvements that are included in the TransNet Early Action Program. This report provides an update on the progress, including a request for design funding for the I-805 North Segment and a request to delay the schedule for the Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service project.

Discussion

I-805 Corridor improvements extend from Otay Mesa to Sorrento Valley in San Diego County. The I-805 Corridor currently contains four project segments: the South Segment from Palomar Street in Chula Vista to State Route (SR) 15, including SR 94 between I-805 and Downtown San Diego; the North Segment from SR 52 to Interstate 5; South Bay Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); and the Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service project. Proposed project improvements consist of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, Managed Lanes, transit service, direct connectors, direct access ramps (DARs), and transit stations.

South Segment

Environmental studies have been completed for HOV/Managed Lanes on I-805 between Palomar Street and I-15. The draft environmental document is scheduled to be released in May 2010[July 2010], with environmental clearance in October 2010[March 2011]. In July 2009 SANDAG allocated $15 million to complete the design of two HOV lanes between Palomar Street and SR 94. The design is scheduled to be complete in November 2011. A schedule for construction will be established once construction funding is allocated. The cost to complete the two HOV lanes is currently estimated at $140 million (2010 $.s). The future four Managed Lanes would be built by 2020 according to the schedule in the Regional Transportation Plan.

The project study report (feasibility study) for HOV lanes on SR 94 between I-805 and Downtown San Diego was completed in April 2008. In July 2009 SANDAG allocated $1 million of TransNet

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board of Directors that $16 million of TransNet funding be allocated to the design of the initial phase of the I-805 North Segment. The Transportation Committee also is asked to move the baseline schedule for the open-to-public date for the Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service project to May 2011.

**REVISED**
funding to conduct environmental and engineering studies. The $1 million was combined with $10 million of Transportation Congestion Relief Program funding, fully funding the environmental phase. The draft environmental document is scheduled to be complete in March 2012, with environmental clearance in March 2013.

Construction began in September 2009 on an I-805 auxiliary lane between SR 54 and Bonita Road/E Street. The new southbound auxiliary lane is scheduled to be open to the public in October 2010. The $7.4 million project is being funded in part by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. No TransNet funds were used on this project.

North Segment

Bids were opened on April 30, 2010, for the construction of HOV lanes on I-805 between Carroll Canyon Road and the I-5/I-805 merge. The project was jointly developed by Caltrans, the City of San Diego, and SANDAG. The project includes the extension of Carroll Canyon Road under I-805 and the construction of a north-facing DAR. The north-facing DAR will provide direct access between Carroll Canyon Road and the I-805 HOV lanes. The apparent low bidder is Coffman Specialties, Inc., with a bid of $50,474,442.50. The bid is 2 percent above the Engineer’s Estimate. The new HOV lanes and DAR are scheduled to be open to the public in June 2012.

Environmental studies have been completed for the HOV/Managed Lanes on I-805 between SR 52 and the I-5/I-805 merge. The draft environmental document has been completed, and the public hearing was held on February 23, 2010. Caltrans is in the process of incorporating comments received into the final environmental document. The design phase for initial phase construction must be fully funded before Caltrans can approve the final environmental document and environmentally clear the project.

Staff is proposing to fully fund the design of a portion of the planned improvement, including HOV lanes between SR 52 and Carroll Canyon Road and also the design of the south-facing DAR at Carroll Canyon Road. This would provide a 13-mile stretch of continuous HOV lanes on I-5/I-805 from Manchester Avenue to SR 52 and provide HOV access to Carroll Canyon Road to and from the south. The Carroll Canyon extension and DAR will provide a much-needed secondary HOV access to Sorrento Valley from I-805. The I-805 Mira Mesa Boulevard interchange is currently the primary access and is heavily congested. Staff is recommending that $16 million of TransNet funding be allocated to the I-805 North project for the initial design phase. This would provide a much-needed, shovel-ready project and allow Caltrans to environmentally clear all of the planned HOV/Managed Lanes improvements planned for the North Segment.

South Bay BRT

This new 21-mile BRT service will connect the Otay Mesa international border crossing with downtown San Diego via eastern Chula Vista. New transit access will be afforded to regional employment centers in downtown San Diego, the Otay Mesa Business Park, and the future Eastern Urban Center as well as to residential communities in Chula Vista and National City. Environmental studies are underway and the draft environmental document is scheduled to be complete in December 2010, with environmental clearance scheduled for August 2011.
Vehicle Assist Automation/Bus On Shoulder Service

In September 2008 SANDAG was awarded an $18 million grant from the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration to demonstrate lane-keeping adaptive cruise-control technology for commuter bus service between Chula Vista and Sorrento Valley. SANDAG matched this grant with $4.5 million of TransNet funds. In April 2009 Caltrans granted SANDAG permission to run the adaptive busses on the inside I-805 shoulders for a two-year demonstration period. SANDAG and Caltrans are currently in the process of procuring the technology needed to outfit the buses. The original baseline schedule called for opening to the public in September 2009. Obtaining the necessary permissions and procuring the technology have proven more challenging than originally estimated. Staff is asking that the baseline schedule be reestablished with a new open-to-public date of May 2011.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contact: Joel Haven, (619) 220-7377, Joel_Haven@dot.ca.gov
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Transit Ridership and Gas Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1st Qtr FY07</th>
<th>2nd Qtr FY07</th>
<th>3rd Qtr FY07</th>
<th>4th Qtr FY07</th>
<th>1st Qtr FY08</th>
<th>2nd Qtr FY08</th>
<th>3rd Qtr FY08</th>
<th>4th Qtr FY08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1st Qtr FY08</th>
<th>2nd Qtr FY08</th>
<th>3rd Qtr FY08</th>
<th>4th Qtr FY08</th>
<th>1st Qtr FY09</th>
<th>2nd Qtr FY09</th>
<th>3rd Qtr FY09</th>
<th>4th Qtr FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gas price</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Ridership and Revenue Miles

Transit Ridership and Jobs
Fixed Route Composite Performance Index

ADA Services Composite Performance Index
Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors find that the Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District made a reasonable effort to implement productivity improvements during FY 2010 and to concur that the productivity evaluation process fulfills TDA requirements.
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