TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
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• 2010 TransNet PLAN OF FINANCE UPDATE

• DESTINATION LINDBERGH - INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION CENTER UPDATE
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MISSION STATEMENT

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
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(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, July 2, 2010

ITEM #                     RECOMMENDATION

+1. APPROVAL OF JUNE 18, 2010, MEETING MINUTES APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMUNICATIONS/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 through 4)

+3. CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM: LOS ANGELES TO SAN DIEGO VIA INLAND EMPIRE SECTION QUARTERLY UPDATE (Linda Culp) INFORMATION

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is the state agency responsible for planning, constructing, and operating a high-speed train system serving California’s major metropolitan areas. The proposed system stretches over 800 miles and would connect San Diego, Los Angeles, the Central Valley, San Francisco, and Sacramento using a state-of-the-art, electrified system capable of speeds in excess of 200 miles per hour. SANDAG continues to monitor the work on the CHSRA. This report is the regular quarterly update to the Transportation Committee.

+4. FEDERAL SECTION 5310 PROGRAM AWARDS (Danielle Kochman) INFORMATION

A state review committee has released the recommendations of projects to be funded through the Elderly and Disabled Transit Program to be considered by the California Transportation Commission. This report will summarize the projects recommended for funding in San Diego County.

REPORTS (5 through 9)

+5. 2010 TransNet PLAN OF FINANCE UPDATE (Kim Kawada) DISCUSSION

Staff will update the Transportation Committee on work to date on the Plan of Finance, including updated program-level analysis of the current TransNet Early Action Program of projects and possible financial scenarios for future consideration. The Transportation Committee is asked to discuss the initial scenarios that have been run for the 2010 Plan of Finance and provide direction to staff.
+6. DESTINATION LINDBERGH - INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION CENTER UPDATE (Dave Schumacher)  INFORMATION

Staff has been developing site plan concepts for the Intermodal Transportation Center based on the Destination Lindbergh Master Plan that would shift the airport terminal location to the northside of Lindbergh Field. The report will highlight the long-range and phase site plan options, coordination with the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority’s northside improvements and long-range planning efforts, and next step actions.

+7. MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT – UPDATE ON SCOPING PERIOD AND SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS (Leslie Blanda)  INFORMATION

Staff will provide a report on the status of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit project. The report will provide an overview of the project, describe the scope and schedule of the current phase of project development, and describe the upcoming project development phases.

+8. FY 2010 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE ALLOCATION (Sookyung Kim)  RECOMMEND

The State Transit Assistance (STA) is a state program administered locally that provides support for public transit services. Although the FY 2010 state budget included a provision that eliminated this fund source for three years, in March of this year the Governor signed into law ABx86 and ABx89 which restores the STA program. The State Controller’s Office transmitted the final STA allocations in a letter dated June 22, 2010. North County Transit District (NCTD) approved this item at its May meeting in anticipation of this action and has submitted a claim to seek the payment. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2011-01, approving the FY 2010 STA claim for NCTD in substantially the same form as attached to the report.

+9. 2008 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT NO. 27 (Sookyung Kim)  APPROVE

The 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is the multiyear program of proposed major highway, arterial, transit, and bikeway projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2009 to FY 2013. SANDAG processes amendments to the RTIP generally on a quarterly basis and occasionally on a more frequent basis as circumstances arise. SANDAG is processing Amendment No. 27 on an urgent basis. The state notified SANDAG that additional federal funds (Regional Surface Transportation Program [RSTP]) are available for FY 2010 but that it must be obligated in the current year. SANDAG worked with Caltrans to exchange TransNet with RSTP in order to ensure that the region does not lose this funding. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Amendment No. 27 to the 2008 RTIP.
10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, July 16, 2010, at 9 a.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF JUNE 18, 2010

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Vice Chair Matt Hall (North County Coastal) at 9:01 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 Mayor Jim Desmond (North County Inland), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the June 4, 2010, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Omar Passans, representing Sustainable Entertainment, provided information about the park-to-park shuttle; a private micro transit model in the Mid-City area of San Diego. This is an effort to find a way to give people a socially and environmentally responsible way to enjoy the communities in this city.

Bob Campbell, Chair, North County Transit District (NCTD), noted information about the vigorous screening of NCTD transit vehicle drivers.

Councilmember Todd Gloria (City of San Diego), stated that neighborhoods want entertainment oriented transit.

Vice Chair Hall introduced new Southern California Tribal Chairmens Association (SCTCA) representative, Dave Tolar.

REPORTS (3 through 8)

3. JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE AND NEW FREEDOM PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA (APPROVE)

In 2008, the Transportation Committee approved revisions to the evaluation and scoring criteria for the Job Access and Reverse Commute and New Freedom federal grant programs.

Dan Levy, Senior Regional Planner, presented the staff report.
Bob Campbell, NCTD Chair, recused himself from voting on this matter due to his association with the NCTD Board and the FACT Board.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Desmond (North County Inland) and a second by Tom Smisek (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority), the Transportation Committee approved the New Freedom and Job Access and Reverse Commute evaluation and scoring criteria, as outlined in Attachments 1 and 2 to the agenda report, respectively, for the 2010-2011 competitive grant process (federal fiscal year 2010 funding) anticipated to begin in June 2010.

4. **DRAFT FY 2011 TRANSPORT AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (APPROVE)**

Richard Hannasch, NCTD Finance Director, and Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer of Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), presented a summary of their FY 2011 budgets, including the use of contingency reserves and a five-year forecast of operations.

Mr. Jablonski also announced an opportunity to purchase 25 ticket vending machines (TVMs) as a tag-on to an order with the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LAMTA), which will provide a cost savings. However, this purchase needs to be approved by the MTS Board.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Vice Chair Hall and a second by Mayor Desmond, the Transportation Committee approved the NCTD and MTS FY 2011 operating budgets for funding, with final budgets subject to approval by the respective transit district boards.

5. **2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES (RECOMMEND)**

Scott Strelecki, Associate Regional Planner, presented the proposed plan performance measures that have been developed for use in the preparation of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Chair Jack Dale (East County) noted there was one request to speak on this item.

Nathan Batchelder, representing Move San Diego, asked the Committee to consider more non-motorized performance metrics and a reduction of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) energy consumption.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Jim King (South County) and a second by NCTD Chair Campbell, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the 2050 RTP performance measures, in substantially the same form as attached to the report.

6. **PROPOSED FY 2011 BUDGET AMENDMENT: LOSSAN BRIDGE REPLACEMENTS (RECOMMEND)**

The U.S. Navy would like to reconstruct two bridges along the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) corridor in Camp Pendleton to allow larger vehicles to pass
underneath the bridges. This item authorizes the Executive Director to enter into agreements with the Navy to fully fund this work and to amend the FY 2011 budget accordingly.

Bill Prey, Construction Manager, presented the staff report.

Harry Mathis, MTS Chair asked that the motion be amended to include future evaluation of double tracking in the LOSSAN corridor. This suggestion was agreed to by the maker and second of the motion.

**Action:** Upon a motion by NCTD Chair Campbell and a second by Mayor Desmond, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to enter into agreements with the Naval Facilities Engineering Command to fully fund the project development and reconstruction of LOSSAN bridges: 208.6 at Green Beach; and 218 at Red Beach, and amend the FY 2011 budget accordingly; and directed staff to include in future evaluations double tracking in the LOSSAN corridor.

7. BLUE AND ORANGE TROLLEY LINE CORRIDOR UPDATE (INFORMATION)

John Haggerty, Principal Design Engineer, provided a progress update on the capital program for procuring new low-floor light rail vehicles, upgrading stations, and rehabilitating rail infrastructure on the San Diego Trolley system. The program update included freight capacity projects on the rail line between San Diego and San Ysidro including environmental status.

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

8. INTERSTATE 5 NORTH COAST CORRIDOR PROJECT UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Allan Kosup, Caltrans Corridor Director, presented an update on the Interstate 5 (I-5) North Coast Corridor, including the project development efforts underway and the upcoming release of the Draft Environmental Document.

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

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, July 2, 2010, at 9 a.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Dale adjourned the meeting at 11:13 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Carl Hilliard</td>
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<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jim Desmond</td>
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<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Carrie Downey</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim King</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Anthony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Todd Gloria</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Marti Emerald</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Greg Cox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Jerry Rindone</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Bob Campbell</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Dave Roberts</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Carl Hilliard</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Snizek</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Panknin</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Albert Phoenix</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Toler</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Francine Kupsch</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome Stocks</td>
<td>Vice Chair BoD</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: INFORMATION

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM: LOS ANGELES TO SAN DIEGO VIA INLAND EMPIRE SECTION QUARTERLY UPDATE

File Number 3101200

Introduction

Since 1993, the State of California has authorized the study of an intercity, high-speed train (HST) system that will connect the state's metropolitan areas, including San Diego. The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is the statewide agency charged with the planning and construction of this system. SANDAG and corridor planning agencies continue to work cooperatively with the CHSRA to advance San Diego’s HST corridor.

The passage of Proposition 1A in November 2008 resulted in $9 billion in bond funds for the entire statewide network. While the CHSRA has set the initial Phase 1 from Anaheim to San Francisco, work is continuing on all sections including San Diego’s. In February, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) announced $2.25 billion in federal stimulus grants will be awarded to the CHSRA for its Phase 1 corridors. None of these grants will be used on the Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire section. In May, the CHSRA submitted a request for $16.6 million federal rail planning funds for the three Phase 2 corridors, with the San Diego section scheduled to receive the largest share. Awards are expected in early fall.

The Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire HST section is 160 miles long, and traverses four counties and more than 100 local jurisdictions (Attachment 1). Currently, this section is in the Alternatives Analysis phase of the Project-level Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). A Preliminary Alternatives Analysis report is scheduled for release by the CHSRA for public comment on September 2, 2010, with completion of the EIR/EIS scheduled for 2014. Attachment 2 shows the alternatives currently under study for the San Diego portion.

SANDAG is one member of the Southern California High-Speed Rail Inland Corridor Group, or SoCal ICG, which is comprised of regional planning agencies along the section. This group meets monthly and is the coordinating group along with the CHSRA that is guiding the project level work over the next three years.

The San Diego County Technical Working Group (TWG), including staff from the corridor jurisdictions, Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit System, and North County Transit District, met in May to review the draft alignments and design options. Similar groups met in Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties. More than 650 comments were received and will be used in the preliminary alternatives analysis document.
Discussion

SOCAL ICG

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA), Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), and San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), in addition to SANDAG and the CHSRA, have approved a Memorandum of Understanding to formalize this cooperative working relationship to advance the Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire HST Corridor. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority is a participating agency. Together, these agencies make up the SoCal ICG and are guiding the project-specific environmental effort over the next three years.

Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire HST Section and Upcoming Activities

Attachments 1 and 2 show the proposed HST alignments, design options and station locations currently under study, including alignments from the final programmatic environmental document certified in 2005, preliminary options proposed by regional agencies and stakeholders in 2009, alternatives requested through the formal project scoping period last fall, and TWG comments.

Other work over the next quarter will focus on:

• The CHSRA Board of Directors will meet in Los Angeles on July 8, 2010.
• Focused meetings with key corridor city staffs to discuss alignments and design options.
• Release of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis document at the CHSRA Board of Directors meeting on September 2, 2010, for public comment.

Related Planning Work

The same consultant team that is working on the main HST section also is assisting SANDAG on the Airport Multimodal Accessibility Plan (AMAP), required by SB 10 (2007), to be completed in FY 2011. The AMAP is to be conducted in cooperation with the SDCRAA and will address ground access improvements to airports that are under development through the SDCRAA’s Regional Aviation Strategic Plan (RASP). Major findings from the AMAP and RASP will be completed in FY 2011, in time for inclusion in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan.

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

Attachments: 1. Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire High-Speed Train Segment  
2. Alternative Alignments in San Diego County

Key Staff Contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957, lcu@sandag.org
CAHST Los Angeles to San Diego via the Inland Empire Section
Alternative Alignments
FEDERAL SECTION 5310 PROGRAM AWARDS

Introduction

Section 5310 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) provides funding for social service agencies to purchase vehicles and related equipment that are used to transport elderly persons and persons with disabilities. The federal grant funds are distributed to the states, which then accept applications from nonprofit agencies and eligible public agencies. Awards are made based on the scores received from local and state review of the applications. This year, approximately $13.1 million was available statewide.

Discussion

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the San Diego region, SANDAG is responsible for the local scoring of the applications received for the region. The Board of Directors has delegated responsibility to the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) to act as the Local Review Committee for the federal Section 5310 review process. At the May 18, 2009, meeting, SSTAC selected members to serve on the Local Review Committee to review applications for FY 2008-2009 Section 5310 funding. The Local Review Committee completed the review of 20 project applications from 6 applicant agencies. Seventeen applications were for vehicles, and three applications were for related equipment. The applications were scored according to the state’s required criteria. SSTAC approved the Local Review Committee scores at its meeting on July 20, 2009, and on July 31, 2009, the Transportation Committee endorsed the scores for the 20 projects awarded by the Local Review Committee for FY 2008-2009 federal Section 5310 program funding, finding that the applications were in conformance with the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.

Upon endorsement of the scores by the Transportation Committee, the applications were forwarded to Caltrans. Statewide, eligible agencies submitted 86 applications for 325 projects requesting a total of $16.1 million in program funds. The State Review Committee, convened by Caltrans, reviewed the scores and developed a draft FY 2008-2009 Statewide Prioritized Project List. This list includes projects down to a 110 percent level of available funding to allow for some flexibility if projects higher up on the list are not deliverable, or if additional funding becomes available. On April 8, 2010, the California Transportation Commission adopted the Statewide Prioritized Project List. Attachment 1 includes the projects from San Diego County included in the Statewide Program of Projects for the Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Elderly and Disabled Transit Program. Eighteen projects in San Diego County were awarded a total of $962,923 in federal funds for this program. Although less funding was available statewide this year, San Diego County projects had a higher success rate of being funded than in recent years. The region was awarded $87,000 more than last year with 90 percent of projects submitted being approved for funding, compared with last year’s 51 percent.
Next Steps

An amendment to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program to include the 18 projects in the adopted Program of Projects will be presented for the Transportation Committee's consideration at its July 16, 2010, meeting.

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

Attachment: 1. Section 5310 Grant Applications for FY 2008-2009 - Adopted Program of Projects

Key Staff Contact: Danielle Kochman, (619) 699-1921, dko@sandag.org
Section 5310 Grant Applications  
FY 2008-2009  
Adopted Program of Projects

Following are the scores for the applications from San Diego County included in the adopted FY 2008-2009 Section 5310 Program of Projects. This federally funded program provides vehicles and other equipment for nonprofit and qualified public agencies to transport senior citizens and persons with disabilities. Agencies from San Diego County submitted 18 applications, of which 16 scored high enough to be included in the Program of Projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total (100 points)</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharp Healthcare Foundation</td>
<td>Type IA Bus</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Shadow Support Group</td>
<td>Type III Bus</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Shadow Support Group</td>
<td>Wheelchair Restraint System (12)</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Services Continuum</td>
<td>Minivan</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp Healthcare Foundation</td>
<td>Minivan</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Shadow Support Group</td>
<td>Type III Bus</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Link Foundation</td>
<td>Type III Bus</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Link Foundation</td>
<td>Type III Bus</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Link Foundation</td>
<td>Type III Bus</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Link Foundation</td>
<td>Type III Bus</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Shadow Support Group</td>
<td>Type III Bus</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Elderlink</td>
<td>Type II Hybrid Bus</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp Healthcare Foundation</td>
<td>Minivan</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Shadow Support Group</td>
<td>Type III Bus</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Shadow Support Group</td>
<td>Wheelchair Restraint System (12)</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Link Foundation</td>
<td>Type III Bus</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Services Continuum</td>
<td>Minivan</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal funds awarded: $962,923  
Local matching funds (11.47%): $124,757 (provided by applicant agency)  
Total project costs: $1,087,680
Introduction

The TransNet Plan of Finance is updated on an annual basis, or more frequently as circumstances arise. The Board of Directors approved the last Plan of Finance update in March 2009. On May 7, 2010, staff provided the Transportation Committee with an informational report on the 2010 update with a focus on the major program changes that have occurred since the 2009 update, including adjustments in program revenues and project costs.

Since the May 7 Transportation Committee report, the Board of Directors approved the FY 2011 SANDAG Budget, including budget changes to several projects in the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP). This report summarizes the major revenue, budget, and cash flow assumptions used in the 2010 TransNet Plan of Finance update, noting any significant differences from 2009.

Working with our financial advisor, staff also has evaluated two initial scenarios: (1) a Baseline scenario that addresses the near-term cash flow needs to keep the existing EAP projects on their current schedules; and (2) an initial Robust scenario that would advance to construction (prior to FY 2018) several projects currently under development in key EAP corridors and prepare new “shovel-ready” projects. This report includes preliminary information about the performance of these two initial scenarios and additional bonding that would be needed over the next several years to meet cash flow needs.

The Transportation Committee is asked to discuss the initial scenarios that have been run for the 2010 Plan of Finance and provide direction to staff. This item will be presented to the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) on June 28, 2010. Any comments received from the ITOC will be presented to the Transportation Committee on July 2, 2010.

Discussion

TransNet Early Action Program

The current TransNet EAP (Attachment 1) includes the development of the Interstate 15 (I-15) Managed Lanes and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service; widening of State Route 76 (SR 76); State Route 52 (SR 52) widening and extension; implementation of the Mid-Coast Corridor, SuperLoop, and Mid-City Rapid transit projects; and Trolley vehicle and station upgrades along the Blue and Orange Lines. The EAP also includes environmental efforts for the Interstate 5 (I-5) North Coast corridor, including high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, and environmental and design efforts for the Interstate 805 (I-805) corridor and implementation of the South Bay BRT service.
In July 2009, the Board of Directors approved programming $70.4 million of TransNet funds for the design of seven projects in the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) coastal rail corridor, design of HOV lanes in the I-5 North Coast corridor, and design of guideway, a direct-access ramp and station, and HOV lanes on I-805 and along State Route 94 to support the South Bay BRT service. The objective was to replenish the number of “shovel-ready” projects, to enable the region to capitalize on future funding opportunities.

**Preliminary Analysis of 2010 Plan of Finance Update**

The last Plan of Finance update approved in March 2009 enabled SANDAG to meet the near-term cash flow needs of the TransNet EAP and the Board’s objectives to make early progress on constructing major corridor projects and to develop the next list of ready-to-go projects. The 2009 update enabled completion of all EAP construction projects by FY 2016.

With the 2010 update, we have continued to see declines in construction costs, which have led to significantly lower bid prices on several key EAP project construction contracts. For example, in 2009, the winning bid for SR 905 construction was 16 percent below the engineer’s estimate, and the winning bid for SR 76 construction was 19 percent below the engineer’s estimate. In addition to cost adjustments to the current EAP projects, these trends have led to a substantial revision to the cost escalation assumptions for this 2010 Plan of Finance update and present the Board with a unique opportunity.

The decline in project costs has helped offset the fall in sales tax revenue. This chart shown in Attachment 2 indexes the costs and revenues to 2005 and tracks their cumulative growth rates through 2017. In addition to these recent trends (costs falling more rapidly than revenues), the chart shows that staff is expecting the cumulative rate of growth in sales tax revenue to outpace the increase in construction cost. This general trend (revenues rising faster than costs) is not unusual coming out of a recession as price pressures are kept at bay while the economy struggles to get the economy above prerecession levels of economic production and output. The chart suggests that for a short period of time (about five years) the purchasing power of the TransNet program will increase, providing an opportunity to advance the planning and construction schedule of additional projects without jeopardizing the financial feasibility of the remaining projects.

Working with our financial advisor, staff has evaluated two initial Plan of Finance scenarios: (1) a Baseline scenario that addresses the near-term cash flow needs to keep the existing EAP projects on their current schedules; and (2) an initial Robust scenario that would advance to construction (prior to FY 2018) several projects that are currently under development in the EAP corridors as well as replenish the region’s list of “shovel-ready” projects.

**Baseline Scenario** - The Baseline scenario evaluated in the 2010 Plan of Finance update would enable the current EAP projects to be completed by FY 2016 (same as 2009 update). To meet near-term cash flow needs for the Baseline scenario, SANDAG would need to obtain bond financing of approximately $100-$110 million in FY 2012 and $160-$170 million in FY 2014. The program balance at the end of the 40-year program is projected to be approximately $400 million (in 2009 dollars). For comparison purposes, the 2009 Plan of Finance update projected a negative cash flow would occur in FY 2036, resulting in the need to identify $1.3 billion in additional funding (in 2008 dollars) to keep the 40-year TransNet program whole.

The substantial decline in construction costs, as reflected in the 2010 Plan of Finance update, presents a unique opportunity. Based on the analysis to date, the TransNet program would have the
capacity to advance additional EAP projects to construction, while keeping the 40-year program whole (without the need to identify additional matching funds in the future).

**Initial Robust Scenario** - In addition to the Baseline scenario, an initial “Robust” scenario has been developed to evaluate opportunities presented by the current financial and construction market conditions. Like the Baseline, the initial Robust scenario would enable the current EAP projects to be completed by FY 2016. This scenario also would advance to construction several projects under development in the LOSSAN rail corridor and allow for the completion of the environmental phases and design of other LOSSAN corridor projects. Also proposed would be various construction projects in the I-15 Corridor to support the I-15 BRT service and replacement of the Nordahl Bridge; construction of HOV lanes in the I-805 Corridor (North and South segments); and construction of a portion of the planned I-5 North Coast Corridor improvements.

The initial Robust scenario would advance about $600 million in project costs prior to FY 2018 in comparison with the Baseline scenario. To meet near-term cash flow needs for this initial Robust scenario, SANDAG would need to obtain bond financing of approximately $350-$400 million in FY 2011 and $650-$700 million in FY 2013. Under this initial Robust scenario, at the end of the 40 years the TransNet program would essentially be balanced; a very small negative cash flow is projected to occur in FY 2040, resulting in the need to identify $1.3 million in additional funding (in 2009 dollars) to keep the TransNet program whole.

**2010 Plan of Finance Assumptions**

**Projected Sales Tax Revenues** - The recession that began in December 2007 resulted in downward trends in taxable retail sales from which TransNet revenues are derived. In January 2010, the Board of Directors approved a 10 percent reduction to the FY 2010 TransNet sales tax revenue estimates, compared to actual FY 2009 receipts, making it the third year in a row of revenue declines. For FY 2011, a 1.87 percent increase in TransNet revenue is projected.

SANDAG staff expects a modest economic recovery over the next few years, with net job growth of 0.5 percent to 1.0 percent (an increase of approximately 6,000 to 12,000 local jobs). The unemployment rate is expected to begin to decline slowly beginning in the second quarter of 2010, reducing by one percentage point by the end of 2010. The anticipated slow rate of economic growth nationally and locally during the year, setting the pace of the recovery for the next few years, is reflected in our local sales tax revenue forecasts. During FY 2015, our sales tax revenue estimates are expected to exceed the level reached during 2007 prior to the start of the recession.

The overall revenue growth rates assumed in the 2009 and 2010 Plan of Finance updates are summarized in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Plan of Finance (POF) - Projected TransNet Revenue</th>
<th>Annual Rates of Change, FY 2009 through FY 2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 POF</td>
<td>-9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 POF update</td>
<td>-9.17% (actual)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**State and Federal Matching Revenues** - The amount of state and federal funds assumed for the EAP are based on committed funds to date, including the current Regional Transportation Improvement Program period (FY 2009 to FY 2013). For future years, SANDAG estimated federal, state, and local transportation funds based on historic experience. The 2010 Plan of Finance revenue assumptions for future years are consistent with the draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP) revenue estimates that are currently under development.

Current Board policy directs 94 percent of all discretionary state and federal formula funds\(^1\) to support the TransNet EAP, and the remaining 6 percent of these funds for non-EAP projects, such as the transportation demand management (TDM) and transportation systems management (TSM) programs.

As required by Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008), SANDAG must develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of the 2050 RTP. The SCS must meet certain greenhouse gas emission targets established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), or SANDAG must prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy to meet the CARB targets. The initial greenhouse gas target-setting scenarios tested to date have shown that TDM and TSM measures could help reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the region. With the 2010 Plan of Finance update, staff evaluated other funding ratios that could continue to provide sufficient funds to support the TransNet EAP as well as provide opportunities to advance the region’s TDM and TSM programs. Staff recommends revising the EAP/non-EAP funding ratio from 94 percent/6 percent to 90 percent/10 percent. The draft 2010 Plan of Finance assumes 90 percent of all discretionary state and federal revenues for the EAP.

**Program Costs** - For TransNet EAP projects, SANDAG works with our project partners to update the Capital Improvement Program project costs and schedules as part of the annual SANDAG Budget. These revised and more detailed costs and schedules are used for the EAP projects, while the non-EAP project costs use the rates of change in costs shown below in Table 2. With the approval of the FY 2011 Budget in May 2010, the Board of Directors approved several budget changes, which are reflected in this year’s Plan of Finance update and summarized in Attachment 3.

After a period of unprecedented high rates of growth in construction costs from 2004 to 2007, we have seen an equally unprecedented decline in construction costs during the last two years (Attachment 4). This decline has resulted in lower costs for several EAP projects. Going forward, additionalDeclines in construction costs are anticipated during FY 2011, and then costs are expected to begin to escalate and return to typical annual escalation rates of 3 percent by FY 2015. The escalation rates assumed in the 2009 and 2010 Plan of Finance updates are shown in Table 2 below:

**Table 2. Plan of Finance (POF) - Projected TransNet Construction Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 POF</td>
<td>-3.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 POF update</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-8.00%</td>
<td>-1.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) These revenue sources include the State Transportation Improvement Program, Proposition 1B State-Local Partnership Program, Regional Surface Transportation Program, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funding program. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 funding also has been dedicated to fund EAP projects.
Proposed Revision to Cost Assumptions for the I-5 North Coast Corridor – Except for construction projects currently underway, costs for typical TransNet projects are based on the original budget contained in the TransNet Extension Ordinance, updated to current year dollars, and then escalated to the year of construction based on projected construction escalation rates. As a project progresses from planning and environmental stages to preliminary engineering and design, cost estimates are updated as additional information is gathered and the project’s scope is refined. These updated estimates are evaluated as part of the annual budget and Plan of Finance updates.

At the June 18 Transportation Committee meeting, Caltrans provided a status report on the I-5 North Coast Corridor project, which extends 27 miles from La Jolla Village Drive in San Diego to Vandegrift Boulevard in Oceanside. Caltrans is finalizing the project’s draft environmental document and expects to release it in early July. The draft document includes four possible build alternatives, all of which would include the construction of a four-Managed Lane (ML) facility in the median of I-5. The alternatives differ in their assumptions for additional general purpose lane widening, and whether they include either a concrete barrier separating the ML from the general purpose lanes or a four-foot painted buffer separation.2

For the I-5 North Coast Corridor, the TransNet Extension Ordinance assumed a $1.2 billion cost (in 2002 dollars), which when escalated to 2009, would result in a $1.7 billion cost estimate. As part of the environmental phase, Caltrans has prepared updated project cost estimates, and due to the complexity of the proposed improvements in the coastal corridor, the updated estimates are significantly higher than the original 2002 estimates. The four build alternatives range between $3.3 billion and $4.4 billion in estimated costs. To reflect these more up-to-date estimates in the 2010 Plan of Finance, staff proposes to assume a $3.3 billion cost estimate for the I-5 North Coast Corridor project, which is consistent with the lowest cost of the four build alternatives included in the draft environmental document. This higher project cost estimate has been assumed in both the Baseline and initial Robust scenarios. The initial evaluation shows that the higher estimate would not significantly impact the affordability of the overall TransNet program.

Next Steps

As part of its July 2009 action, the Board of Directors approved programming funds for the design of an initial component of the overall I-5 North Coast Corridor improvements – the addition of two HOV lanes from Manchester Avenue to SR 78 and related improvements. When compared with other potential EAP projects that could be advanced to construction, the I-5 North Coast Corridor project has significant risks that could impact the project delivery schedule; these schedule risks include the improvements needed across multiple coastal lagoons and securing necessary permits from the California Coastal Commission.

Staff is currently making refinements to develop additional versions of the “Robust” scenario – one that includes advancing the construction of the two HOV lanes and related improvements in the I-5 North Coast Corridor prior to FY 2018 and another that assumes construction completion after FY 2018. The purpose of evaluating these revised versions of the Robust scenario is to determine the impact advancing the I-5 North Coast Corridor HOV improvements would have on the near-term borrowing needs for the TransNet program (FY 2011-FY 2013).

2 The four alternatives include: (1) 8 general purpose lanes plus 4 buffer-separated 4 ML; (2) 8 general purpose lanes plus 4 barrier-separated ML; (3) 10 general purpose lanes plus 4 buffer-separated 4 ML; and (4) 10 general purpose lanes plus 4 barrier-separated ML.
This additional scenario analysis would be presented to the ITOC on July 14, 2010, and to the Transportation Committee on July 16, 2010. At that time, the ITOC and Transportation Committee also would be asked to make a recommendation to the Board of Directors on the 2010 TransNet Plan of Finance update. Final action on the 2010 update is scheduled for the July 23, 2010, Board of Directors meeting.
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EARLY ACTION PROJECTS
May 2010

1. SR 76: Widen highway
2. SR 52: Widen and extend highway
3. Mid-Coast:
   Transit: Old Town-UCSD
   Transit: UTC SuperLoop
4. I-15:
   HOV/Express Lanes
   Transit: Escondido-Downtown
   Transit: Escondido-Sorrento Valley
5. I-805:
   HOV/Express Lanes
   Transit: Otay-Downtown
   Transit: Otay-Sorrento Valley
6. North Coast:
   I-5 HOV/Express Lanes
   Coastal rail double-tracking
7. SPRINTER:
   Oceanside-Escondido light rail
8. Blue and Orange Line Trolley:
   Low-floor vehicles
   Station upgrades
9. Mid-City:
   Transit: Downtown-SDSU
10. Goods Movement:
    South Line rail upgrades
    SR 905

Highway Projects
- Completed
- Under Construction
- Preliminary Engineering

Transit Projects
- Completed
- Under Construction
- Preliminary Engineering
- Light Rail Line
Comparison of TransNet Revenues and Construction Index
Cumulative Escalation Indexed to 2005

Cumulative Escalation Indexed to 2005
Summary of Approved Budget Changes

to TransNet Early Action Program

With the approval of the FY 2011 SANDAG Budget in May, the Board of Directors approved several TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) budget changes, which are reflected in this year’s Plan of Finance update and are summarized below. Overall, the total program budget for the TransNet EAP would be reduced by approximately $131 million, largely resulting from lowered rates of change in construction costs and lower bid prices. The resulting program-level EAP budget would be approximately $5.27 billion. Adjustments to individual project budgets include:

- Reductions in project budgets, based on lower than expected bid amounts for current I-15, SR 52, and SR 76 construction projects. In addition, budget reductions for future I-15, I-805, and SR 76 construction projects are included as a result of lowered construction escalation rates in future fiscal years.

- Support cost increases are included for I-15 and I-805 corridor projects. Additional work required as part of the I-15 FasTrak® system installation and additional environmental studies needed for the I-805/Carroll Canyon project have resulted in an increased need for Caltrans support.

- An additional $16 million in TransNet funding is included for the design of the initial phase of the I-805 North project.

- The SuperLoop transit project budget was reduced by $2.84 million based on a lower estimate to complete.

- A $6.60 million increase is included to complete environmental clearance on the I-5 North Coast corridor project.

- A $1.96 million increase is included for the LOSSAN Oceanside Station Stub Tracks and Crossovers project to cover increased design costs; the impact footprint for this project was underestimated during the initial planning phase.

- The recently obtained $8.4 million ARRA high-speed rail grant was added to the LOSSAN Tecolote–Washington Street Crossovers project budget.

- A minor reduction in Environmental Mitigation Program costs as a result of escalation factor.
## TransNet EAP Budget Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP #</th>
<th>TransNet Corridor</th>
<th>FY 2011 Approved Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>FY 2010 Approved Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201501</td>
<td>I-15 South ML</td>
<td>$361,937</td>
<td>$411,997</td>
<td>($50,060)</td>
<td>Budget reduced based on low bid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201502</td>
<td>I-15 Middle ML</td>
<td>$471,115</td>
<td>$471,115</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201503</td>
<td>I-15 North ML</td>
<td>$215,427</td>
<td>$215,427</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201504</td>
<td>I-15 FasTrak®</td>
<td>$24,122</td>
<td>$23,872</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>Additional Caltrans support needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201505</td>
<td>I-15 BRT Stations Rancho Bernardo, Sabre Springs, Del Lago</td>
<td>$46,170</td>
<td>$46,170</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201506</td>
<td>I-15 Mira Mesa DAR &amp; BRT Station</td>
<td>$79,557</td>
<td>$79,557</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201507</td>
<td>I-15 Mid-City In-Line BRT Stations</td>
<td>$21,631</td>
<td>$21,631</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201508</td>
<td>I-15 BRT Vehicles &amp; Planning</td>
<td>$34,348</td>
<td>$38,172</td>
<td>($4,364)</td>
<td>Lower escalation factors used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201509</td>
<td>Downtown Stations</td>
<td>$9,154</td>
<td>$10,291</td>
<td>($1,137)</td>
<td>Lower escalation factors used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201510</td>
<td>Nordahl Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280501</td>
<td>I-805 South ENV</td>
<td>$31,516</td>
<td>$31,516</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280503</td>
<td>I-805 North ENV and Design</td>
<td>$25,424</td>
<td>$9,424</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>Budget increased by $16M for North segment design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280504</td>
<td>South Bay BRT</td>
<td>$97,108</td>
<td>$109,627</td>
<td>($12,519)</td>
<td>Lower escalation factors used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280505</td>
<td>I-805 HOV/Carroll Cyn DAR</td>
<td>$86,743</td>
<td>$86,143</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>Support cost increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280507</td>
<td>VAA Bus on Shoulder</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280508</td>
<td>SR 94 (I-5 to I-805)</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280509</td>
<td>West BRT Guideway</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280510</td>
<td>2HOV</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 South/ SR 94/ SR 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041501</td>
<td>Mid-Coast Transit</td>
<td>$1,246,292</td>
<td>$1,246,292</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041502</td>
<td>SuperLoop</td>
<td>$36,349</td>
<td>$39,187</td>
<td>($2,838)</td>
<td>Budget reduced based on lower estimate to complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210010</td>
<td>Orange-Blue PM</td>
<td>$23,019</td>
<td>$23,019</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210020</td>
<td>Blue Crossovers</td>
<td>$29,270</td>
<td>$29,270</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210030</td>
<td>Blue Stations</td>
<td>$64,900</td>
<td>$64,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210040</td>
<td>New Rail</td>
<td>$56,600</td>
<td>$56,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210050</td>
<td>Slope Repair</td>
<td>$2,725</td>
<td>$2,725</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210060</td>
<td>Substation Rehab</td>
<td>$1,390</td>
<td>$1,390</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210070</td>
<td>Platform Upgrades</td>
<td>$43,290</td>
<td>$43,290</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210080</td>
<td>New Vehicles</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200501</td>
<td>I-5 North Coast ENV</td>
<td>$57,282</td>
<td>$50,677</td>
<td>$6,605</td>
<td>Funding for environmental clearance added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200502</td>
<td>I-5 HOV &amp; Lomas</td>
<td>$71,759</td>
<td>$71,759</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200504</td>
<td>I-5 2HOV</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TransNet EAP Budget Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP #</th>
<th>TransNet Corridor</th>
<th>FY 2011 Approved Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>FY 2010 Approved Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COASTER/LOSSAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239801</td>
<td>Sorrento-Miramar</td>
<td>$23,700</td>
<td>$23,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239802</td>
<td>San Onofre</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239803</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>$3,058</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,958 Design cost increase due to larger impact footprint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239804</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239805</td>
<td>Poinsettia</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239806</td>
<td>San Elijo</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239807</td>
<td>Sorrento-Torrey</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239808</td>
<td>Tecolote</td>
<td>$9,400</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$8,400 Recent $8.4M ARRA grant included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205202</td>
<td>SR 52 Widening: I-15 to Mast</td>
<td>$44,425</td>
<td>$44,425</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205203</td>
<td>SR 52 Extension</td>
<td>$520,529</td>
<td>$548,905</td>
<td>($28,376) Budget reduced based on low bid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230001</td>
<td>SPRINTER</td>
<td>$65,870</td>
<td>$65,870</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207602</td>
<td>SR 76 Middle</td>
<td>$171,359</td>
<td>$181,613</td>
<td>($10,254) Budget reduced based on low bid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207606</td>
<td>SR 76 East</td>
<td>$201,549</td>
<td>$225,544</td>
<td>($23,995) Lower escalation factors used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240001</td>
<td>Mid-City Rapid</td>
<td>$44,526</td>
<td>$44,526</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300601</td>
<td>San Ysidro Yard</td>
<td>$40,460</td>
<td>$40,460</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300602</td>
<td>South Line Improvements</td>
<td>$107,030</td>
<td>$107,030</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1390501</td>
<td>SR 905: I-805 to Britannia</td>
<td>$77,646</td>
<td>$105,100</td>
<td>($27,454) Budget reduced based on low bid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200200</td>
<td>Biological Mitigation</td>
<td>$428,000</td>
<td>$428,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200300</td>
<td>Habitat Conservation</td>
<td>$44,519</td>
<td>$48,062</td>
<td>($3,543) Lower escalation factors used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,265,999</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,396,726</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-$130,727</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caltrans Construction Index (12-Month Average)
DESTINATION LINDBERGH: INTERMODAL
TRANSPORTATION CENTER UPDATE

Introduction

The Destination Lindbergh Master Plan was completed and presented to the Transportation Committee in spring 2009. One of the key recommendations of that report was the development of an Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) adjacent to the proposed northside airport terminal complex. The study area for the proposed ITC is west of Interstate 5, south of Washington Street, east of Pacific Highway, and north of Sassafras Street. The ITC could provide direct connections to the airport terminal for regional transit services (COASTER, Trolley, Bus Rapid Transit, and local bus services), intercity Amtrak services, as well as terminus station for the planned California High-Speed Rail system.

Over the last year, both SANDAG and the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) have been undertaking various studies that would lead to implementation of Phase I improvements of the Destination Lindbergh Master Plan. SANDAG efforts have focused on an advanced planning study to assess site design options for the ITC and outline of a Phase I ITC improvement plan. This planning study has been closely coordinated with the SDCRAA’s work effort for Phase I on-airport improvements, which include development of a Consolidated Car Rental Facility (CONRAC) on the northside of the airport. The City of San Diego also is an active participant in these work efforts, including a contribution of $200,000 towards the advanced planning study.

This report provides an update on the ITC site design planning study, coordination efforts with the SDCRAA (regarding the CONRAC facility planning effort) and the City of San Diego (regarding community redevelopment opportunities), and next step actions.

Discussion

Study Process

SANDAG established a technical advisory committee (TAC) and retained a consultant to look at potential site designs for the ITC. As well as close coordination with the SDCRAA and City of San Diego, other key stakeholders on the TAC include:

- Caltrans
- Metropolitan Transit System
- U.S. Marine Corps
- Port of San Diego
- North County Transit District
- California High-Speed Rail Authority
The ITC advanced planning study is being conducted in two phases. The current work effort has focused on evaluating the overall ITC site design needs, identifying alternative site designs given the opportunities/constraints of the ITC site, and developing preferred short- and long-term concepts for the ITC. Based on the preferred short-term ITC concept, the second study phase will further refine the short-term design concept, along with identifying potential redevelopment opportunities in and around the ITC facility.

ITC Site Planning Study Status

The short-term ITC facility is designed to coordinate with the first phase SDCRAA’s efforts on northside airport improvements. These improvements include the development of the CONRAC facility and operation of an on-airport shuttle connection between the CONRAC facility and the existing southside terminal and gates. The consolidated ITC station could serve COASTER, Amtrak, Trolley, and Bus services that would be connected to the CONRAC and on-airport shuttle by an elevated pedestrian walkway over Pacific Highway. In the longer term, the ITC facility could be expanded to include the proposed southern terminus station for the California High-Speed Rail system.

An additional objective of the advanced planning study was to develop design concepts for direct connector ramps from Interstate 5 to the future northside airport terminal. However, since the airport terminal buildings have not yet been designed, and the necessary information on location and height of the terminal buildings will not be available for at least three years, the proposed work on the ramps has been scaled back to developing only some initial design concepts.

With the increased frequencies planned for Trolley, COASTER, and Amtrak services, grade separations of Washington and Sassafras Streets will be needed. The analysis indicates that the grade separations would need to be constructed as a first phase project before the ITC facility is developed given the constrained ITC site and the fact that temporary bypass tracks would need to be constructed. The advanced planning study will undertake preliminary design and develop capital cost estimates of these grade separations.

Based on input from the TAC, an initial set of preferred ITC layouts have been developed.

- Attachment 1 shows the layout for the first phase ITC facility developed and refined by the project team. It includes a pedestrian overcrossing of Pacific Highway that will link to the CONRAC facility. A dedicated shuttle bus service would provide frequent connections between the CONRAC and the existing Commuter Terminal, Terminal 1, and Terminal 2 facilities on the southside of the airport. The design shows the Trolley and Amtrak/COASTER tracks in a trench with a new paid parking lot on the site for Amtrak users. MTS would include bus bays and stops on Pacific Highway, Washington Street, and Hancock Street to provide bus service to this site. There is extensive potential redevelopment opportunity above the parking and at the east end of the site.

- Attachment 2 shows one of two possible long-term configurations of the ITC facility that includes the high-speed rail (HSR) station. The HSR tracks reach the station through a tunnel from the north. All functions for HSR operations, including passenger platforms, charter bus bays, hotel shuttles and private car parking are incorporated into the site design. A large station house is provided at the west end of the HSR site to handle passenger ticketing and check in.
functions, including concessions. This option also shows a potential people mover system linking the HSR terminal with the northside terminal. This system would be an extension of an airport people mover that would be required if all of the airport gates were not relocated to the north side. A parking structure is placed on top of the HSR tracks to accommodate the parking demand for the HSR system. Retail or concession services could be accommodated within a building in the parking structure.

- Attachment 3 shows the second option for the long-term ITC facility with HSR. In this option most of the high speed rail facilities including charter bus bays, hotel shuttles, private automobile parking, and passenger handing systems are integrated with the air terminal building to create a combined air/HSR check-in and security facilities. Minimal station facilities for HSR would be provided at the ITC, primarily to handle passengers transferring from the Trolley, MTS Bus, COASTER, or Amtrak. This option also includes the potential for a people mover link from the air terminal check-in to the HSR passenger platforms. There would also be potential retail and service redevelopment opportunities on the ITC facility.

**Next Steps**

The first phase of the study is nearing completion in terms of the short- and long-term site designs, as well as development of preliminary cost estimates. The second phase of the study will take a close look at the short-term ITC facility (Attachment 1), include further development of site design details and redevelopment opportunities, conceptual engineering studies for the grade separations, and further detail on capital cost estimates. This effort will set the stage for formal environmental studies that could begin in 2011 should funding be identified. Caltrans will begin working on the initial preliminary concepts for the freeway connector ramps. This preliminary concept planning will examine how the ramps could tie into I-5, but would not address specific designs to link with the airport since a definitive design for the air terminal will not be available for several years.

The ITC Advanced Planning Study is scheduled to be completed by December 2010, initial design concepts of the Caltrans freeway connector concepts by June 2011, and conceptual engineering of the rail grade separations by December 2011.

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

Attachments: 1. Proposed Phase 1 Site Plan (no High Speed Rail)
                2. Proposed Phase 2 Site Plan Concept A (with High Speed Rail)
                3. Proposed Phase 2 Site Plan Concept B (with High Speed Rail)

Key Staff Contacts: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
                   Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906, dsc@sandag.org
MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT - UPDATE ON SCOPING PERIOD AND SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

Introduction

The scoping period for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) provided the public and agencies with an opportunity to review and comment on environmental issues and alternatives proposed to be analyzed in the draft environmental document. The scoping period began on May 3 and continued through June 1. This report presents a summary of the outreach activities for public scoping, scoping meetings and comments received during the scoping period.

Discussion

On April 23, 2010, the Board of Directors approved three light rail transit (LRT) Alternatives to be carried forward for consideration at scoping for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Draft SEIS/SEIR. The alternatives include LRT Alternatives 1 (combines 1, 4, and 5), 3 and 6. A map of the alternatives is included as Attachment 1.

Outreach for Scoping Period

Prior to scoping a variety of outreach activities were performed to inform the public and agencies about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and the scoping period. These outreach activities were outlined in the draft Public Involvement Plan released by the Board in May 2009.

Outreach activities included the following:

- Formal notice of Notice of Preparation (NOP) published in two regional circulation newspapers
- NOP sent to State Clearinghouse and the Office of the San Diego County Clerk
- NOP sent to approximately 130 federal, state, and local agencies and Native American Tribes
- Advertisement of scoping period and meetings published in two regional circulation newspapers, eight local newspapers, and one Spanish-language newspaper
- Mid-Coast e-mail newsletter distributed to Mid-Coast distribution list of over 200
- Scoping information highlighted in SANDAG e-mail newsletter
- Approximately 25,000 postcards sent to household and business addresses in Mid-Coast Corridor announcing scoping meetings
- News release issued to local and regional newspaper, television and radio outlets
• SANDAG and Keep San Diego Moving Web sites promoted scoping period
• SANDAG Facebook page promoted scoping period
• Project Working Group (PWG) members requested to outreach to constituents
• Business and community group meetings presentations to provide project information and promote scoping period

Public Scoping Meetings

During the scoping period, five public meetings were held at locations throughout the Mid-Coast Corridor: the SANDAG offices, Caltrans District 11, Western Clairemont, University City, and University of California, San Diego. Approximately 215 individuals attended the scoping meetings to gain further information on the project, of which 68 provided comments. The dates, times, and locations of the scoping meetings are provided in Attachment 2.

The scoping meetings were conducted in an open house forum with several stations providing information about the project. The stations included: Project & Process Overview, Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives, Alternatives for Scoping, Public Involvement, and Comments. Project team members staffed each station to provide information and answer questions. Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) staff participated in each scoping meeting and provided information about current MTS services and the plan for future service connections to the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. A Spanish translator was in attendance at each of the meetings and many scoping materials were available in Spanish.

In addition to the staffed stations, a video presentation ran on a loop throughout the entire open house period. The video included information and graphics about the location and characteristics of the Mid-Coast Corridor, an animated map showing the three alternatives for scoping, and a “flyover” of each alternative using Google Earth satellite images of the corridor.

Comments were taken verbally with the assistance of a court reporter or in writing by meeting participants filling out a comment form.

Options for Submittal of Scoping Comments

A number of methods were available to the public for submitting comments during the scoping period. Members of the public could participate in one of the five scoping meetings and submit comments verbally or in writing by filling out a comment form. Comments also could be submitted via U.S. mail, e-mail, facsimile, or telephone to (619) 595-5620.

The various methods for submitting comments were detailed on the project Web site, on the comment form, in the scoping meeting invitation flier, and in public notices and advertisements published in newspapers.

Summary of Scoping Comments

SANDAG received 243 comment submissions which include letters, e-mails, comment cards, telephone messages, and verbal testimony provided to the court reporter at the scoping meetings. Most submissions contained several comments, each of which was logged into a database. Approximately 740 individual comments were received.
Comments received were categorized into one of six categories: general comments; comments related to purpose and need; comments related to alternatives; comments related to evaluation; comments related to costs and funding; and comments related to analysis of environmental effects. There are a total of 21 subcategories within the 6 main categories. A summary of the scoping comments is included as Attachment 3.

Comments received from agencies are summarized separately in the attached report. These agencies have regulatory responsibilities for the project which may include permits or approvals required for project implementation; therefore, their comments and directions are reproduced in detail.

The comment that was made most frequently, with 107 comments received, is opposition to LRT Alternative 3 due to either proximity to or potential impacts to Rose Canyon Open Space Park and/or concerns with tunnel construction. The second most frequent comment, with 97 comments received, is support for LRT Alternative 1.

**Actions by MTS and University Community Planning Group (UCPG)**

MTS received a report on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project at its May 13, 2010, Board of Directors meeting. The MTS Board of Directors voted unanimously to support LRT Alternative 1.

At the April 13, 2010, meeting, the UCPG unanimously approved a motion “To strongly support and take only the LRT 1 Alignment to scoping, and eliminate alternatives LRT 3 and LRT 6 and not take them to scoping.”

**Selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) or Alternatives for the Draft SEIS/SEIR**

The Final Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report is under development. The Final Report will contain a summary of scoping comments and responses to comments. The Final Report also will include a recommendation on an LPA, or alternatives, to be analyzed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

The Final Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report is scheduled to be presented to the Project Working Group on July 14, 2010. The Transportation Committee is scheduled to review the Final Report and recommendation from the Project Working Group on July 16, 2010, and forward a recommendation to the Board of Directors for review at its July 23, 2010, meeting.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Project Implementation and Mobility Management

Attachments: 1. LRT Alternatives for Scoping map
               2. Scoping Meeting Flyer
               3. Summary of Scoping Comments

Key Staff Contact: Leslie Blanda, (619) 699-6907, lbl@sandag.org
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will extend transit service from the Old Town Transit Center north to the University City community, serving major destinations including Westfield University Town Centre (UTC) shopping mall, University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and downtown San Diego.

SANDAG wants to hear from you ... Come learn about the project and provide your input during the Scoping Period, which will run from May 3, 2010, through June 1, 2010.

Please join us at one of five open house Scoping Meetings in locations throughout the Mid-Coast Corridor. Come anytime during the Scoping Meetings to review information and provide comments. Comments will be accepted through June 1, 2010 via fax at (619) 699-1905, via e-mail at midcoast@sandag.org, or by mail to SANDAG, Attn: Mid-Coast Comments, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.

Wednesday, May 5, 2010
SANDAG
Board Room (7th Floor)
401 B Street, San Diego, CA, 92101
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop/Transit stations located at 4th/B St. & 5th Ave. Trolley Station.

Tuesday, May 11, 2010
University of California, San Diego (UCSD)
Price Center East Ballroom
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA  92037
3 to 6 p.m.
Bus stop located at Gilman Dr./Myers Dr. on UCSD campus.

Wednesday, May 12, 2010
Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center
Garfield Theatre
4126 Executive Drive, La Jolla, CA, 92037
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop located at Executive Dr./Regents Rd.

Thursday, May 20, 2010
Clairemont High School
Cafeteria
4150 Ute Drive, San Diego, CA, 92117
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop located at Clairemont Dr./Ute Dr.

Tuesday, May 25, 2010
Caltrans District 11 Office
Gallegos Conference Room
4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, CA 92110
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop/Transit station located at Taylor St./Juan St. & Old Town Transit Center.

For more information about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, please visit www.sandag.org/midcoast.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in the Scoping Meetings listed above. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5620 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request materials in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5620, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
El Proyecto del Corredor Mid-Coast de SANDAG extenderá el servicio de transporte público desde el Centro de Transporte Público de Old Town al norte hasta la comunidad de University City, dando servicio a importantes destinos como el centro comercial Westfield University Town Centre (UTC), La Universidad de California, San Diego (UCSD) y el downtown San Diego.

SANDAG quiere escuchar su opinión … Se buscan comentarios públicos durante el período de alcance público, el cual va desde el 3 de mayo al 1 de junio de 2010.

Por favor considere ir a una de las cinco Reuniones Públicas en ubicaciones a lo largo del corredor Mid-Coast. Conozca más del proyecto y dé sus comentarios. Se aceptarán comentarios hasta 1 de junio de 2010, vía fax al (619) 699-1905, vía e-mail al midcoast@sandag.org, o por correo a la atención del Mid-Coast Comments, en SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.

**Miércoles 5 de mayo de 2010**
SANDAG
Board Room (Piso 7)
401 B Street, San Diego, CA, 92101
4 a 7 p.m.
Parada de autobús/Estación de Transporte público en 4th/B St. & 5th Ave. Estación del Trolley.

**Martes 11 de mayo de 2010**
University of California, San Diego (UCSD)
Price Center East Ballroom
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92093
3 a 6 p.m.
Parada de autobús ubicada en Gilman Dr./Myers Dr. en el UCSD campus.

**Miércoles 12 de mayo de 2010**
Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center
Garfield Theatre
4126 Executive Drive, La Jolla, CA, 92037
4 a 7 p.m.
Parada de autobús ubicada en Executive Dr./Regents Rd.

**Jueves 20 de mayo de 2010**
Clairemont High School
Cafetería
4150 Ute Drive, San Diego, CA, 92117
4 a 7 p.m.
Parada de autobús ubicada en Clairemont Dr./Ute Dr.

**Martes 25 de mayo de 2010**
Caltrans District 11 Office
Gallegos Conference Room
4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, CA 92110
4 a 7 p.m.
Parada de autobús/Estación de Transporte Público ubicadas en Taylor St./Juan St. & Old Town Transit Center.

Para más información acerca del Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast, por favor visite www.sandag.org/midcoast.

En cumplimiento con la ley Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG asistirá a las personas que requieran ayuda para participar en las Reuniones Públicas enlistadas arriba. Si requiriera tal asistencia, por favor comuníquese a SANDAG al 619) 595-5620 con al menos 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión. Para solicitar los materiales en un formato alterno, por favor llame al (619) 395-5620, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), o por fax al (619) 699-1905.
4.0 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

Comments on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project were received during the scoping period through a following methods: verbal testimony or written comment cards at the public scoping meetings; and via e-mail, postal mail, and telephone correspondence. The comments covered a variety of topics and were submitted by various parties, including: agencies, community organizations, elected officials, and members of the general public. The 30-day scoping period began on May 3, 2010 and closed June 1, 2010. Scoping comments were accepted for one week after the close of the scoping period to account for any comments that were in the mail. In all, 244 comment submissions were received containing more than 700 individual comments. Comment submissions included any letters, e-mails, phone calls, or testimony given by an individual or an organization. In most cases, each submission included multiple individual comments. Copies of all comments can be found in Appendices C, D, and E of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping Report, depending on the type of correspondence.

This Summary of Scoping Comments is presented in two sections. Section 5.1 contains a Summary of Substantive Public and Organization Comments. Two-hundred and thirty-five public and organization comment submissions were received. Section 5.2 contains a Summary of Substantive Agency Comments. In total, nine agency comment letters were received. The agency comments are presented in Section 5.2 by the agency submitting the comments.

4.1 Summary of Substantive Public and Organization Comments

All comments submissions as well as individual comments were documented and entered into an electronic database for analysis. The database identified the name of the commenter and/or commenting agency, the source of the comment, the content of the comment, the topic(s) discussed by the comment, and commenter affiliations, if applicable. Form-letter submissions were grouped in the database, with each commenter noted in the record. Comments were categorized into six major categories and 21 sub-categories (or topics).

A brief analysis of the comments by category, and their respective topics, is provided below.

4.1.1 General Comments

General comments identified an overall need for improved transit service, not limited to the Mid-Coast Corridor. Suggestions included expanding transit hours and developing a transit policy/system that would eliminate the need for individual automobiles in the San Diego area. Other comments suggested a need for transit system improvements/features, including bathrooms and increased public art.

Several general comments pertained to the Mid-Coast Corridor. Some comments advocated for enhanced transit services to areas within the Mid-Coast Corridor not served by the proposed alternatives, including: La Jolla, Miramar, Ocean Beach, Sorrento Mesa, Sorrento Valley, Torrey Pines, the San Diego International Airport,
Interstate 805 (I-805), Interstate 8 (I-8), and State Route 163 (SR 163). Other comments suggested serving entirely different corridors, such as Interstate 15 (I-15) or Interstate 5 (I-5) north of I-805.

There were also several suggestions for other projects in the Mid-Coast Corridor, but that do not specifically address the project purpose and need, including the following: COASTER enhancements, such as double track, a tunnel, and additional stations; roadway improvements, such as a Regents Road bridge; and, pedestrian and bicycle projects at various locations. One suggestion was to add pricing to existing freeways rather than to provide additional transit capacity. Another comment suggested following a holistic approach to San Diego County’s transportation problems rather than developing an individual project.

4.1.2 Comments Related to Purpose and Need

Five comments specifically were related to purpose and need for the project. The comments focused on the need for connecting transit service to the project, on clarifying the nature of transit-supportive land use identified in the need, expanding the definition of need to include additional travel markets, and clarifying what would constitute a competitive trip time. One comment questioned the need for the project and suggested the resources be directed to upgrade existing lines, including new elevators and the addition of restrooms.

4.1.3 Comments Related to Alternatives

Comments related to the alternatives were analyzed by each of the individual topics listed below. Of the 244 comment submissions received, 177 included comments related to the technology or alternatives. In addition to the major topics listed, there were questions about the type and location of supporting facilities and other project features, and regarding the interface of the project with shuttles and other transit services. One comment noted that any alternative must meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Other individual comments questioned the use of light rail transit (LRT) in favor of heavy rail transit (powered by an electric third-rail) or diesel single-unit vehicles.

4.1.3.1 Bus Rapid Transit

Three comment submissions by one organization requested the inclusion of a bus rapid transit (BRT) alternative in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR).

4.1.3.2 Light Rail Transit Alignments/Routes

Most of the comments received for alignments/routes were supportive of LRT Alternative 1. Ninety-seven comment submissions specifically supported LRT Alternative 1, while twelve comment submissions were supportive of any LRT alternative, three supported LRT Alternative 1 or 6, and two supported LRT Alternative 3. One-hundred and seven comment submissions were opposed to LRT Alternative 3, three were opposed to LRT Alternative 6, and two were opposed to LRT Alternative 1.
Concerns with LRT Alternative 1 were related to its looping back to the south, complicating a potential future extension north. Support for LRT 1 noted service to UCSD and minimization of effects to Rose Canyon Open Space Park.

The comments that objected to LRT Alternative 3 cited the following: proximity to Rose Canyon Open Space Park, potential environmental effects of the project on Rose Canyon Open Space Park and adjacent areas, potential effects to wildlife and habitat, concern with the spread of invasive species, potential noise and other community impacts, and concerns with tunnel construction, including traffic disturbance on Executive Drive. The limited support for LRT Alternative 3 noted that the alignment would provide a more direct option for a potential future extension north.

Comments opposed to LRT Alternative 6 noted issues with its design including numerous small-radius curves and potential environmental and transportation effects on the Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center.

Several alternative alignments or project configurations were suggested, including:

- A design option to LRT Alternative 1 that would replace the UCSD West Station with a Veterans Administration (VA) Medical Center Station crossing I-5 south of Voigt Drive.
- An alignment following LRT Alternative 1, but terminating in the vicinity of the Gilman Drive/Voigt Drive intersection, along with the construction of a separate dedicated right-of-way loop for rubber-tired transit that would connect UCSD, University Towne Centre(UTC), and the COASTER Sorrento Valley Station.
- An alignment following LRT Alternative 1, but extend north from the UCSD West Station through the UCSD Park north of Voigt Drive to Genesee Avenue.
- An alignment serving Pacific Beach by crossing Mission Bay on Ingram Street, rather than using the existing Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)/San Diego Northern Railway (SDNR) right-of-way.

4.1.3.3 Light Rail Transit Stations

Thirty-four of the comment submissions discussed stations. Many supported proposed station locations. Others suggested either eliminating or adding stations. The Executive Drive, UCSD West, and Clairemont Drive Stations were suggested for elimination. Additional stations were suggested at SR-52, Gilman Drive, Jutland Drive, and the VA Medical Center. Seven comment submissions supported a station at the VA Medical Center. The SR-52, Gilman Drive, and Jutland Drive locations were each identified as potential station locations in two submissions.

Other comments related to stations included providing good non-motorized transportation access, good bus connections, park-and-ride facilities, secure bike parking, and design to support redevelopment in the vicinity of the stations. One comment suggested a major roadway grade-separated connection from Grand Avenue to Morena Boulevard near the Balboa Avenue Station.
4.1.4 Comments Related to Evaluation

Five comments related to the evaluation of the alternatives. The comments requested additional details on how the preliminary analysis was completed and the process used by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to evaluate New Starts projects. There were requests to change the presentation of findings, including using highly detailed maps for planning-level analysis. One comment requested that the SEIR evaluate the competitiveness of transit travel times to drive times, another indicated concern that standard FTA user benefit calculations over-estimate the effect of transfers. One comment noted the need for complete documentation of travel forecasting methods and assumptions.

4.1.5 Costs and Funding

Twenty-four submission included comments related to costs and funding. Several comments observed cost differences between alternatives evaluated. Multiple comments suggested reduced rate or free fares. Highway and other funds were suggested to be redirected to transit. Other comments requested that no University of California funds be used to support the project and that the dedicated TransNet funds be redirected to other transit improvements. Other comments were concerned with the long-term costs of the project, considering the current economic recession. One recommendation was to accelerate the project to seek Federal funds earlier.

4.1.6 Comments Related to Analysis of Environmental Effects

Sixty-eight comment submissions included comments related to the scope of analysis for the individual topics listed below.

4.1.6.1 Traffic and Parking

Twenty-two comments were related to traffic and parking effects both during construction and operation. Comments noted the need for park-and-ride facilities both to serve local demand and to intercept southbound I-5 traffic. Some comments stated that students and workers already park in residential neighborhoods and take transit to their destination; as such, they were concerned that the project would increase this occurrence. Several comments related to how the system will integrate with and effects to the bus system.

Traffic concerns included the following: increased general traffic and congestion, loss of travel lanes, the need for transit signal priority, conflicts between transit and roadway traffic in the UCSD area, and increased traffic around stations. Also, the need for an interface with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and project coordination with other transportation projects was noted. Comments noted that mitigation needs to be considered to facilities where the project would cause an impact.

4.1.6.2 Non-motorized Transportation

Numerous comments were related to providing good pedestrian and bicycle access to the stations. Other comments requested recreational trail improvements in the vicinity of the project.
4.1.6.3 Land Use
Land use comments included concerns with density, if it would be sufficient to support the system, and recommendations to consider transit-oriented development potential. One comment noted an “urban farm” at UCSD for consideration during evaluation. General plan and municipal code requirements should be reviewed and any planned smart-growth centers should be identified.

4.1.6.4 Neighborhoods
Neighborhood concerns included parking pressure from residents outside of the neighborhoods using the system.

4.1.6.5 Safety and Security
One comment requested the analysis of any correlation between transit and crime and noted the large coverage area of the San Diego Police Department. Safety concerns were voiced about at-grade pedestrian track crossings, especially by students, in the UCSD and University City areas.

4.1.6.6 Economic Development
Comments on economic development were related to redevelopment of areas around stations. One comment noted that the long-term economic benefits of transit should be presented.

4.1.6.7 Right-of-Way Acquisitions and Relocations
Opposition was voiced to the acquisition of parkland for the project.

4.1.6.8 Environmental Justice
Comments included the need to consider access for and impacts to low-income and minority populations to transit. The EIS should identify whether the proposed alternatives may disproportionately and adversely affect low-income or minority populations and document the process for community involvement.

4.1.6.9 Visual
Comments included a request for renderings showing how the project will look in the UCSD area and a consideration of lighting effects on surrounding uses, including wildlife.

4.1.6.10 Air Quality
One comment noted that the project would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The project is located in an ozone nonattainment and a carbon monoxide maintenance area. One comment noted that mobile source air toxics should be addressed.

4.1.6.11 Noise and Vibration
Several comments were related to the analysis of noise and vibration. An explanation of the science of acoustics was requested. Other requests included the measurement of existing levels as well as the evaluation of future project noise generation, including wheel squeal, track maintenance effects, and cumulative effects for at-grade and elevated guideway sections and for supporting facilities. Concerns included the Balboa/Morena, La Jolla Colony, La Jolla Village Square, and University City areas and noise effects on wildlife in open-space areas. Other comments were related to bus and road noise from other projects.
4.1.6.12 Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials
An analysis of solid waste impacts was requested. One comment asked that the project consider green infrastructure and material reuse and recycling. One comment requested the evaluation of toxics and human health impacts.

4.1.6.13 Ecosystems
Comments noted a need to evaluate the project as a barrier to wildlife, especially if fencing is introduced. The evaluation of habitat loss, lighting, and noise effects on wildlife was requested. One comment noted a concern that invasive species could be introduced by Trolley operations. Potential mitigation sites were noted in the Rose Creek Watershed Opportunities Assessment if the project would create impacts that would require mitigation. Analysis of potential temporary and long-term impacts to Least Bell’s Vireo was requested.

4.1.6.14 Water Resources
Comments identified concerns with flood control, hydrology, runoff from on-site contamination, water supply, and hydraulic modeling. An analysis of stormwater impacts was requested. Comments stated that functional conditions of waters and riparian areas should be evaluated. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act will be applicable to the project and that measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to waters should be incorporated into the project.

4.1.6.15 Parks
One-hundred and nine comment submissions, more than for any other environmental topic, included comments related to parks and parklands. The comments focused on the protection and analysis of potential effects on Mandell-Weiss Eastgate City Park, Marian Bear Memorial Park, and Rose Canyon Open Space Park. Comments noted a need to address project compatibility with relevant park plans, including the Marian Bear Memorial Park Natural Resources Management Plan, the San Diego River Master Plan, and with the Rose Creek Watershed Opportunities Assessment. Several comments were related to existing uses of and resources within the parks, including the current frequent practice of access to the parks by illegal trespass and crossing of the existing MTS/SDNR right-of-way. Opposition to the use of the parkland was noted. The potential to impact the Mission Valley Preserve was also noted.

4.1.6.16 Historic/Cultural Resources
The Native American Heritage Commission identified Native American cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the project and commented that cultural landscapes should be considered along with other resources evaluated and consider avoidance when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning and implementation.

4.1.6.17 Construction Impacts
Several comments noted that construction effects related to traffic, access, water quality, and jobs should be evaluated.

4.1.6.18 Indirect and Cumulative Effects
Comments identified a need to consider the cumulative effects of various planned projects, including the planned I-5 improvements, on a broad range of the environmental
topics that are discussed above. One comment suggested that previous comments on the “UC North/South Transportation Corridor Project EIR” should be reviewed.

4.2 Summary of Substantive Agency Comments

Several agencies provided comments on the project during the scoping period (Appendix D of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping Report). This section provides a summary of comments presented by agencies during the scoping period. These agencies have regulatory responsibilities related to the project, which may include permits or approvals required for project implementation; therefore, their comments and directions are reproduced in detail in this report. The agencies that submitted comments during the scoping period include:

- United States Environmental Protection Agency
- United State Fish and Wildlife Service
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- California Department of Transportation
- State of California Native American Heritage Commission
- State of California Public Utilities Commission
- University of California, San Diego
- City of San Diego

4.2.1 United States Environmental Protection Agency

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) commends the FTA and SANDAG for seeking to improve public transportation service. The Draft SEIS should:

- Explore a range of reasonable alternatives, including the No-Action Alternative, and briefly discuss reasons for eliminating alternatives.
- Identify opportunities for the alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts while fulfilling the project purpose.
- Identify measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors, mobile source air toxics (MSAT) and particulate matter (PM).
- Ensure that the emission from both the construction and the operational phases of the project conform to the approved state implementation plan (SIP).
- Include a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan
- Identify the cumulative contributions to greenhouse gas emissions that will result from implementation of the project.
- Discuss how the project will impact existing vehicle lanes, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian paths due to project construction or operation.
• Evaluate “green infrastructure” and industrial materials recycling
• Address requirements of the EPA and US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the CWA.
• Identify whether the proposed alternative may disproportionately and adversely affect low-income or minority populations in the surrounding area and should provide appropriate mitigation measure for any adverse impacts.
• Document the process used for community involvement and communication.

4.2.2 United States Fish and Wildlife Service
The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) noted that sensitive habitats exist within the project area, including coastal sage scrub, wetlands, salt marsh, chaparral, and grassland. The project also falls under the City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan (SAP). Following is a summary of the FWS recommendations for information to be included in the SEIS/SEIR:
• Discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed project.
• List and assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area.
• Discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources.
• Mitigation measures for unavoidable adverse project-related impacts on sensitive plants, animals, and habitats. The analyses should include alternatives that avoid or otherwise reduce impacts to sensitive biological resources.

4.2.3 California Department of Fish and Game
The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) provided both general and specific comments.

4.2.3.1 Specific Comments
The project is located within the MSCP Subarea Plan (and Implementing Agreements under the NCCP program) for the City of San Diego. The CDFG is interested in options to minimize grading impacts to preserve lands. The CDFG will consider the alternatives analyzed in the context of their relative impacts on biological resources, on both a local and regional level. Take authorization pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and the Federal Endangered Species Act must be obtained if the project has the potential to result in a "take" of state- and/or federally-listed species of plants or animals. Identify location of construction and post-construction best management practices related to the development footprint; native plants should be used to the greatest extent feasible.

4.2.3.2 General Comments
The CDFG has responsibility for wetland and riparian habitats. A jurisdictional delineation of the creeks and their associated riparian habitats should be included in the Draft SEIR. For any activity that will affect a streambed, the project applicant must notify the CDFG to determine if a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required.
The CDFG notes several of the same document requirements already listed by the EPA and provided details on how the analysis should be completed and what mitigation should be considered.

**4.2.4 California Department of Toxic Substances Control**

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (CDTSC) commented the SEIR should:

- Evaluate whether conditions within the project area may pose a threat to human health or the environment. Information on data sources was provided.
- Identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated with hazardous substances.
- Investigate the presence of other hazardous chemicals, mercury, and asbestos containing materials (ACMs) for facilities to be demolished.
- Protect human health and the environment of sensitive receptors during any construction or demolition activities.
- Manage any hazardous wastes in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law.

**4.2.5 California Department of Transportation**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) supports the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, as it would provide new travel options and improve mobility within the congested Interstate 5 (I-5) corridor. Based on the coordination that has occurred over the years between Caltrans and SANDAG, Caltrans has no major concerns with locating the proposed Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project within the Caltrans right-of-way as planned.

Any work performed within the right-of-way requires discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and must be clearly identified and included in the environmental document. The identification of avoidance and/or mitigation measures will be a condition of the Caltrans encroachment permit approval as well as the procurement of any necessary regulatory and resource agency permits.

Improvement plans for construction within the State Highway right-of-way must include the appropriate engineering information consistent with the state code, and signed and stamped by a professional engineer registered in the State of California. The Caltrans Permit Manual contains a listing of typical information required for project plans.

All design and construction must be in conformance with the ADA.

**4.2.6 State of California Native American Heritage Commission**

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) performed a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search in the NAHC SLF Inventory, established by the legislature pursuant to PRC §5097.94(a), and Native American Cultural resources were identified within the APE, the Old Town, Pacific Beach, and La Jolla areas. We recommend that you contact persons...
on the attached list of Native American contacts and the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) State of California Public Utilities Commission

4.2.7 State of California Public Utilities Commission

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has regulatory and safety oversight over railroad crossings in California. In the development of the environmental document, SANDAG should analyze impacts to highway-rail crossings. CPUC approval is required for the construction of any new crossing. SANDAG should consider grade separations for major thoroughfares and study pedestrian and vehicle traffic at the crossings. During the process, SANDAG should be in contact with staff to discuss any relevant concerns or issues.

4.2.8 University of California, San Diego

The University of California, San Diego (UCSD) commented that bringing additional alternative transportation options to our growing campus and to the San Diego region is critical to a healthier environment and the region's economic vitality. Extending the Light Rail Transit (LRT) to our West and East Campuses as soon as possible is imperative to allow our campus to minimize its impact on San Diego's freeways, local roads, and intersections.

UCSD intends to be an engaged partner to ensure safety and security of our campus community, including the following: students in Sixth College, adjacent to the UCSD West Station (Pepper Canyon location), which was included in the University Center/Sixth College Neighborhood Plan adopted by UCSD in 2004; students who attend the Preuss School, our charter middle/high school on UCSD East Campus; and, the preservation of emergency and non-emergency access to the UCSD Medical Center.

Safe and effective pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation, to, from, and on the campus, are top concerns and priorities. UCSD has developed a detailed list of issues that must be addressed and mitigated by the project. Issues include, but are not limited to, noise, vibration, safety, security, circulation, biology, construction staging, electromagnetic fields, and aesthetic impacts.

The following comments are based on the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report and represent issues noted by members of the UCSD community:

- **LRT 1. Advantages:** impacts to sensitive biological resources are minimized. **Disadvantages:** several at-grade crossings, impacting vehicular circulation and visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists; separates Warren Field and Canyonview Pool recreation complexes along Voigt Drive; Integration of LRT and proposed at-grade Voigt Drive DAR creates a complex issue for construction phasing and operation; impacts to Preuss School, including safety of pedestrians; impacts to campus recreation lands; impacts to Campus Point Drive intersection at entry to UCSD Medical Center and for emergency vehicles.

- **LRT 4. Advantages:** impacts to sensitive biological resources are minimized; aerial alignment on UCSD East Campus minimizes circulation impacts; potential for reduced LRT right-of-way requirements; regional access to UCSD East Station more
easily accommodated at this location, with elevated station allowing flexibility of land uses; aerial alignment may better integrate with proposed Voigt Drive DAR improvements. **Disadvantages:** separates Warren Field and Canyonview Pool recreation complexes along Voigt Drive; impacts to campus recreation lands; integration of LRT and proposed at-grade Voigt Drive DAR, with Campus Point Drive realignment, is critical during design, construction, and operation; coordination with access to UCSD Medical Center and UCSD East Campus needed.

- **LRT 5. Advantages:** avoids Voigt Drive, ensuring ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR; reduces impacts to Preuss School; regional access to UCSD East Station more easily accommodated at this location; minimizes impact to baseball field; eliminates impact to Campus Point Drive intersection at entry to UCSD Medical Center and for emergency vehicles. **Disadvantages:** impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources; impacts to recreational lands; additional impacts to Sixth College student housing on north; potential impacts to future UCSD East Campus development sites; Campus Point Drive realignment as part of proposed Voigt Drive DAR still being studied, which may impact the feasibility of this alignment.

- **LRT 3. Advantages:** avoids Voigt Drive, ensuring ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR; avoids impacts to Preuss School; avoids impacts to campus recreational lands; UCSD East Station location most proximate to UCSD Medical Center; and, avoids impacts to UCSD Medical Center and UCSD East Campus access. **Disadvantages:** impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources south of Thornton Hospital; UCSD East Station location not desirable for regional access; potential impacts to Mesa Housing and Science Research Park; and, constrained design opportunities for future I-5/Gilman Drive bridge project.

- **LRT 6. Advantages:** avoids Voigt Drive, ensuring ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR; avoids impacts to Preuss School; UCSD East Station location most proximate to UCSD Medical Center; and, avoids impacts to UCSD Medical Center and UCSD East Campus access. **Disadvantages:** impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources south of Thornton Hospital; additional impacts to Sixth College student housing on north; UCSD East Station location not desirable for regional access; impacts to Health Sciences buildings to be constructed on UCSD East Campus (office buildings and CTRI Phase 2); and, potential impacts to planned I-5/Gilman Drive bridge.

### 4.2.9 City of San Diego

Comments were received from City of San Diego staff from the Park and Recreation, City Planning and Community Investment, Environmental Services, Storm Water, and The Development Services Departments in response to the NOP. Analysis of the alternatives should also include an assessment of consistency with any relevant park plans, including the Marian Bear Memorial Park Natural Resources Management Plan, the Draft 2005 San Diego River Master Plan, and any other relevant documents for the open space areas.

The section for Least Bell’s Vireo should address temporary construction impacts and long-term impacts from loss of habitat and/or shading along Rose Creek and the San Diego River. Please include an analysis of these potential impacts.
The project may have potential impacts to Marian Bear Memorial and Rose Canyon Open Space (OS) Parks, and the Mission Valley Preserve.

Station locations at Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, and Balboa Avenue Stations should consider bicycle and pedestrian access, and potential for future infill and transit-oriented development (TOD).

Under “Probable Environmental Effects”, address the solid waste impacts associated with the project. Impacts from storm water be evaluated and addressed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The transportation impact analysis prepared for the SEIR should follow the guidelines of the City of San Diego Traffic Impact Study Manual, July 1998.

Cumulative development projects in the project area should be identified/updated in coordination with the City’s City Planning and Community Investment and Development Services Departments.

The environmental document should analyze impacts to all resources within the City of San Diego boundaries consistent with the City of San Diego’s Significance Determination Thresholds.

Consideration should be given to additional and/or alternate station locations, especially in the area between the proposed Balboa Avenue Station and the station near Nobel Drive and near the Gilman Drive/I-5 interchange area.

4.3 Comment Database

A copy of the comment database is provided in Appendix F of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping Report.
FY 2010 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE ALLOCATION

Introduction

The State Transit Assistance (STA) is a state program administered locally that provides support for public transit services. The FY 2010 state budget included a provision to eliminate this funding source for three years; however, in March of this year the Governor signed into law ABx8-6 and ABx8-9, which restores the STA program. The State Controller’s Office published the final STA allocations on June 22, with payments to the counties transmitted on June 25, 2010. In anticipation of this action, the North County Transit District (NCTD) Board of Directors approved the required findings and resolution at its May 2010 meeting. At the June 25, 2010, meeting, the Board approved the NCTD findings as part of the approval for the FY 2011 Transportation Development Act allocations.

Discussion

NCTD STA Claim ($5,945,102)

The FY 2010 allocation was made available by the State Controller’s Office in a letter dated June 22, 2010. NCTD plans to use the entire amount available for operations. State law requires that operators meet certain qualifying criteria (to determine service efficiency) to use STA funds for operations; however, the state budget legislation suspended this requirement from January 1, 2010, through FY 2012. As a result, SANDAG did not calculate the operations qualifications for NCTD and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). The SANDAG area, as defined under the STA program, consists of the area outside of the MTS area of jurisdiction. NCTD is the only claimant of STA funds in the SANDAG area.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2011-01, approving the FY 2010 State Transit Assistance claim for North County Transit District in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 1.

Attachment: 1. Resolution No. 2011-01

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, ski@sandag.org
RESOLUTION NO. 2011-01

APPROVING THE ALLOCATION OF STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA) CLAIM TO THE NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the North County Transit District (NCTD) has filed a claim for State Transit Assistance (STA) funds in the amount of $5,945,102 for FY 2010 pursuant to Section 6730(a) of Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR); and

WHEREAS, at the June 25, 2010, meeting, the Board of Directors adopted the required findings for NCTD pursuant to Section 6754; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors finds that the above claim is in substantial conformance with the provisions of the Transportation Development Act of 1971, as amended, and meets the specific requirements of Section 6754 of Title 21 of the CCR;

NOW THEREFORE

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

1. That the Board of Directors does hereby approve the allocation of STA to the following claimants for purposes listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11041003</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$5,945,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 2nd day of July 2010.

ATTEST: ________________________________
SECRETARY

CHAIRPERSON

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

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

Attachment 1
Introduction

On July 25, 2008, the Board of Directors adopted the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the multiyear program of proposed major highway, arterial, transit, and bikeway projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2009 to FY 2013. The 2009 Federal State Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP), which includes the SANDAG 2008 RTIP, received federal approval on November 17, 2008.

Background

There are two types of RTIP amendments, formal and administrative. Formal amendments require, among other things, a 15-day public notice period while administrative amendments are considered minor in nature and do not require a public notice period. Chapter 2 of the adopted 2008 RTIP provides additional details regarding the difference between formal and administrative amendments. Amendment No. 27 is considered administrative because the proposed change is consistent with the federally-accepted administrative amendment procedures. The federal agencies delegated the approval of administrative amendments to the state, thereby streamlining the approval process.

Discussion

Amendment No. 27 is an amendment outside of the regular quarterly cycle due to timing. On June 22, 2010, the state published information that additional federal funds are available to the San Diego region. These funds, including the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), must be obligated before the end of the federal fiscal year, or September 30, 2010. However, SANDAG must submit all required paperwork to the state in early July 2010. Due to the urgent obligation requirement, SANDAG needed to identify a project that already had RSTP programmed. The one project that met the requirement is the Interstate 5 (I-5) North Coast project. Below provides the proposed project amendment. Attachment 1 (Table 1) provides additional information.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Amendment No. 27 to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.
Caltrans

- **I-5 North Coast (CAL09):** SANDAG learned that approximately $10.5 million in additional RSTP funds are available to obligate in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010. This amendment proposes to exchange a like amount of TransNet-Major Corridors (MC) with RSTP thus delaying the use of TransNet. For SANDAG FY 2010 is complete so the exchange with RSTP is shown in FY 2012. Due to a procedure known as Expedited Project Selection Process (EPSP), SANDAG can obligate the FY 2012 funds in FFY 2010. This action not only defers the use of TransNet, it also frees up RSTP capacity in FY 2012 to program toward other projects. The total project increase to $89,782,000 is consistent with the Board of Directors approved FY 2011 budget for this project.

**Fiscal Constraint Analysis**

Federal regulations require the 2008 RTIP to be a revenue-constrained document with programmed projects based upon available or committed funding and/or reasonable estimates of future funding. Funding assumptions are generally based upon: (1) authorized or appropriated levels of federal and state funding from current legislation; (2) conservative projections of future federal and state funding based upon a continuation of current funding levels; (3) the most current revenue forecasts for the TransNet program; and (4) the planning and programming documents of the local transportation providers.

As an administrative amendment, an updated fiscal constraint analysis is not required. The proposed changes included in Amendment No. 27 do not affect the fiscal constraint as submitted as part of Amendment No. 20, the last formal amendment to the 2008 RTIP. Chapter 4 of the Final 2008 RTIP discusses in detail the financial capacity analysis of major program areas, including discussion of available revenues. The 2008 RTIP, including Amendment No. 27, continues to be reasonable when considering available funding sources.

**Air Quality Analysis**

On July 25, 2008, SANDAG found the 2008 RTIP in conformance with the Regional Air Quality Strategy/State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the San Diego region. All of the required regionally significant capacity increasing projects were included in the quantitative emissions analysis conducted for the 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan: Pathways for the Future (2030 RTP) and the 2008 RTIP. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) jointly approved the conformity determination for the 2008 RTIP and the conformity redetermination for the 2030 RTP on November 17, 2008. On January 22, 2010, an additional Air Quality analysis was approved by the Board for all capacity-increasing projects included in Amendment No. 16, which was subsequently approved jointly by FHWA and FTA on February 19, 2010.
The proposed amendment does not reflect a change in the design concept and scope of the project or the conformity analysis years as assumed for the regional emissions analysis of the currently conforming RTP and RTIP. The project in RTIP Amendment No. 27 meets the conformity provisions of the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR §93.122(g)). Amendment No. 27 does not interfere with the timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures. The 2008 RTIP, including Amendment No. 27, remains in conformance with the SIP.

LAUREN WARREM
Director of Finance

Attachment: 1. Table 1, 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, Amendment No. 27

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, ski@sandag.org
## Table 1
### 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
#### Amendment No. 27
##### San Diego Region (in $000s)

**Caltrans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID:</th>
<th>CAL09</th>
<th>RTIP #:08-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Interstate 5 - HOV Managed Lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description:</td>
<td>From La Jolla Village Dr. to Harbor Dr. - construct HOV/Managed Lanes on I-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Reason:</td>
<td>Increase Funding, Fund Exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Total Cost:</td>
<td>$89,782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Capacity Status: | CI |
| Exempt Category: | Non-Exempt |

| Open to Traffic: | Jul 2016 |

### Project Prior to Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$29,121</td>
<td>$18,599</td>
<td>$18,599</td>
<td>$10,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP NHS</td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP State Cash</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$51,702</td>
<td>$8,794</td>
<td>$1,436</td>
<td>$18,053</td>
<td>$22,840</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,025</td>
<td>$7,677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$83,177</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,361</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,848</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,562</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,615</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Prior to Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$18,599</td>
<td>$18,599</td>
<td>$18,599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP NHS</td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP State Cash</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$55,619</td>
<td>$8,803</td>
<td>$3,848</td>
<td>$21,302</td>
<td>$10,833</td>
<td>$10,833</td>
<td>$10,833</td>
<td>$52,004</td>
<td>$3,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$83,177</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,361</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,848</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,562</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,615</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RTIP Fund Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Advanced Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRA</td>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Federal Stimulus Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP</td>
<td>Border Infrastructure Program (Federal under SAFETEA-LU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA</td>
<td>Bicycle Transportation Account (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>Corridors and Borders Infrastructure Program (Federal under TEA-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (Federal formula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIA</td>
<td>Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (Prop. 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO</td>
<td>High Priority Demonstration Program under TEA-21 (Federal discretionary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO-Sec 115</td>
<td>High Priority Demonstration Program under FY 2004 Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO-Sec 117/STP</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program under FHWA Administrative Program (congressionally directed appropriations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (State legislation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARVEE</td>
<td>Grant Anticipated Revenue Vehicles (FHWA bonds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBP</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Program under SAFETEA-LU (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation under TEA-21 (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>Hazard Elimination System (Federal administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>High Priority Program under SAFETEA-LU (Federal discretionary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (Administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>Housing and Urban Development (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Interstate Maintenance Discretionary (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI</td>
<td>Intercity Rail Improvement (Prop 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Indian Reservation Roads program (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>National Highway System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Public Transportation Account (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTMISEA</td>
<td>Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement (Prop. 1B state bond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1A - High Speed Rail</td>
<td>High Speed Passenger Bond Program (Prop 1A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTCIP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Recreational Trails Program (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>State Highway Operation &amp; Protection Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLPP</td>
<td>State Local Partnership Program (Prop. 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School (Federal program administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Interregional Program (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Regional Improvement Program (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5307</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Urbanized Area Formula Program (Federal including ARRA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
#### Amendment No. 27
#### San Diego Region (in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary Program (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula program (Federal including ARRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 (NS)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary - New Starts Program (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5310</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Elderly &amp; Disabled Program (Allocated by CTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5311</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Rural Program (Federal including ARRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5316 (JARCI)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Jobs Access Reverse Commute (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5317 (NF)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration New Freedom (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion Relief Program (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSP</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Community &amp; System Preservation (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA-B</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act-Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Facilities (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA/TE</td>
<td>Transportation Enhancement Activities Program (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGER (ARRA)</td>
<td>Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (Federal Stimulus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGGER (ARRA)</td>
<td>Transit Investment for Greenhouse Gas and Energy Reduction (Federal Stimulus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>Traffic Light Synchronization Program (Prop. 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSGP</td>
<td>Transit Security Grant Program (Federal Homeland Security Office and State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>Transportation Systems Management (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-78</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - SR 78 (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-ADA</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Transit (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-B</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Bike (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-BPNS</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax extension - Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-BRT/Ops</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Bus Rapid Transit/New Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-Border</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-CP</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Commercial Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-H</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-L</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local Streets &amp; Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSG</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local Smart Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local System Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-MC</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Major Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-REMP</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Regional Environmental Mitigation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-SMIP</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Regional Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-SS</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Senior Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-T</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-TSI</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax- Transit System Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of TransNet Revenues and Construction Index
Cumulative Escalation Indexed to FY2005

Actual vs. Projected
July 2, 2010

SANDAG Transportation Committee
401 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Item 6 – Destination Lindbergh: Intermodal Transportation Center Update

Destination Lindbergh gives us an excellent opportunity to reaffirm the importance of transit in our future planning and growth of our region. The number of travelers flying into the San Diego International Airport is expected to increase dramatically and the airport is steadily outgrowing its own capacity to serve San Diego County. Therefore it is critical that today’s planning revolves around providing safe and alternative methods of transportation for travelers going to and from their destination.

We are excited to see a heavy emphasis in this plan on providing high frequency trolley, bus service and Coaster routes, as well as taking into consideration possible high speed rail. This is the perfect environment to encourage transit as the most competitive mode of transportation among SDIA travelers and to provide the necessary infrastructure and land use strategies to support an effective transit network.

Implementing a strong and robust transit system into Destination Lindbergh has the ability to increase overall transit ridership in San Diego as passengers realize the benefits of using trolley, rail, and bus to get to their destination. Integrating fast and effective transit to and from the airport can produce very competitive trip times and savings among commuters. For example, instead of paying high parking prices or battling the traditional bottleneck of traffic on Harbor Boulevard, competitive transportation options allow passengers to have the peace of mind of a stress-free and easy commute by taking high-performing transit to catch their flights. Fast and convenient transit options to SDIA can surely become a model example for providing competitive transit options to other parts of the County as well.

Finally, providing a complete and effective transportation hub has great potential for extensive redevelopment opportunities along this corridor. The report confirms this redevelopment opportunity in Attachment 1 and studies have shown repeatedly that transit can help spur economic and residential redevelopment. Integrating a comprehensive transit network at this site will certainly become a catalyst for new jobs, strong economic output, and a sustainable revitalization of the area.
As we continue planning the future of our airport and our entire region, it is important we continue to remind ourselves to focus our emphasis on providing sustainable communities. Even more importantly, public transit must be supported by the political will to implement and fund high quality transit operations to produce and maintain a high level of service for commuters. We sincerely appreciate the efforts of SANDAG and the San Diego Regional Airport Authority for their work on this important project for San Diego residents and our guests who fly in and out of SDIA.

Sincerely,

Elyse Lowe
Executive Director, Move San Diego

EL:nb
Destination Lindbergh: Intermodal Transportation Center Update

July 2, 2010

Background

- Destination Lindbergh Master Plan recommended:
  - Northside airport terminal complex
  - Adjacent ITC facility to provide direct connections from transit/Amtrak/HSR
  - Direct freeway ramps from I-5
ITC Site Planning Status

- **Northside Airport Phase 1 improvements**
  - Airport Authority
    - CONRAC facility
    - On-airport shuttle
  - SANDAG
    - ITC site design and redevelopment opportunities
    - Consolidated facility serves Trolley, COASTER, Bus, Amtrak
    - Pedestrian bridge from ITC to CONRAC/airport shuttle
    - Trolley/COASTER/Amtrak grade separations

- **Long Range ITC facility:**
  High Speed Rail terminal station

Study Coordination

- **Technical Advisory Committee formed to coordinate studies among stakeholders**
  - San Diego County Regional Airport Authority
  - Caltrans
  - City of San Diego
  - MTS and NCTD
  - Port of San Diego
  - CA High Speed Rail Authority
  - SANDAG

- **City of San Diego contributed $200,000 towards ITC study**
Preferred ITC Design Layouts

Preferred design layouts developed with input from TAC

1. Opening Day: CONRAC & Phase I ITC
2. Long Range: Northside Air Terminal and HSR
   - All HSR functions at ITC
   - Some HSR functions at airport terminal

Existing Conditions
Opening Day ITC Site Layout

Long Range Site Layout (All HSR Functions at ITC)
Next Steps

- Refine Opening Day option and prepare cost estimate (by end of 2010)
- Prepare initial concept for direct freeway ramps (Caltrans – by June 2011)
- Prepare preliminary design for rail grade separations (by December 2011)
- Sets stage for formal environmental studies (could begin in 2011, but currently unfunded)
Scoping Period

- Scoping Period for Draft SEIS/SEIR
  
  Provided opportunity for public and agencies to review and comment on scope of environmental issues and alternatives proposed to be analyzed in draft environmental document.
Scoping Period

- Scoping Period
  - 30-Day Scoping Period
  - May 3 through June 1

- SANDAG Board
  - approved 3 LRT Alternatives for Scoping on April 23
Outreach for Scoping

- Notice of Preparation
- PWG involvement
- Community meetings
- Newspaper advertisements
- Direct mail to more than 25,000 homes/businesses
- E-mail distribution to stakeholders
- Mid-Coast Web pages
- Media outreach

Scoping Meetings – Open House
SANDAG received 243 comment submissions
- Letters, e-mails, comment cards, telephone messages, verbal testimony at scoping meetings
- Most contained several comments
- 740 individual comments received

Comments categorized into 6 categories:
- General Comments
- Purpose and Need
- Alternatives
- Evaluation of Alternatives
- Costs and Funding
- Analysis of Environmental Effects
- 21 sub-categories
Scoping Comment Summary

- Most frequent comment - 107 comments received
- Opposition to LRT Alternative 3
  - Potential impacts to Rose Canyon
    - Effects to wildlife and habitat
    - Spread of invasive species
  - Potential noise and other community impacts
  - Concerns with tunnel construction under Genesee Avenue and Executive Drive

---

Scoping Comment Summary

- Second most frequent comment - 97 comments received
- Support for LRT Alternative 1
Other comments on alternatives
- Support:
  • any LRT alternative – 12 comments
  • LRT 1 or LRT 6 – 3 comments
  • LRT 3 – 3 comments
  • BRT – 3 comments
- Oppose:
  • LRT 1 – 2 comments
  • LRT 6 – 3 comments
- 4 new LRT alternatives suggested

Analysis of Environmental Effects - 109 comments related to parks
Protection and analysis of potential effects on:
- Mandell-Weiss Eastgate City Park
- Marion Bear Memorial Park
- Rose Canyon Open Space Park
MTS Board Action During Scoping

- MTS Board of Directors received report on Mid-Coast Project – May 13, 2010
- MTS Board of Directors voted unanimously to support LRT Alternative 1

Next Steps

- Final Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report
  - Summary of scoping comments
  - Responses to comments
  - Recommendation on a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) or alternatives to be analyzed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR
Next Steps

- Final Comparative Evaluation Report and Recommendation presented in July
  - Project Working Group – July 14
  - Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee – July 14
  - Transportation Committee – July 16
  - Board of Directors – July 23

Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Briefing

July 2, 2010