BORDERS COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, June 25, 2010
12:30 to 2:30 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- PROGRESS REPORT ON THE SAN DIEGO - IMPERIAL COUNTY I-8 CORRIDOR STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE
- PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE 2010 BINATIONAL SEMINAR
- 2050 RTP: UATS AND DEVELOPMENT OF INITIAL UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK
- PROGRESS REPORT ON THE SAN YSIDRO LAND PORT OF ENTRY RECONFIGURATION AND EXPANSION PROJECT

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

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

MISSION STATEMENT

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

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

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

1. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 23, 2010, MEETING MINUTES
   APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Borders Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee 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 ITEMS (#3 through #5)

3. BORDERS COMMITTEE WORK ELEMENTS AND CALENDAR OF MEETINGS FOR FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2011 (Hector Vanegas)

   INFORMATION

   This report outlines the work elements and tasks included in the FY 2011 Overall Work Program that are related to the responsibilities of the Borders Committee, as well as a draft calendar of meetings for FY 2011.

4. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE SAN DIEGO - IMPERIAL COUNTY INTERSTATE 8 (I-8) CORRIDOR STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE (Ron Saenz)

   INFORMATION

   The Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG), in partnership with Caltrans, District 11 and SANDAG completed the Final San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan in February 2009. This report describes progress made since last reported at the October 2009 Borders Committee meeting.

5. PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE 2010 BINATIONAL SEMINAR "CROSSBORDER CLIMATE CHANGE STRATEGIES: RAISING AWARENESS OF ADAPTATION" (Chair Paul Ganster, Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities)

   INFORMATION

   Since 1997, SANDAG has organized an annual event to address binational topics. This year the event focused on Crossborder Climate Change Adaptation Strategies. This report will present highlights from the 2010 binational seminar.
### REPORT ITEMS (#6 through #9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): URBAN AREA TRANSIT STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT OF INITIAL UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK (Carolina Gregor and Elisa Arias)

SANDAG is currently preparing the 2050 RTP. The Urban Area Transit Strategy will serve as the basis of the transit strategy to be included in the RTP. The transit networks, combined with highway improvements and other management strategies, will form the basis for the initial 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network. Attached are two reports that were provided to the SANDAG Board of Directors earlier this month on these topics. Borders Committee members are asked to provide feedback on the initial network.

#### 7. REPORT FROM THE CONSUL GENERAL OF MEXICO (Hon. Remedios Gómez-Arnau, Consul General of Mexico in San Diego)

The Consul General of Mexico in San Diego, Hon. Remedios Gómez-Arnau, contributes to the Borders Committee dialogue by providing periodic reports on binational activities within the purview of the Committee. This report highlights President Felipe Calderón and President Barack Obama Joint Statement, signed on May 19, 2010, during the visit to Washington D.C. of Mexico’s President Felipe Calderón.

#### 8. REPORT FROM THE CONSUL GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES: PERSPECTIVES AND UPDATES ON BORDER ISSUES (Hon. Steven B. Kashkett, Consul General of the United Status in Tijuana, Mexico)

Consul General Steven B. Kashkett will brief the Committee on the Consulate’s view on a variety of Borders Committee related topics. Consul General Kashkett is a career diplomat that has served in several countries and since last year he has served as the Consul General of the United States in Tijuana, Baja California.

#### 9. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE SAN YSIDRO LAND PORT OF ENTRY RECONFIGURATION AND EXPANSION PROJECT (U.S. General Services Administration)

In December 2009, the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) initiated the construction of Phase 1A of the San Ysidro Land Port of Entry Reconfiguration and Expansion Project. GSA staff will provide an update on the project and its construction schedule.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>UPCOMING MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, July 23, 2010, at 12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>ADJOURNMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ next to an item indicates an attachment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting of the Borders Committee was called to order by Chair Patricia McCoy (South County) at 12:35 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Borders Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

   Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Greg Cox (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember John Minto (East County), the Borders Committee approved the minutes from the March 26, 2010 meeting. Mayor Pro Tem Jim Dahl (Orange County) and Councilmember Crystal Crawford (North County Coastal) abstained.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   Chair McCoy thanked Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego), Councilmember Minto, Councilmember Sam Abed (North County Inland), Chairman Chris Devers, Pauma Band of Mission Indians (Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association), and Chairman Mark Romero, Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians (Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association), for their efforts in bringing about the successful Tribal Summit.

   Councilmember Crawford recommended viewing the video regarding tribal sovereignty and asked if it was available for viewing by others.

   Chairman Devers responded that the video is not currently available as the tribes are still reviewing it.

   Supervisor Slater-Price reported there will be tribal representation on the Unified Disaster Council (UDC).

   Councilmember Abed expressed his gratitude to all participants; stating there is a better understanding of the issues, and that coordination is necessary to improve emergency response.
Chair McCoy recognized Councilmember Crawford and Jane Clough-Riquelme, Senior Planner (SANDAG), for organizing and leading the Tribal Summit; and, informed on the honors bestowed upon Ms. Clough-Riquelme by the tribes and the American Planning Association (APA).

CONSENT ITEMS (#3 THROUGH #4)

3. STATUS REPORT ON SANDAG, ORANGE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (OCTA), AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG) COLLABORATION ON LONG-RANGE PLANNING (INFORMATION)

Staff members from OCTA, SCAG, and SANDAG have met periodically to collaborate on long-range planning efforts including Senate Bill (SB) 375 implementation, updates to long-range transportation plans, and rail and corridor planning. This status report provided information on recent collaboration activities.

4. 2010 SANDAG ANNUAL BINATIONAL EVENT UPDATE (INFORMATION)

The Save the Date announcement for the 2010 binational seminar to be held on June 1, 2010, was provided.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Minto and a second by Councilmember Crawford, the Borders Committee approved Consent Items 3 and 4.

REPORT ITEMS (#5 through #7)

5. FINAL REPORT OF PHASE III OF THE INTERSTATE 15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (I-15 IRP) (APPROVE)

In 2008, the I-15 IRP between San Diego and southwestern Riverside received funding to continue implementing interregional strategies in transportation, housing, and economic development to improve the quality of life for residents in both Regions.

Jane Clough-Riquelme, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item; and, Kevin Viera, Program Manager, Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), provided additional details.

Action: Upon a motion by Council President Ben Hueso (City of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Minto, the Borders Committee unanimously accepted the final report for Phase III of the I-15 IRP (Attachment 1).

6. SOUTH AND EAST SAN DIEGO COUNTY/IMPERIAL COUNTY 2009 COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) (INFORMATION)

In October 2008, the South County Economic Development Council (South County EDC) received a grant to create a CEDS, which is required to qualify for Economic Development
Administration (EDA) assistance for public works and planning efforts, and a prerequisite for being designated by EDA as an economic development district. The CEDS was recently completed and Cindy Gompper-Graves, Executive Director (South County EDC), summarized its findings; and, Jo Marie Diamond, Vice President (South County EDC), presented additional information.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

7. PERSPECTIVES ON WATER SUPPLY IN THE BINATIONAL BORDER REGION

a) PERSPECTIVES ON WATER USAGE ASSOCIATED WITH CLIMATE CHANGE IN BAJA CALIFORNIA (INFORMATION)

Alberto Pombo, PhD, Department of Urban and Environmental Studies, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, reported on the Mexican perspective regarding future impacts that climate change could have on water usage and availability in Baja California.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

b) OVERVIEW OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY (SDCWA) CROSSBORDER ACTIVITIES (INFORMATION)

At the 2009 joint meeting of the Borders Committee and the City of Tijuana, Mayor Jorge Ramos raised the issue of water supply and the concept of a desalination plant in the border region. Halla Razak, Colorado River Programs Director (SDCWA), provided an overview on SDCWA’s work on crossborder water issues, including outcomes from a preliminary study on a proposed desalination plant in Baja California.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, May 28, 2010, at 12:30 p.m.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair McCoy adjourned the meeting at 2:31 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING
#### APRIL 23, 2010
12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia McCoy (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Rudy Ramirez</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Crystal Crawford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jim Wood</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Carl Kruse</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South County</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Rudy Ramirez</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Crystal Crawford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jim Wood</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Carl Kruse</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>John Minto</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>David Allan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>David Allan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>John Minto</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>David Allan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association</td>
<td>Chris Devers</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Romero</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denis Turner</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Elsa Saxod</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>Rich Macias</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathew Gleason</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Orange</td>
<td>City of San Clemente</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Campbell</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BORDERS COMMITTEE

June 25, 2010

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: INFORMATION

BORDERS COMMITTEE WORK ELEMENTS AND CALENDAR OF MEETINGS FOR FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2011

File Number 3200400

Introduction

This report presents a proposed calendar of meetings that outlines the work elements and tasks included in the FY 2011 Overall Work Program (OWP) that are related to the responsibilities of the Borders Committee. As recommended in previous years, the proposed calendar of meetings is organized by themes: binational, interregional, and tribal.

Discussion

The FY 2011 OWP is organized by strategic goals and areas of emphasis. Planning and Forecasts is one of the areas of emphasis that pertains directly to the work of the Borders Committee, and it is defined as “A coordinated planning process that will lead to a scheduled adoption of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in July 2011, including a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). This area of emphasis also includes collaborative efforts with partner agencies in neighboring counties, Mexico, and tribal nations, focusing on development of strategies and delivery of projects and programs that will improve mobility and sustainability in our regions.” The following are selected work elements within the Planning and Forecasts area of emphasis:

31007.00 Goods Movement Planning
31008.00 Comprehensive Freight Gateway Study
34001.00 Interregional Planning: Imperial, Orange, and Riverside Counties
34002.00 Interregional Planning: Binational Planning and Coordination
34005.00 Interregional Planning: Tribal Liaison Program
34200.00 New Border Crossing and State Route (SR) 11

Additionally, the Borders Committee is listed as the Policy Committee in the OWP work element 34008.00 ARJIS: Interregional Justice Data-Sharing that is included in the Internal and External Coordination area of emphasis.

The proposed FY 2011 Borders Committee calendar of meetings organizes future meeting agendas into three themes (binational, interregional, and tribal) in order to encourage proper representation by stakeholders. Regularly scheduled committee meetings and special meetings are listed chronologically by month with a list of proposed meeting topics, activities, and actionable
items. The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) Board will review this schedule and will report at a future meeting on its specific recommendations for tribal policy issues to be considered by SANDAG’s Policy Advisory Committees, including the Borders Committee. Changes and additional recommendations of the SCTCA pertaining to the Borders Committee will be incorporated into the attached matrix and presented at a future meeting.

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

Attachment: 1. Borders Committee FY 2011 Calendar of Meetings

Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas, (619) 699-1972; hva@sandag.org
# Borders Committee FY 2011 Calendar of Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>TENTATIVE TOPICS / ITEMS</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 23, 2010</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td><strong>Agenda</strong>&lt;br&gt;$\cdot$ Proceedings from 2010 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit&lt;br&gt;$\cdot$ Tribal Collaboration - Next Steps&lt;br&gt;$\cdot$ Update from the Reservation Transportation Authority&lt;br&gt;$\cdot$ County-Tribal Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 27, 2010</td>
<td>MEETING MAY BE CANCELLED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24, 2010</td>
<td>Binational</td>
<td><strong>Agenda</strong>&lt;br&gt;$\cdot$ Recommendations from the 2010 Binational Seminar&lt;br&gt;$\cdot$ Briefing on State Route 11/Otay Mesa East POE Financial Strategy&lt;br&gt;$\cdot$ Recommendations from Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association (SCTCA) on Tribal Issues for Borders Committee FY 2011 Meeting Schedule&lt;br&gt;$\cdot$ Cal-EPA Crossborder Efforts on Climate Change</td>
<td>Recommend&lt;br&gt;Information&lt;br&gt;Discussion/ Possible Action&lt;br&gt;Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22, 2010</td>
<td>Binational / Interregional</td>
<td><strong>Agenda</strong>&lt;br&gt;$\cdot$ San Diego-Imperial County I-B Corridor Strategic Plan Update&lt;br&gt;$\cdot$ Update on Selected Strategies from the Otay Mesa – Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Information&lt;br&gt;Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19, 2010</td>
<td>Interregional / Tribal</td>
<td>§ Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Tribal, Binational and Interregional Components  Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ Good Neighbor Environmental Board: Report to the President of the United States  Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16, 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEETING MAY BE CANCELLED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 28, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEETING MAY BE CANCELLED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 25, 2011</td>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>§ Updates on Comprehensive Freight Gateway Study  Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan Update  Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2011</td>
<td>Binational</td>
<td>§ Status Report on Otay Mesa East-Otay II POE and connecting roads  Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ Briefing on State Route 11/Otay Mesa East POE Financial Strategy  Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ Progress report on the San Ysidro POE Reconfiguration and Expansion Project by GSA  Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ Organization of the 2011 Binational Seminar  Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 2011</td>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>§ Status Report on SANDAG and Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Collaboration on Long-Range Planning  Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan  Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Agenda:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 2011</td>
<td>Interregional / Tribal</td>
<td>§ TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 2011</td>
<td>Binational</td>
<td>§ (Tentative) Joint Meeting of the Borders Committee, COBRO, and the City of Tijuana City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ Progress Report on the Implementation of Strategies Included in the Otay Mesa - Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRESS REPORT ON THE SAN DIEGO - IMPERIAL COUNTY INTERSTATE 8 (I-8) CORRIDOR STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

File Number 3400100

Introduction

The Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG), in cooperation with Caltrans, District 11 and SANDAG, began work on the development of the San Diego Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan in 2008. This study identified issues, established goals and objectives, and developed interregional strategies in the areas of transportation, housing, and employment to ensure adequate levels of service on the I-8 corridor. The study’s Executive Summary is attached. This report describes progress made since last reported at the October 2009 Borders Committee meeting.

Discussion

Since the Strategic Plan’s completion, progress has been made on a goal included in Strategy 2b: Explore Opportunities to Expand Ridesharing. This goal calls for the expansion of the 511 service to Imperial County. During the past months, SANDAG has worked on extending some elements of the 511 service to Imperial County by expanding the existing Advanced Traveler Information System for Commercial Vehicle Operations (ATIS-CVO) component designed for the I-8 corridor commercial vehicle user. This service is anticipated to begin operation in summer 2010.

The ATIS-CVO component of the 511 service will be a free phone and Web service that will consolidate the San Diego and Imperial County regions’ transportation information into a one-stop resource, and will be available to I-8 corridor commercial vehicle operators (truck drivers and trucking operations management) in both counties. The 511 service will provide up-to-the-minute information on traffic conditions, incidents, border wait times, and driving times, on a 24-hours a day, seven days a week basis. The ATIS-CVO project is funded through a cooperative agreement with Caltrans.

Next Steps

Staff will continue to monitor progress on implementation of the San Diego - Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan strategies and will provide periodic updates on these and other related activities in the Imperial County.

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

Attachment: 1. Executive Summary of the San Diego - Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan

Key Staff Contact: Ron Saenz, (619) 699-1922; rsa@sandag.org
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG), in collaboration with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 11, developed the San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan as the first phase of a planning effort to improve mobility for people and goods along the Interstate 8 (I-8) freeway corridor between San Diego and Imperial counties. The Strategic Plan recognizes that traffic is the result of a complex interaction of economic, growth, environmental, and other dynamics. As a result, it looks holistically at these traffic-related issues and provides direction for future phases of this planning effort that will lead to detailed implementation plans.

By working with a consortium of public and private sector interests, the Strategic Plan also sets the stage for the interregional partnerships that will be critical to implementing short- and long-term solutions. Policy guidance was provided by SANDAG’s Borders Committee and Joint Policy Advisory Group, the IVAG Regional Council, and Tribal Nations along the I-8 corridor. Technical guidance was provided by a Joint Technical Advisory Group, comprised of staff from several interested public agencies, Tribal Nations, and representatives of private-sector stakeholders. Many of these stakeholders will need to be involved in future planning and implementation of Strategic Plan recommendations.

Ultimately, this Plan looks proactively at how to move the Imperial and San Diego regions toward actions that will avert future problems before they become problems. As such, it was guided by several goals for the I-8 corridor itself:

- Improve interregional collaboration
- Maintain and improve mobility for people and goods
- Enhance the quality of life in the Imperial Valley and San Diego County
- Improve the economic vitality of Imperial Valley and San Diego County
- Minimize negative impacts of growth and transportation improvements on the environment

The Strategic Plan recommendations were based in part on an interregional survey of the traveling public. This was vital to crafting strategies that respond to the needs or motivations for those who either use the freeway or could use the freeway in the future. Two opinion surveys were conducted in August and September of 2008. The first study, a survey of Imperial County residents, was conducted using traditional telephone interviewing methods and was designed to address: (1) perceived quality of life in Imperial County; (2) current commute patterns; (3) future commute patterns; and (4) non work-related travel. While this survey recognized that the majority of residents do not use the I-8 freeway for interregional travel, the intent was to gain insight into any issues that could change their travel behavior and turn them into long-distance users of the I-8 freeway in the future. The second study, an automated telephone survey or Interactive Voice Response (IVR) survey, specifically targeted users of I-8, the primary corridor linking Imperial and San Diego counties. This was a direct attempt to understand who uses the freeway and what motivates those to the long, 100 plus mile one-way travel associated with driving between San Diego and Imperial counties, and vice-versa.
The following general findings were drawn:

- **The Imperial Valley is Currently Not a Bedroom Community for San Diego County.** While interregional commuting between Imperial Valley and San Diego County grew between 1990 and 2000, the sheer distance between the two counties and the jobs/housing balance in Imperial County results in a minimal number of commuters traveling to San Diego County for jobs.

- **There is General Satisfaction with the Current State of the I-8 Freeway Commute.** Imperial Valley residents are very satisfied with their quality of life and residents of both Imperial and San Diego are satisfied with their commutes along the I-8 corridor.

- **As Congestion Increases on the I-8 in the Future, It Will Be Worst in San Diego County.** While traffic volumes are growing along the entire corridor, existing and projected congestion levels (e.g., Level of Service E or worse) are confined to the San Diego County portion of the corridor (generally west of El Cajon).

- **Up to Half of I-8 Commuters Would Consider Some Form of Ridesharing.** Just under half of commuters surveyed, report that they would consider a carpool, vanpool, or use public transportation in the future. Despite this willingness to consider ridesharing, two-thirds of super commuters who face particularly long commutes are equally unlikely to move closer to their work locations or to take lower-paying jobs closer to where they currently live. Even if gas prices exceed $6 a gallon, findings suggest that it is unlikely to persuade super commuters to abandon their current commute.

- **As the Imperial Valley Matures, Its Economy Will Diversify and Reduce the Need for Interregional Commutes to San Diego County.** Imperial Valley employment has been, and is, projected to continue to diversify and shift away from an agriculturally-based economy.

The Strategic Plan ultimately identifies a number of short-term early actions and longer-term interregional strategies that were developed through a consensus process. These recommendations are intended to serve as a general road map for subsequent efforts in addressing the long-term needs for the I-8 corridor and are not intended to be exhaustive of all potential solutions.

**Goal 1: Improve Interregional Collaboration**

- **Strategy 1a:** Improve interregional and regional information sharing regarding on-going studies to maximize the benefits and minimize duplication of effort.

- **Strategy 1b:** Continue to integrate Tribal Nations into overall planning process for the I-8 corridor.

- **Strategy 1c:** Collaborate on cross border people and goods movement issues, including recommendations and projects identified in the California-Baja California Border Master Plan.

**Goal 2: Maintain and improve mobility for people and goods**

- **Strategy 2a:** Maintain key capital investments identified in SANDAG’s 2030 Regional Transportation Plan and the Imperial County 2007 Transportation Plan Highway Element.
to improve mobility for people and goods on I-8, including widening the I-8 from four to six lanes between El Cajon to Alpine (2nd Street to Los Coches Road) and widening the I-8 within Imperial Valley between SR-111 and Forrester Road.

- Strategy 2b: Explore opportunities to expand ridesharing.
- Strategy 2c: Explore the feasibility of promoting telecommuting programs at government agencies and other large employers.

Goal 3: Enhance the quality of life in the Imperial Valley and San Diego County

- Strategy 3a: Support pro-active, comprehensive planning.
- Strategy 3b: Explore means of preserving what people like about the Imperial Valley.
- Strategy 3c: Explore local access to medical and dental care, including specialized care and hospitalization.

Goal 4: Improve the economic vitality of Imperial Valley and San Diego County

- Strategy 4: Support economic development focusing on job creation, particularly on higher paying jobs.

Goal 5: Minimize negative impacts of growth and transportation improvements on the environment

- Strategy 5a: Preserve I-8 transportation corridor right of way.
- Strategy 5b: Monitor related interregional issues and identify impacts to the corridor, if any.
PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE 2010 BINATIONAL SEMINAR
“CROSSBORDER CLIMATE CHANGE STRATEGIES: RAISING AWARENESS ON ADAPTATION”

Introduction

The 2010 Binational Seminar “Crossborder Climate Change Strategies: Raising Awareness on Adaptation” was held on June 1, 2010, at Caltrans, District 11. The event had the sponsorship of the Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego; the Secretariat of Environmental Protection of Baja California (SPA, in Spanish); El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (COLEF); the City of Tijuana Municipal Planning Institute (IMPlan, in Spanish); the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA); and Caltrans, District 11. The seminar drew attendance by stakeholders and representatives from planning agencies from both sides of the border, including Tijuana and the San Diego region. A background document was prepared for the event containing basic information on climate change issues in the United States and Mexico, and on efforts being taken on both sides of the border in the area of climate change adaptation.

Discussion

The goal of this event was to seek input and discuss potential adaptation strategies to address climate change impacts. The seminar fostered dialogue between stakeholders, policy makers, and the general public on adaptation strategies, with an emphasis on linking them to the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

The program for the event included presentations on the following: setting the stage for a discussion on crossborder strategies for climate change and the regional transportation plans; a review of SANDAG’s Climate Action Strategy; an Overview of Climate Change Adaptation and the 2050 RTP – White Paper; and briefings on the states of California and Baja California climate change adaptation planning efforts. The event concluded with an expert panel discussion on crossborder climate change adaptation strategies.

The following are highlights of comments made by the panel of experts:

- The issue of climate change should not only be addressed as an environmental topic but also as a developmental issue requiring cross-cutting policies.

- The issues of adaptation apply mainly at the local level.
Social justice issues should be considered when planning climate change and adaptation strategies.

When climate change is considered, transportation issues must be addressed along with water and energy issues, similar to how land use and transportation are integrated in smart growth plans.

Regarding the implementation of climate change legislation, it would be beneficial to implement a strategy of incentives and even dedicate resources, such as the Green Fund proposed by Mexico at the 2009 Copenhagen Conference.

While sharing information is vital for regional collaboration, it would still be desirable to ensure the continuity of cooperation on climate change by institutionalizing cross-border cooperation.

Local implementation of potential federal and state mandates was identified as a challenge, since each region has peculiarities that make them different.

Concerning planning efforts, there is still a gap between the scientific community and the end users (e.g., planners and engineers). In this regard, closer cooperation could help diminish uncertainties and lead to greater shared knowledge.

Before trying to create a common baseline to measure greenhouse gas emissions, it is important to develop a common language for stakeholders for further research on both sides of the border.

**Next Steps**

The conclusions of the event will be discussed by the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO), and will be presented along with any recommendations to the Borders Committee at a future meeting. If recommended, the 2010 Binational Seminar results would also be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

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

Attachment: 1: Crossborder Climate Change Strategies: Raising Awareness of Adaptation: 2010 Binational Seminar Background Document

Staff Contact: Héctor Vanegas, (619) 699-1972; hva@sandag.org
Introduction

Every year since 1997, the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) has supported the organization of the SANDAG annual binational events. The 2009 Binational Seminar focused on “Challenges and Opportunities for Crossborder Climate Change Collaboration.” The Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) and the Borders Committee discussed the outcomes from the seminar and proposed a set of four recommendations, which were approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2009.

1. Recognize the importance of encouraging all levels of agencies and stakeholders in our San Diego – Baja California region to mutually agree on priority aspects of climate change collaboration, including mitigation, adaptation, and education strategies.

2. Encourage the inclusion of strategies for collaboration and sharing information on regional climate change action plans in San Diego and Baja California.

3. The 2010 binational event should follow up on topics related to climate change planning.

4. In 2010, produce a progress report on developments and actions taken in climate change planning as a result of the 2009 seminar recommendations.

For the 2010 Binational Seminar, COBRO and the Borders Committee recommended that the event focus on discussing possible strategies to adapt to climate change impacts, as well as on the effects that climate change has on transportation infrastructure. They also recommended that this discussion be incorporated as input into the preparation of the SANDAG 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

This report provides an overview on climate change adaptation initiatives occurring in the United States and Mexico. In addition, a more focused White Paper “Draft Overview of Climate Change Adaptation and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan” is included with the seminar materials.

Discussion

The issue of climate change has been in discussions for years, and countries all over the world have been dealing with it in different ways. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was signed in 1992 and was ratified in 1994 by both the United States and Mexico, among many other countries.
Linked to the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol sets binding targets for 37 industrialized countries and the European community for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Mexico signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1998, ratified it in 2000, and enacted the legislation in 2005. The United States signed the Protocol in 1998, but has not ratified or enforced it. Negotiations to develop a new protocol took place on December of 2009 at the United Nations Climate Change Conference, Copenhagen 2009, which was hosted by the Government of Denmark. Governments engaged at the highest political level, and the outcome of that engagement was reflected in the Copenhagen Accord. While much attention has focused on the Accord, the Conference in Copenhagen also made good progress in a number of areas including improvements to the clean development mechanism, and draft decisions on adaptation, technology, and capacity-building. Point number 3 of the Copenhagen Accord states:

“Adaptation to the adverse effects of climate change and the potential impacts of response measures is a challenge faced by all countries. Enhanced action and international cooperation on adaptation is urgently required to ensure the implementation of the Convention by enabling and supporting the implementation of adaptation actions aimed at reducing vulnerability and building resilience in developing countries, especially in those that are particularly vulnerable, especially least developed countries, small island developing States and Africa. We agree that developed countries shall provide adequate, predictable and sustainable financial resources, technology and capacity-building to support the implementation of adaptation action in developing countries.”

The United States’ Perspective on Climate Change

Federal

In 2009, the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) initiated the Interagency Climate Change Adaptation Task Force (Task Force), which includes representatives from more than 20 Federal Agencies. When the President signed the Executive Order on Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance, on October 5, 2009, he called on the Task Force to develop, within one year, Federal recommendations for adapting to climate change impacts both domestically and internationally.

On March 16, 2010, the Task Force released an Interim Progress Report which outlines the Task Force’s progress to date and recommends key components to include in a national strategy on climate change adaptation. These six components include:

1. Integration of Science into Adaptation Decisions and Policy
2. Communications and Capacity-Building
3. Coordination and Collaboration

4. Prioritization
5. A Flexible Framework for Agencies
6. Evaluation

The Task Force formed workgroups to consider the capabilities of the Federal Government to respond to the impacts of climate change on various critical sectors, institutions, and agency mission responsibilities. The workgroups are focused on the following topics:

- Agency Adaptation: Develop recommendations on how agencies should plan and implement adaptation efforts.
- Science Inputs to Policy: Develop recommendations to couple the production of scientific and technical support to adaptation planning, prioritization, and resilience building within the USG, in the US, and internationally.
- Insurance: Develop recommendations on opportunities for the United States Government to support insurance and adaptation issues.
- Water Resources Adaptation: Develop recommendations on how Federal water management agencies should plan and implement adaptation actions related to climate impacts on water resources.
- International Resilience: Develop recommendations on opportunities for the United States Government to support and lead international adaptation efforts.
- Health: Develop recommendations focused on educating and communicating with policymakers, public health officials, healthcare professionals, and the public; building early warning systems, identifying vulnerable populations; forecasting, modeling, and predicting the health impacts of climate change; and building capacity to better prepare for and respond to those impacts.
- Fish, Wildlife, and Plants: Develop recommendations on how Federal agencies, state, local, and tribal governments should plan and implement adaptation efforts related to climate impacts on wildlife, fish, and plants.
- Structure for Coordination and Collaboration: Develop recommendations on the structure for U.S. Government adaptation efforts and on how Federal agencies can coordinate adaptation activities with other Federal agencies, state, local, and tribal governments, and the private sector and civil society.
- Urban: Develop recommendations on how Federal agencies in conjunction with state, local, and tribal governments can implement adaptation efforts related to climate impacts on urban environments, communities, and infrastructure.
- Coasts and Oceans: Develop recommendations to strengthen resiliency of coastal communities and marine and Great Lakes environments and their abilities to adapt to climate change impacts and ocean acidification.
- Land: Develop recommendations on how Federal land management agencies in conjunction with state, local, and tribal governments and private landholders can address adaptation related to climate impacts on land.
• Communications: Develop recommendations on how the Federal Government can better communicate messages regarding climate change adaptation and resilience within and outside the government.

The Task Force workgroups have hosted 20 listening sessions with key stakeholders and experts. The listening sessions are designed to engage the expertise and recommendations of external organizations into the workgroup deliberations early in this review process. In October 2010, the Task Force will report to the President on the development of domestic and international dimensions of a U.S. approach to climate change adaptation and what Federal Agencies are doing to support this effort. The Task Force also will recommend additional aspects to consider in the development of a comprehensive national strategy.

In addition to the work done by the Task Force, the federal government administers a wide array of public-private partnerships to reduce U.S. GHG emissions. These programs focus on energy efficiency, renewable energy, methane, and other non-carbon dioxide (non-CO2) gases, agricultural practices and implementation of technologies to achieve GHG reductions. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) implements several voluntary programs that substantially contribute to the reduction of GHG emissions. The U.S. EPA plays a significant role in encouraging voluntary reductions from large corporations, consumers, industrial and commercial buildings, and many major industrial sectors. Some of the U.S. EPA’s GHG reduction initiatives include: the Clean Energy-Environment State Partnership, Climate Leaders, Combined Heat and Power Partnership, Energy Star, EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality Voluntary Programs, Green Power Partnership, High Global Warming Potential (GWP) Gas Voluntary Programs, Methane Voluntary Programs, and WasteWise.

The United States government is investing in a diverse portfolio of energy technologies with the potential to yield substantial reductions in emissions of GHGs. Given the considerable lead times for energy technology development, deployment and commercialization, investment in these technologies must be made today. With the establishment of the Climate Change Technology Program (CCTP) the U.S. continues to be a leader in climate technology research and development. The CCTP vision is to attain - on a global scale in partnership with others - a technological capability that can provide abundant, clean, secure, and affordable energy and related services needed to encourage and sustain economic growth, while simultaneously achieving substantial reductions in emissions of GHGs and mitigating the risks of potential climate change.

The U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP) coordinates and integrates federal research on changes in the global environment and their implications for society. The USGCRP began as a presidential initiative in 1989 and was mandated by Congress in the Global Change Research Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-606), which called for "a comprehensive and integrated United States research program which will assist the Nation and the world to understand, assess, predict, and respond to human-induced and natural processes of global change." Thirteen departments and agencies participate in the USGCRP, which was known as the U.S. Climate Change Science Program from 2002 through 2008. The program is steered by the Subcommittee on Global Change Research under the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources, overseen by the Executive Office of the President, and facilitated by an Integration and Coordination Office.
Executive Order S-3-05

In an effort to address climate change issues, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger issued Executive Order S-3-05 in 2005 to advance renewable energy technologies and reduce the emission of GHGs. Executive Order S-3-05 set the following GHG emission reduction targets standards for the state of California:

- Reduce GHG emissions to the 2000 level by 2010;
- Reduce GHG emissions to the 1990 level by 2020; and
- Reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below the 1990 level by 2050.

California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32)

Executive Order S-3-05 was followed by the passage of the landmark California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill [AB] 32), which established a comprehensive program of regulatory and/or market mechanisms to achieve real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of GHG emissions. AB 32 codified into law the goal of Executive Order S-3-05 to achieve the 1990 GHG emissions level by 2020, and authorized the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to monitor and regulate sources of GHG emissions in order to reduce GHG emissions. CARB is required to:

- Establish a statewide GHG emissions cap for 2020, based on the 1990 level of emissions, by January 1, 2008;
- Adopt mandatory reporting and verification rules for significant sources of GHGs by January 1, 2008;
- Adopt a scoping plan by January 1, 2009, for achieving the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in GHG emissions; and
- Adopt regulations by January 1, 2011, to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in GHG emissions, to become operative by January 1, 2012.

Climate Change Scoping Plan

The CARB Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) outlines the main strategies for meeting the AB 32 GHG reduction target, which include a range of actions including direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms like a cap-and-trade system, and a cost-of-implementation fee to fund the program. CARB and other state agencies must adopt these reduction measures by the start of 2011, and already a number of “early action” measures required by the Scoping Plan have been adopted, such as the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. In addition, the Scoping Plan emphasizes the need to better connect land use and transportation planning to help the state achieve its GHG emissions reduction target for 2020.
Senate Bill 375 (SB 375)
The on-road transportation sector is the largest contributor of GHG emissions in San Diego County, accounting for 46 percent of the total GHG emissions, almost twice as much as the next largest sector. Almost 90 percent of emissions in this sector are from passenger cars and light trucks (e.g., sport utility vehicles, pick-up trucks). The state has enacted several laws that create a framework for reducing GHG emissions from the on-road transportation sector. In general, California employs a three-pronged approach to implement this framework:

- Improve the fuel efficiency and lower GHG emissions from passenger vehicles (e.g., Pavley Standards, zero-emission vehicle [ZEV] program);
- Reduce the carbon intensity of transportation fuels (Low Carbon Fuel Standard); and
- Integrate regional land use and transportation planning to reduce emissions from vehicle travel (SB 375).

To further address the GHG emissions-reduction goals of Executive Order S-3-05 and AB 32, SB 375 was signed into law on September 30, 2008. SB 375 will enable Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), like SANDAG, to collaborate with local governments, CARB, and a variety of stakeholders to meet California’s climate change goals.

SB 375 requires the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as a new element of the 2050 RTP, along with the traditional policy, action, and financial requirements.

The SCS must demonstrate how the development patterns and the transportation network, policies, and programs can work together to achieve the GHG emission reduction targets for cars and light trucks that will be established by CARB, if there is a feasible way to do so. If targets cannot be met through the SCS, then the region is required to develop an Alternative Planning Strategy that demonstrates how the emission reduction targets could be achieved.

In essence, the SCS includes four building blocks:

1. Land use component that accommodates the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and includes the protection of sensitive resource areas, including areas protected under habitat conservation plans;
2. Transportation networks including highways, transit, and local streets and roads;
3. Transportation demand management strategies; and
4. Transportation system management programs and policies.

California’s Preferred Loading Order
The California Public Utilities Commission and California Energy Commission adopted a preferred loading order to meet goals for satisfying the state’s growing demand for electricity while reducing GHG emissions. The preferred loading order for new energy
resources places top priority on increasing energy efficiency and demand response, then new generation from renewable and distributed generation resources, and finally with clean, fossil-fueled generation and infrastructure improvements.

**2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy**

The 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy (CAS) report summarizes the best known science on climate change impacts in the state to assess vulnerability and outlines possible solutions that can be implemented within and across state agencies to promote resiliency.

The California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) took the lead and developed this adaptation strategy, working through the Climate Action Team (CAT) led by the California Environmental Protection Agency. Seven sector-specific working groups, 12 state agencies, boards and commissions, and numerous stakeholders were convened for this effort. The strategy proposes a comprehensive set of recommendations designed to inform and guide California decision makers as they begin to develop policies that will protect the state, its residents and its resources from a range of climate change impacts.

The strategies included in this report were approved by the CAT Team, which represents all of state government. Now, the CAT will lead in the coordination of measures and push to develop the necessary tools to effect adaptation protocols. California’s mitigation (CAT) and adaptation (CAS) processes will be further integrated through extensive information exchange and consolidation of working groups from both efforts.

It is recognized that implementation of the following adaptation strategies will require significant collaboration among multiple stakeholders to ensure they are carried out in a rational, yet progressive manner over the long term. These strategies distinguish between near-term actions that will be completed by the end of 2010 and long-term actions to be developed over time.

Key recommendations include:

1. A Climate Adaptation Advisory Panel (CAAP) will be appointed to assess the greatest risks to California from climate change and recommend strategies to reduce those risks building on California’s Climate Adaptation Strategy.

2. California must change its water management and uses because climate change will likely create greater competition for limited water supplies needed by the environment, agriculture, and cities.

3. Consider project alternatives that avoid significant new development in areas that cannot be adequately protected (planning, permitting, development, and building) from flooding, wildfire, and erosion due to climate change.

4. All state agencies responsible for the management and regulation of public health, infrastructure or habitat subject to significant climate change should prepare as appropriate agency-specific adaptation plans, guidance, or criteria by September 2010.

5. To the extent required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2, all significant state projects, including infrastructure projects, must consider the potential impacts of locating such projects in areas susceptible to hazards resulting from climate change.

6. The California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA) will collaborate with CNRA, the CAT, the Energy Commission, and the CAAP to assess California’s vulnerability to...
climate change, identify impacts to state assets, and promote climate adaptation/mitigation awareness through the Hazard Mitigation Web Portal and My Hazards Web site as well as other appropriate sites. The transportation sector CAWG, led by Caltrans, will specifically assess how transportation nodes are vulnerable and the type of information that will be necessary to assist response to district emergencies.

7. Using existing research the state should identify key California land and aquatic habitats that could change significantly during this century due to climate change. Based on this identification, the state should develop a plan for expanding existing protected areas or altering land and water management practices to minimize adverse effects from climate change induced phenomena.

8. The best long-term strategy to avoid increased health impacts associated with climate change is to ensure communities are healthy to build resilience to increased spread of disease and temperature increases. The California Department of Public Health will develop guidance by September 2010 for use by local health departments and other agencies to assess mitigation and adaptation strategies, which include impacts on vulnerable populations and communities and assessment of cumulative health impacts. This includes assessments of land use, housing and transportation proposals that could impact health, GHG emissions, and community resilience for climate change, such as in the 2008 Senate Bill 375 regarding Sustainable Communities.

9. The most effective adaptation strategies relate to short- and long-term decisions. Most of these decisions are the responsibility of local community planning entities. As a result, communities with General Plans and Local Coastal Plans should begin, when possible, to amend their plans to assess climate change impacts, identify areas most vulnerable to these impacts, and develop reasonable and rational risk reduction strategies using the CAS as guidance.

10. State fire fighting agencies should begin immediately to include climate change impact information into fire program planning to inform future planning efforts.

11. State agencies should meet projected population growth and increased energy demand with greater energy conservation and an increased use of renewable energy. Renewable energy supplies should be enhanced through the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan that will protect sensitive habitat that will while helping to reach the state goal of having 33 percent of California’s energy supply from renewable sources by 2020.

12. Existing and planned climate change research can and should be used for state planning and public outreach purposes; new climate change impact research should be broadened and funded. By September 2010, the California Energy Commission will develop the CalAdapt Web site that will synthesize existing California climate change scenarios and climate impact research and to encourage its use in a way that is beneficial for local decision-makers. Every effort will be made to increase funding for climate change research, focusing on three areas: linkages with federal funding resources, developing Energy Commission-led vulnerability studies, and synthesizing the latest climate information into useable information for local needs through the CalAdapt tool.
San Diego

San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory

In 2008, the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC), a research center at the University of San Diego (USD) School of Law, released the “San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory.” The report calculated the theoretical emissions reductions necessary for San Diego County to reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 - the statewide statutory target under AB 32. The inventory includes historical GHG emissions from 1990 to 2006, and estimates future emissions until 2020 under a business-as-usual scenario. The study is intended to promote understanding of GHG emission sources in the region and to serve as a resource to local and regional policy-makers as they consider strategies to reduce GHG emissions.

Important findings include:

- San Diego County emitted 34 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents\(^2\) in 2006 - an 18 percent increase over 1990 levels.
- By 2020, under a business-as-usual scenario, regional GHG emissions are expected to be 43 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents, an increase of 26 percent over 2006 levels and 48 percent over 1990 levels.
- To meet AB 32 emission reduction targets, San Diego County would have to produce 33 percent less emissions than the projected business-as-usual levels in 2020.
- In 2006, emissions from on-road vehicles represented 46 percent of total GHG emissions in San Diego County.
- San Diego County likely can reduce its GHG emissions to the 1990 level by 2020 through a combination of reduction strategies from all sectors (reductions from the on-road transportation, electricity, and natural gas sectors would represent 81 percent of total reductions).

The San Diego Foundation’s Regional Focus 2050 Study

In 2008, the San Diego Foundation performed an assessment of the impacts of climate change in the San Diego region in the year 2050 if current trends continue. The primary aim of this analysis was to provide a scientific basis for local governments and other public agencies to develop climate-preparedness strategies for mitigating the damage from, as well as adapting to, climate change.

According to the Focus 2050 Study, the population of San Diego County is expected to grow to 4.5 million in 2050, an approximately 50 percent increase from 2007. Substantial population growth will fuel an increase in GHG emissions and further contribute to the global problem unless preventative action is taken.

---

\(^2\) Carbon dioxide equivalency is a quantity that describes, for a given mixture and amount of GHG, the amount of CO\(_2\) that would have the same global warming potential, when measured over a specified timescale.
Going forward, the San Diego region must develop a plan of action to address and mitigate the expected consequences of climate change for its populace and environment. Some important potential impacts of climate change on the San Diego region as identified by the Focus 2050 Study include:

- **Heat Waves** - heat waves will increase in frequency, magnitude, and duration.
- **Precipitation** - the high degree of variability of annual precipitation will prevail, suggesting the region will continue to be highly vulnerable to drought.
- **Sea Level Rise** - sea levels will rise 12-18 inches resulting in serious flooding in low-lying areas and an increased incidence of extreme high sea level events which occur during high tides.
- **Water Supplies and Demand** - with 80 percent of imported water coming from the diminishing resources of the Sacramento Delta and the Colorado River – and local supplies being reduced -- the increasing water demand from growing populations and commercial activities will not be met.
- **Wildfires** - increased drought and potential longer Santa Ana wind conditions will lead to more frequent and severe wildfires.
- **Ecosystems** - extended drought and increased temperatures can stress individual plants, increase their susceptibility to insect attack, result in widespread forest decline, and the exodus/extinction of plant and animal species.
- **Public Health** - increases in extreme weather-related illness, rodent- and water-borne disease, pollution, and worsening wildfire conditions will severely affect the region’s population.
- **Electricity** - total electricity demand by 2050 is projected to increase by approximately 60 percent, with peak loads increasing by 70 percent, due to increased cooling demand in the summer and the potential need for water desalination plants to offset reduced water supplies.

**Overview of SANDAG Climate Action Strategy**

SANDAG has developed a Climate Action Strategy (Strategy), which was approved by SANDAG’s Board of Directors in March of 2010. A major purpose of the Strategy is to identify land use and transportation policy measures that could help SANDAG meet or exceed its targets for reducing GHG emissions from passenger cars and light-duty trucks that will be established by CARB per SB 375.

The Strategy identifies goals, objectives, and policy measures in the areas of transportation, land use, buildings, and energy use. Also addressed are measures and resources to help local governments reduce emissions from their operations and in their communities. It serves as a guide to help policymakers address climate change as they make decisions to meet the needs of our growing population, maintain and enhance our quality of life, and promote economic stability. It does so in the context of the significant action on climate change happening in California, and the need for national and international attention to address what is ultimately a global problem.
SANDAG, local governments, and other regional entities have authority and influence over three essential areas that contribute to climate change:

1. Land use patterns, transportation infrastructure, and related public investments
2. Building construction and energy use
3. Government operations

As a result, this Strategy focuses on these areas where regional and local agencies have the authority or opportunity to influence emissions and make our region more resilient to the changing climate. The opportunity and ability to reduce the three largest sources of GHG emissions in our region are in the following areas:

- On-road transportation (i.e., passenger vehicles, light-, medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, and motorcycles);
- Electricity generation; and
- Natural gas end uses (e.g., space heating, cooking, etc.).

When combined, these three sources account for about 80 percent of emissions in the San Diego region, with on-road transportation alone responsible for about 46 percent of the total. Just as important, our transportation and energy infrastructure systems also are threatened by climate change impacts. Responding to climate change will require us to mitigate our GHG emissions and adapt to the changes coming to our region. Regional and local government efforts to reduce our GHG emissions will require a foundation of improved land use and transportation planning, and changes in the amounts and types of energy we use.

The main strategies are:

1. Reduce Total Miles of Vehicle Travel
2. Minimize Greenhouse Gases When Vehicles are Used
3. Promote Use of Low Carbon Alternative Fuels
4. Protect Transportation Infrastructure from Climate Change Impacts
5. Reduce Energy Use in Residential and Commercial Buildings
6. Increase Use of Renewable Energy
7. Reduce Water-Related Energy Use and Greenhouse Gases
8. Protect Energy Infrastructure from Climate Change Impacts
9. SANDAG and Local Governments Lead by Example

Development and implementation of adaptation measures will be critical to protecting the region from the impacts of climate change. This Strategy does not identify adaptation measures for all of the potential wide-ranging impacts. Many agencies with jurisdiction in the San Diego region are likely to have a role in adaptation planning, with SANDAG being just one of several agencies. Due to SANDAG’s core function as the regional transportation planning agency and its long involvement in regional energy issues, the Strategy focuses on adaptation measures to consider when addressing impacts to transportation and energy infrastructure.
Decisions on which adaptation measures to pursue, responsible entities, and opportunities for coordination are best debated among regional and local officials and the general public during updates to local government General Plans and other community plans (and related regulatory mechanisms) and during updates to SANDAG plans like as is the case with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which this Seminar hopes to solicit input on.

**SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

SANDAG is developing the 2050 RTP, which will rely upon the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and other planning efforts as the foundation for integrating land uses, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies within a regional smart growth framework. The RTP focuses both on the movement of people and goods, including marine terminals, air cargo facilities, freight rail, and land ports of entry that link our region with Mexico. In accordance with state and federal guidelines, the 2050 RTP is scheduled for adoption by the Board of Directors in summer 2011.

Per SB 375, the 2050 RTP will incorporate new legislative requirements. The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) will be a new element of the RTP, and will be designed to show how regional GHG emission reduction targets, to be established by the CARB, will be achieved through development patterns, infrastructure investments, and transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

SANDAG has prepared a draft white paper on climate change adaptation that has three main objectives. They include:

1. Assessing the 2010 California RTP Guidelines regarding best practices for addressing climate adaptation in RTPs.
2. Identifying strategies included in the 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy related to transportation infrastructure.
3. Evaluating adaptation efforts by transportation agencies across the country.

Input from this Binational Seminar will be considered in the development of the 2050 RTP.

**Mexico’s Perspective on Climate Change Adaptation**

**Federal**

In April 2005, the Mexican Congress created the Intersecretariat Commission for Climate Change (or Comisión Intersecretarial de Cambio Climático, CICC) to be the entity in charge of promoting and coordinating the development of programs and strategic actions to implement mandates from the UNFCCC. In May 2007, the CICC presented Mexico’s National Strategy for Climate Change (or Estrategia Nacional de Cambio Climático, known as ENACC) that serves as the framework for the preparation of the Special Plan for Climate Change 2008–2012 within Mexico’s National Development Plan (PND) 2007–2012.
ENACC identifies measures, specifies possibilities and emission reduction ranges, proposes the necessary studies to define precise mitigation goals, and outlines the needs of the country to move forward in building adaptation capacities.

The issue of climate change was included in Mexico’s PND, under the section dedicated to sustainability. With this inclusion, Mexico has recognized the impact of GHG in climate change and acknowledged the consumption of fossil fuels as its principal cause. Two of the objectives of the PND, under Climate Change and Energy Policy of Baja California, are to reduce emissions of GHG, and to promote measures of adaptation to the effects of climate change.

To date, Mexico has presented three progress reports and three updates of its national inventory of GHG (Inventario Nacional de Emisiones de Gases de Efecto Invernadero).

At the state level, the Mexican federal government has established collaboration agreements with state governments for the development of Special Programs for Climate Change (Programas Especiales de Cambio Climático, known as PECC). The following are some of the objectives defined by the PECC 2008-2012 in terms of adaptation strategies:

- To promote the incorporation of preventive adaptation criteria for the effects of climate change in urban development and land use policies and programs that mainly address the most vulnerable sectors of the population.
- To strengthen adaptation capacities for extreme weather and hydro-meteorological phenomena.
- To promote the integration of criteria for disaster prevention and for long-term adaptation to climate change in population policies, to reduce the exposure to risk, mainly from extreme hydro-meteorological events.
- To consolidate public policies at the national level in terms of environmental education, and in terms of capacity building for mitigation and adaptation in key social sectors (academia, private sector, civil organizations) and priority geographic areas for sustainability with the purpose of encouraging responsible and informed public participation.

The purpose of PECCs will be to:

- Develop an inventory and report of local GHG emissions;
- Identify potential sources of GHG emission reductions;
- Identify the most vulnerable zones, infrastructure, and population;
- Identify projects for adaptation; and
- Develop response and adaptability capacities.
Baja California

As part of its State Program for Environmental Protection 2008-2013, Baja California’s Secretariat of Environmental Protection (SPA), has developed the State Plan for Climate Change Action of Baja California (PEAC-BC, as it is in Spanish), with support from Regional Academic Institutions (IES, as it is in Spanish) such as the Center for Science Research and Superior Education (Centro de Investigación Científica y de Educación Superior, CICESE), The Northern Border College (El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, COLEF), and the Autonomous University of Baja California (Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, UABC).

The main objective of the PEAC-BC is to evaluate the current and future situation of the effects of climate change in different socio-economic sectors at the state level, and propose mitigation and adaptation measures.

To attain the latter, the following specific objectives were proposed: (1) update the GHG inventory, (2) create local and regional climate change scenarios for the 21st century under two scenarios of increased GHG (low emissions and high emissions), (3) estimate increases in sea level in the coasts of Baja California, and (4) evaluate the possible impacts that climate change could have in the water, agricultural and livestock, health, transportation, housing, urban development, tourism, marine ecosystems, and terrestrial biodiversity sectors.

At this time, three workshops addressing this theme have been completed. The first workshop, held on August 25, 2008, at CICESE in Ensenada, was attended by the researchers of the three IESs, where they performed evaluations, and shared impact scenarios such as:

- Climate and Climatic Scenarios
- Ecosystems, Agricultural Sector, and Cattle Farming
- Emissions and the Impact of GHG

The second workshop took place at the COLEF campus in Tijuana on February 18, 2009, with the objective of presenting the results of the regionalized climate scenarios and initiating academic and governmental collaboration. The stakeholders that participated were: the City of Tijuana’s Municipal Planning Institute (IMPlan), the State of Baja California’s Water Commission (CEA), Energy Commission (CEE), Secretariat for Health (ISESALUD), and the Institute for Real Estate and Housing development (INDIVI). Participants from Mexico’s federal government included the Secretariats for Agriculture and Livestock (SEFOA), for Tourism (SECTURE), and for the Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT). Participants formed collaborative work tables to discuss their respective subjects of expertise.

The third workshop of the PEAC-BC took place at UABC on September 24 and 25, 2009, where substantial improvements were presented on the diagnosis of the actual state of the previously mentioned socio-economic sectors, as well as on the first two specific objectives that were planned.
Investigators from UABC and CICESE generated regional climate change scenarios for Baja California with troubling predictions; they determined that, with no action taken to mitigate or reduce the quantity of GHG emissions, there could be an increase of 1°C (1.8°F) in the average temperature in the next 20 years and up to 5°C (9°F) by the end of this century. Although these temperature increases seem small, scientists warn that even these slight changes could irreversibly harm species forever. In addition, if the average temperature increases one degree, extreme temperatures (minimum and maximum temperature) could increase from 1°C to 3°C (1.8°F to 5.4°F) in the affected region, which could affect weather and agricultural cycles.

Furthermore, it was stated that arid and semiarid regions, like Baja California, are particularly vulnerable to climate change because, in addition to the predicted increase in temperature, a 15 percent decrease in annual precipitation is projected in the next 20 years along with high rainfall variation signifying the possibility of many consecutive years of extreme drought followed by extended years of extreme rainfall. The reduction in precipitation would be most severe in winter and spring (10% - 15% less) and, when combined with the projected increase in temperature, could produce a major evaporation/transpiration cycle drying the soil and plants much more rapidly. This could potentially devastate the spring/summer crops that require humidity and cold-weather hours to grow. Moreover, it was identified that these changes could also have other
negative effects such as reduced availability of water and energy for agriculture, cattle farming, and tourism.

By the end of 2009 the goal of the PEAC-BC was to propose to the Governor of Baja California a series of strategies and actions to mitigate climate change and adapt to its effects, which would eventually become public policies for the welfare of the Baja Californian society.

**Tijuana**

**Tijuana’s Municipal Planning Institute’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategies**

As a follow-up to the strategies contained in the Municipal Plan for Urban Development (PMDU) 2008-2030, the City of Tijuana’s Municipal Planning Institute (IMPlan) is taking steps to address climate change and to implement adaptation strategies. Through strategies for Smart Growth and Land Use, the Urban Development Plan for Population Growth (PDUCEP) considers adopting the implementation, follow-up and focus of the ENACC to address the mitigation of the effects of climate change.

The following programs are being considered with the goal of counting, addressing and mitigating the effects of climate change in the municipality of Tijuana:

- Local Environmental Agenda
- Municipal Program of Ecological Regulation
- Ecological and Land Use Program for the City Coastline
- Development Rights Transfer Program (TDD, for its Spanish acronym)
- Municipal Air Quality Program
- Integrated Municipal Waste Management Program (GIRSM, for its Spanish acronym)

**Binational Efforts**

The importance of crossborder collaboration on climate change adaptation strategies has been recognized by both federal administrations. On April 2009, U.S. President Barack Obama and Mexican President Felipe Calderón announced plans to strengthen and deepen bilateral cooperation by establishing the U.S. - Mexico Bilateral Framework on Clean Energy and Climate Change. The Bilateral Framework was established after both presidents recognized a need for joint efforts to reach our common goal of achieving a low carbon future and a clean energy economy. This framework, which creates a mechanism for political and technical cooperation, and information exchange, will facilitate common efforts to develop clean energy economies, and will complement and reinforce existing cooperative efforts between the two countries. The Bilateral Framework will focus on renewable energy, energy efficiency, adaptation, market mechanisms, forestry and land use, green jobs, low carbon energy technology development and capacity building, GHG inventories, and climate change mitigation strategies.
With regard to the U.S.-Mexico border, the Bilateral Framework will promote efforts established in the Border 2012 program to reduce GHG emissions, strengthen the reliability and flow of crossborder electricity grids, promote academic and scientific exchanges on renewable energy, and facilitate border states’ energy trading mechanisms. Other border activities could include a bilateral border crossing planning group to develop strategies to reduce emissions such as truck stop electrification and anti-idling technology for border vehicles, among other initiatives.

Another important development is the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on Environmental Cooperation between the California Environmental Protection Agency, the California Department of Food and Agriculture and the California Resources Agency, and Mexico’s Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources. The MOU was signed in 2008 with the purpose of promoting and carrying out broader cooperative activities regarding environmental issues among the signing parties in the framework of their respective purview, and based on the principles of equality, reciprocity, information exchange, and mutual benefit. Climate change was identified as one of the priority areas of action within the MOU. An Action Plan was developed with the objective of identifying topics of common interest in order to carry out cooperative activities needed to implement the MOU, and there were three topics of common interest identified for climate change:

1. Cooperative exchange of information through experts in the field of research on climate change, including: a) impacts of climate change on natural ecosystems, agriculture and water resources, and infrastructure; and b) options of adaptation to climate change.

2. Development of principles for mutual benefit and opportunities for collaboration in the fields of: a) GHG emissions registry, and b) carbon market, including exploring the possibility of Mexican states joining The Climate Registry and the Western Climate Initiative, prior fulfillment of the needed legal requirements for that purpose.

3. Development, particularly among the U.S. and Mexican Border States, to support the development of comprehensive state plans for climate change.
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The Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) advises SANDAG’s Borders Committee concerning both short and long-term binational related activities, issues and actions; provides recommendations regarding binational border-related planning and development; and identifies ways to assist and coordinate with existing efforts in the binational area. The membership consists of elected officials and staff representatives of academia, business, community organizations, and the Mexican government. “The COBRO will serve as a working group to the SANDAG Borders Committee to facilitate a better understanding of the binational border-related issues and needs of the California-Baja California region.”

The SANDAG Borders Committee brings together elected officials and representatives from San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, and Orange Counties, and Mexico with the goal to create a regional community where San Diego, our neighboring counties, tribal governments, and Mexico mutually benefit from our varied resources and international location. The Borders Committee provides policy direction to the SANDAG Board regarding issues or activities related to planning and coordination between the San Diego region and its surrounding neighbors.
**2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: UPDATE ON THE URBAN AREA TRANSIT STRATEGY**

**Introduction**

Every four years, SANDAG updates its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The current RTP, which extends to the year 2030, was adopted in 2007. SANDAG is currently preparing a 2050 RTP, which is scheduled for adoption in 2011.

An important part of the development of the 2050 RTP is the preparation of an innovative and visionary "Urban Area Transit Strategy." The Urban Area Transit Strategy will serve as the basis for development of the regional transit network to be included in the 2050 RTP along with all of the other modal networks (highway, high occupancy vehicle (HOV)/Managed Lanes, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, freight improvements, etc.). As part of the strategy, three draft transit network alternatives have been developed for analytical purposes.

The purpose of today’s report is threefold: (1) to introduce the draft transit network alternatives and summarize feedback received to-date; (2) to review proposed transit mode share goals for key corridors/communities; and (3) to present a preliminary summary of the performance of each network. These items will help inform Board discussion on Item 3B, the development of the 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network.

**Initial Transit Scenarios and Feedback Received**

Through the planning process, staff has developed and begun testing three transit network alternatives with a focus on the urban areas of the San Diego region. Ultimately, one of the networks (or a combination or variation) will be incorporated into the unconstrained transportation network in the 2050 RTP. The overarching goal is to create a world-class transit system for the San Diego region in 2050 that significantly increases the use of transit, walking, and biking in the urbanized areas of the region, makes transit more time-competitive with the automobile, maximizes the use of transit during peak periods, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled in the region.

The transit alternatives under study are grouped into three themes and illustrated conceptually as follows:

- **Transit Propensity** Expands Transit in the Most Urbanized Areas
- **Commuter Point-to-Point** Emphasizes Quick Access to Work
- **Many Centers** Connects Local Smart Growth Areas and Activity Centers
The three transit alternatives have been intentionally designed to vary significantly from one another in order to test how different transit strategies might function in the long-term when compared across a number of performance measures.

The draft networks have been presented to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees, various SANDAG working groups, an outside Peer Review Panel, and at the five 2050 RTP public workshops (held April 26 - May 6, 2010). Subway-style maps of each draft alternative are provided in Attachments 1 – 3, and a brief description of the initial concept behind each alternative is provided in Attachment 4. The study area for the Urban Area Transit Strategy is provided in Attachment 5 for reference purposes. More detailed maps, including transit routes and station locations, are available on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/uats.

In Item 3B of today’s report, staff is recommending initial routes for incorporation into an unconstrained regional transit network for the 2050 RTP that is a combination of network elements from the draft transit alternatives based on comments by the policymakers, stakeholders, the public, and the Peer Review Panel; the overall performance of the networks with respect to identified performance measures (discussed below); the performance of specific routes and modes; and other factors. The report goes on to assess the regional highway network in order to set the stage for developing a comprehensive transportation network.

Feedback Received

In general, staff has received positive feedback on the concept of developing and testing alternative transit strategies, and on the draft networks developed to-date. At its April 16, 2010, meeting, Transportation Committee members articulated support for the networks being tested in the three alternatives and expressed excitement at the prospect of building a robust transit network that can enhance regional mobility options and potentially influence the region’s reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

During the remainder of April, staff presented the transit networks to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), and the Quality of Life Stakeholder Working Group. Earlier this month, the networks also were presented to the Regional Planning Committee. Comments by the working groups generally have been positive. While some working group members are concerned that the alternatives do not sufficiently emphasize transit in the less urbanized areas, others are concerned that the networks are too broad and there is insufficient focus on the urban core. In addition, working group members have encouraged staff to conduct analysis on the effects of land use assumptions, user charges, and transportation demand management before finalizing mode share goals. Suggestions also have been received to identify regionally-based transit mode share figures, in addition to corridor-based mode share figures. Other ideas included evaluating a broader range of ideas for last-mile solutions that could include the use of taxicabs, addressing parking pricing, and considering fare-free zones or fare-free routes as a way of increasing mode share.

A wide range of comments were made at the RTP public workshops. Attachment 6 provides a sampling of some of the comments received. SANDAG is encouraging additional comments via the Web site at www.sandag.org/uats.
Peer Review Panel Key Findings

As a unique part of the planning process, SANDAG assembled an outside Peer Review Panel to critically assess the alternative networks. The Peer Review Panel, which consisted of two public sector and two private sector panelists with extensive professional experience in land use, economics, transportation, congestion management, transit management, and transit-oriented development, convened in San Diego during the week of April 19, 2010. (Peer Review Panel biographies are included in Attachment 7.)

Generally, the Peer Review Panel felt that the Transit Propensity and Many Centers transit networks had merit and could each result, to varying degrees, in a successful long-term transit network. The Panel stated that while the 2050 RTP will define the region’s long-term mobility vision, the plan’s ultimate success will be grounded in the implementation of near-term demonstration or “catalyst” projects that showcase elements of the transit vision, particularly the integration of transit into smart growth areas. More specifically, the following observations were made about the alternative transit scenarios:

- **Transit Propensity**: The Panel observed that this scenario may be too focused on some geographically-concentrated areas to the exclusion of other areas (such as major employment areas, University City, and North County) to meet the region’s long-term mobility goals.

- **Commuter Point-to-Point**: The Panel expressed nervousness about promulgating a type of mobility that supports a dispersed land use pattern. The Panel felt that this scenario may encourage longer trips by both autos and transit, and that this scenario portrayed a more “business as usual” approach that may not have the ability to influence land use decisions toward more integrated communities and sustainability.

- **Many Centers**: The Panel commented that this scenario provides a solid vision, but may need to be refined. Panelists suggested focusing transit investments into a smaller number of smart growth centers that either already have high housing and employment densities or have smart growth plans in the early phases of the regional growth forecast, thereby placing a priority on existing and near-term smart growth. The Panel recommended that SANDAG revisit its Smart Growth Concept Map and consider making changes that might coalesce the smaller smart growth areas into larger-scale ones, thereby promoting “smarter” smart growth.

In addition, the Panel provided broader, more global observations summarized in Attachment 8, focusing on issues such as economic competitiveness; technological savviness; world-class region; sustainability and co-benefits; land use development around transit stations; land use, freeways, and parking; project prioritization; leadership and champions; and dedicated funding sources. In addition to the group findings, several Peer Review Panelists also contributed individual opinions, summarizing their observations of the region’s strengths and weaknesses. Those individual viewpoints are contained in Attachment 9.

Interestingly, many of the observations by the Peer Review Panel reinforce some of the key “Overarching Themes” and “Considerations for San Diego” summarized in the Executive Summary of the Lessons Learned from Peer Regions report produced by the SANDAG consultant team on this project when it began late last year. These overarching themes and considerations are contained in Attachment 10.
Proposed Transit Mode Share Goals

The Urban Area Transit Strategy work program includes developing peak-period transit mode share goals for regionally significant corridors/communities for 2050. There are two general issues that must be addressed in identifying mode share goals: first, how to determine the most suitable corridors/communities for which to establish mode share goals; and second, how to set appropriate mode share goals for the selected areas. Theoretically, the goals should be ambitious yet achievable, based on quantifiable trends and patterns, and have the ability to be measured over time. As a starting point for identifying where transit mode share goals would be most appropriate, staff identified geographic areas and travel corridors based on:

- High-volume travel corridors (all motorized trips), both current and future, that factor in trip purpose, trip origins and destinations, and time of day (such as peak-period vs. off-peak);
- Major job centers that attract large volumes of peak-period trips;
- Land use patterns that focus on locations with transit-supportive land uses (such as higher densities, walkable communities) and where access to transit (and often existing transit mode share) is high; and
- Existing transit markets that have been identified through the Metropolitan Transit System Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) and the North County Transit District Mobility Plan to ensure that RTP transit mode share goals are consistent with current short-range transit plans.

Attachment 11 illustrates the travel corridors, major employment areas, and high-activity areas for use in identifying peak-period transit mode share goals.

After conducting research, it is staff’s conclusion that very few areas have actually established transit mode share goals for corridors or communities. As a result, an approach similar to one used in Brisbane, Australia, is being proposed to develop the mode share goals. This approach involved aiming to increase the proportion of trips made on public transit by 50 percent between the plan’s initial and target year. The plan recognized that achieving a 50 percent increase in public transit’s share of all travel would be an ambitious, yet achievable, target over the 14-year planning period. There was initial discussion of doubling the mode share (increasing it to 100 percent), and it was found that that goal would be impossible without requiring significant revisions to curtail the expansion of urbanization and strict new measures to restrain single-occupancy vehicle use during peak-period commute times. Neither of those actions appeared to be possible at that time, given community lifestyle and travel patterns, but the plan left open the possibility of revisiting the target in future plans.

Proposed Approach

In the case of the San Diego region, the staff recommendation is to start with a more aggressive base year — a base year consisting of a combination of the 2030 RTP transportation network and the 2050 land uses\(^1\) — as the foundation upon which to set peak-period, home-to-work transit mode share goals in the urban area. This would provide a higher starting point for any proposed mode share increase. Staff then proposes applying a goal of a 25 percent increase in the peak-

---

\(^1\) The base year assumes the higher mode share value of either the currently adopted 2030 Reasonably Expected RTP or the 2030 Unconstrained RTP, combined with the 2050 land uses.
period transit mode share over this base year assumption. (This approach is different than the Brisbane method, which used an existing base year of 1997 as the starting point for a 50 percent increase.) The approach would be applied to the urban area, as well as to the identified corridors/areas.\(^2\)

For example, the current 2030 RTP Unconstrained Network would increase the mode share for peak-period, home-to-work trips within the Urban Area Transit Strategy study area from the 2008 level of 5 percent to the 2030 projected level of 9 percent, an increase of 80 percent between 2008 and 2030. Applying the 25 percent goal would mean increasing the 2030 RTP mode share an additional 25 percent from 9 percent to 11 percent as the starting point for the 2050 transit mode share goal for the study area. The end result would be a rise in the mode share by 120 percent between 2008 and 2050. Because the year 2050 is 40 years away, and the current tools to predict human travel behavior that far into the future are not completely accurate, staff is proposing that the goals be generalized into “goal ranges” based on patterns of geographic groupings. This would result in a 10-15 percent transit mode share goal range for the urban area. This would more than double the peak-period, home-to-work transit mode share in the urban area during this time period. When considering the proposed mode share increases from existing levels to the year 2030 in the current RTP, it seems reasonable to set 25 percent as an ambitious, yet achievable, goal.

Proposed Goal Ranges

Attachment 12 contains the information described above and the peak-period, home-to-work transit mode share goal ranges based on the geographic groupings for the various corridors/areas. Attachments 13a, 13b, and 13c illustrate the 2008 peak-period transit mode shares, the mode shares for the 2030 RTP Network with the 2050 land uses, and the proposed 2050 transit mode share goal ranges from a geographic perspective.

Next Steps for Mode Share Goals

Over the next few months, staff proposes to conduct sensitivity tests by corridor/area to see how various adjustments could further affect peak-period transit mode share. These may include options such as increasing transit frequencies, increasing transit travel speeds, testing parking pricing, adjusting land use assumptions, or other scenarios to help refine the peak-period, home-to-work transit mode share goal ranges.

In addition, in an effort to consider mobility options from a multimodal perspective, staff also will examine mode share goals for walking/biking, carpooling, and vanpooling, which, when combined with transit mode share goals, can ultimately provide a more comprehensive view of overall non-single-occupancy vehicle peak-period mode share for incorporation into the 2050 RTP.

The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees are discussing the proposed methodology and the resulting transit mode share goal ranges at their joint meeting on June 4, 2010, and any comments made will be provided verbally at the June 11 Board Policy meeting. Staff will report the modeled transit mode share performance at a future meeting.

---

\(^2\) Having transit mode share goals for the urban area and for several specific corridors/areas, rather than a single regionwide transit mode share goal, better reflects how transit investments are made, that is, focused on specific areas where the propensity for using transit is the highest.
Performance of Transit Network Alternatives

Analysis is underway to compare the three transit networks against one another, as well as against a baseline scenario, which consists of an overlay between the 2030 RTP transportation network and the land use assumptions included in the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. The analysis is organized according to performance measures that line up with the following objectives that support the overall transit goals for the San Diego region in 2050:

- Increase peak-period mode share
- Maximize transit ridership
- Develop a cost-effective and implementable transit system
- Support an efficient and effective transportation system
- Address the need for sustainability
- Address the need for environmental justice/social equity
- Make transit more time competitive with the car

These transit-specific objectives also are consistent with the overall 2050 RTP goals and objectives. (The detailed set of performance measures was presented to the Transportation Committee at its April 16, 2010, meeting, and is available on the Web site at www.sandag.org/uats.)

Attachment 14 contains initial data comparing the performance of the three transit alternatives against the 2008 transit network and the baseline scenario described above. In order to isolate the performance of transit in each alternative, staff held constant the highway network and the land use assumptions of each transit network.\(^3\)

Initial analysis shows that all three scenarios yield significantly better results than the existing (2008) transit network, and that all three scenarios result in modest to significant improvements in most performance measures when compared against the baseline scenario. The baseline scenario places the region at an aggressive starting point for comparison purposes, given the high level of transit investment included in the 2030 RTP. The overall concept was to test three varying strategies for expanding the role of transit in the region beyond that outlined in the current RTP.

In summary, the initial analysis shows that while none of the scenarios performs the best in all of the categories, the Many Centers scenario appears to have the highest overall performance, although it also requires the highest level of capital and operating cost support. That being said, the analysis shows that there are effective features in the Transit Propensity, Commuter Point-to-Point, and Many Centers alternatives that could be incorporated into a combined strategy. As a result, there appears to be an opportunity to combine the most effective features of all three scenarios into a “Hybrid” alternative that could then be further evaluated and refined as cost estimates and revenue assumptions become available. More detail on the “Hybrid” approach is contained in Item 3B of this report.

---

\(^3\) All transit network alternatives hold the highway networks and land use assumptions constant. The highway network for each alternative consists of the highway network included in the 2030 RTP and the land use assumptions are those assumed in the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast.
Next Steps

Based on discussion today on both Items 3A and 3B of this report, staff will return to the Board of Directors in July with a report on the transit mode share performance for the geographic areas and with a refined list of transit projects for possible incorporation into the 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
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1. Transit Propensity Subway-Style Map
2. Commuter Point-to-Point Subway-Style Map
3. Many Centers Subway-Style Map
4. Draft Initial Transit Concepts
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6. Sampling of Comments on the UATS from 2050 RTP Public Workshops
7. Peer Review Panel Biographies
8. Peer Review Panel Global Observations
9. Peer Review Panel Individual Perspectives
10. Executive Summary of Lessons Learned from Peer Regions Report
11. Major Travel Corridors and Areas for Use in Identifying Initial Transit Mode Share Goals
12. Proposed Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges for Identified Corridors and Areas
13. Peak-Period, Home-to-Work Transit Mode Share Maps
   a. 2008 Transit Mode Share
   b. 2030 RTP Transit Mode Share (with 2050 Land Uses)
   c. 2050 Proposed Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges
14. Initial Performance of Transit Network Alternatives

Key Staff Contacts: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
                  Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906, dsc@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #31003
Transit Propensity

Expanding Transit in the Most Urbanized Areas

Legend

- High Speed Rail
- COASTER Rail
- Light Rail Transit
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Rapid Bus
- Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator
- High Frequency Local Bus Services
Commuter Point-to-Point

Emphasizing Quick Access to Work

Legend
- High Speed Rail
- COASTER Rail
- Light Rail Transit
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Peak Bus Rapid Transit Commuter
- Rapid Bus
- Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator
- High Frequency Local Bus Services
Draft Initial Transit Concepts

Transit Propensity:

*Expands Transit in the Most Urbanized Areas*

Builds on the San Diego region’s innovative trolley system - expands transit in the central core and in the region’s most urbanized areas, many of which are characterized by pre-World War II street grid patterns. Provides very frequent transit services, alleviating riders from schedules and allowing easy transfers. Major investments may include streetcars, grade separations, priority treatments, transit nodes, expanded light rail, enhanced bike and walk access, and improvements to the public realm.

Commuter Point-to-Point:

*Emphasizes Quick Access to Work*

Transit to work is an easy option - leverages new dedicated transit facilities and flexible use of Managed Lanes to serve work trips. A system of few transfers provides high speed, reliable commute options during peak periods with a variety of “last-mile” treatments. Major investments may include Managed Lanes with in-line stations, park and ride lots, new fixed guideways, and some rail expansion.

Many Centers:

*Connects Local Smart Growth Areas and Activity Centers*

Supports the San Diego region’s local commitments to smart growth - consists of a multi-radial transit system serving the region’s larger-scale smart growth areas and major activity centers. Transit services are oriented toward the centers, and supported with frequent connections between the centers. Major investments may include a variety of transit priority treatments between centers, expanded light rail, enhanced transit centers, shuttles and streetcars connecting to the transit centers, enhanced bike and walk access, and improvements to the urban realm.
Sampling of Comments on the Urban Area Transit Strategy
from 2050 RTP Public Workshops

• Strong support for more bike projects, more bike racks on buses and trolleys, and related connections to transit stations;
• Suggestions on transit line extensions in particular areas (e.g., streetcar from Park Blvd. to I-805 along University Avenue; light rail to North County; streetcar along Monroe Avenue);
• Observation that places with great transit systems (e.g., London, Paris, Sydney, Moscow, San Francisco) have underground stations and lines;
• Support for extension of the planned high speed rail system to the international U.S./Mexico border;
• Support for building an extensive transit system (“build it and they will come” notion);
• Concern over the lack of funding for transit services and the related suggestion to be less ambitious in the transit planning process;
• Need for more real-time information at transit stations;
• Encouragement for the use of smaller buses to increase efficiency;
• Preference for the “Many Centers” alternative;
• Support for priority measures to bypass areas with traffic congestion and improve travel times;
• Concern about future mobility for seniors and the need to plan ahead to meet their needs for “aging in place;”
• Encouragement for expanding sidewalks and planting street trees to make walking and biking more pleasant, particularly at transit stations;
• Appreciation for the Spanish translation at the workshops.
Urban Area Transit Strategy
Peer Review Panel Biographies

John M. Inglish – General Manager/CEO, Utah Transit Authority (UTA)
John Inglish has worked in the transportation industry for more than 35 years. With an engineering background, Mr. Inglish began his career in 1970 as a systems planning engineer for the Utah State Highway Department. In the early 1970s he began working for the Wasatch Front Regional council on the early initiatives that formed today’s UTA. In 1977, he became the director of Transit Development for UTA, and in August 1997, the UTA Board of Trustees appointed Mr. Inglish as the general manager for the Authority. Under his leadership, UTA has garnered national and worldwide recognition for its transportation systems. He oversaw funding and construction of the $312.5 million Sandy to Salt Lake TRAX light rail line, completing the 15-mile TRAX line one year ahead of schedule and under budget, as well as the $118.5 million University TRAX light rail line connecting downtown Salt Lake City and the University of Utah in time for the 2002 Winter Olympics.

Martin Tuttle – Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs for the California Department of Transportation
Martin Tuttle has more than 25 years of top transportation and innovative land use planning management experience at the local, regional and state levels of government. As Deputy Director of Planning and Modal Programs at Caltrans, Mr. Tuttle is responsible for the Caltrans Divisions of Local Assistance, Mass Transportation, Planning, Rail, Aeronautics and Transportation System Information. As the executive director of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), he launched its nationally-recognized “Blueprint” transportation and land use growth plan. Mr. Tuttle also has served as the executive director of the Solano Transportation Authority (STA). As a top staff member to Assembly Majority Leader Tom Hannigan in the California State Legislature for 13 years, Mr. Tuttle managed innovative land-use and transportation reform legislation, including the bill establishing the successful Capitol Corridor intercity rail service between Sacramento and San Jose. Prior to joining Caltrans, he oversaw transit oriented development and urban infill housing projects for URS Corporation and New Faze Development.

George Hazel – Chairman, MRC McLean Hazel Ltd
George Hazel has extensive experience in all aspects of transport and communications, both urban and rural. He has specific expertise in strategic planning and policy development, the integration of transportation with other related areas, the prioritization of projects with respect to economic, environmental, and social objectives, and innovative funding of transportation infrastructure around the world. He has studied all forms of transportation policy around the world, including congestion charging and demand management, mode shift, goods movement, and growth management. Mr. Hazel has worked in the public, private, and academic sectors at a senior level and has acted as advisor to the Academy of Sustainable Communities, the Commission for Integrated Transport, Transport for London, the Queensland State Government, the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Region, the City of San Diego and many government agencies around the United Kingdom. Currently an honorary professor at the Robert Gordon University and adjunct professor at the Queensland University of Technology, Mr. Hazel has published a book on Making Cities Work and presents at conferences around the world.

Aidan Hughes – Principal, Arup
Aidan Hughes is the leader of Arup’s planning practice in the US, which focuses on integrated urbanism and sustainable planning and design. Mr. Hughes brings over 20 years experience and a proven track record in the management of complex multi-disciplinary projects. He consults to municipal governments, transportation agencies, and developers, and is currently leading the sustainable redevelopment of the Concord Naval Weapons Station in Concord, CA. A major part of the redevelopment program is compliance with California AB 32 (global warming act) and evaluating and mitigating carbon emissions from transportation, energy, and other sources for each redevelopment alternative. He also is involved in the Treasure Island Sustainability Planning project in San Francisco. Mr. Hughes is a USGBC LEED Accredited Professional, has worked in Europe, Asia and the United States, and has a broad understanding of the global approaches to delivering successful planning and infrastructure projects.
Peer Review Panel’s Global Observations

The Peer Review Panel convened in San Diego from April 19 – 21, 2010, to review and assess the work completed to date on the Urban Area Transit Strategy in relation to the preparation of the broader 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In addition to the Panel’s comments on the three alternative transit networks summarized in the staff report, the Panel also made a number of more global observations, as follows.

- **Economic Competitiveness:** Transportation is seen as the major driver of regions’ economic competitiveness, and an increased focus on developing public transit systems is seen as a key factor in cities around the world for meeting mobility needs that ensure long-term economic sustainability.

- **Technological Savviness:** All over the world, technology is increasingly being used to market transportation options and other services to individuals based on user-preferences. Integrated electronic cards, such as the Octopus Card in Hong Kong and the Oyster Card in England, are providing tremendous potential to the private sector for marketing goods and services to end users; to the public sector for tailoring, directing, and providing incentives for transit/transportation services to end users; and for users who receive incentives and discounts for many kinds of products and services based on established purchasing choices. Global technology firms are actively seeking opportunities to develop markets. The Compass Card in the San Diego region is a solid start, and the region should proactively work to expand the Compass Card services beyond transportation to provide users with more convenience and incentives, and to maximize the region’s ability to direct future transportation marketing decisions.

- **World Class Region:** The San Diego region has true potential of becoming a world class region. The focus of the Urban Area Transit Strategy should shift from developing a “world class transit system” to developing a “transportation system that supports a world class region and its local communities.”

- **Sustainability and Co-Benefits:** In addition to pursuing transit as a means to help meet the Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) (Steinberg, 2008) regulatory mandates to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, transit also can help provide alternative transportation options, reduce foreign energy dependency, improve air quality, and reduce the proportion of American budgets spent on transportation. In addition, any co-benefits from smart growth development patterns and integrated transit systems should be highlighted and promoted, including internal trip capture, increased walking and biking, and carbon reductions in energy, waste, and water resulting from green building programs.

- **Land Use Development around Transit Stations:** Land use developers around the world recognize the economic potential for redevelopment around transit stations. Increasingly, the public sector is participating more directly with the private sector in the planning, design, and implementation of these types of redevelopment projects that result in more transit-oriented uses and direct economic benefits to the public sector that can then be invested back into transit infrastructure development. The Panel cited the proposed Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, and Balboa Avenue station sites along the Mid-Coast light-rail transit alignment as prime examples where such public/private partnerships could be forged. Additionally, the Panel
expressed concern over the proposed Genesee Avenue alignment in the University City area, where an elevated trackway and station are currently proposed in order to minimize impacts on auto traffic. The Panel felt that the added costs of grade-separation versus an at-grade alignment may not be justified given the benefit that would accrue to the overall transportation system with the addition of the Mid-Coast project. They emphasized the importance of having transit facilities at the ground level as a means to better integrate into the surrounding community rather than forcing a separation from vehicle traffic as a traditional method of addressing congestion.

- **Land Use, Freeways, and Parking:** Land use density, design, and mix are essential components of a successful urban fabric and transit system. Locations that have limited parking and freeway expansions, and have simultaneously added an array transit services, have increased the overall performance of their transit systems and have increased transit mode share. The Panel felt that SANDAG should more directly reward communities that currently have high land use densities near transit stations, and should more directly influence land development in areas that currently have regional transit services. In addition, the Panel encouraged SANDAG to work more directly with the development community to build higher-density projects at stations, and to evaluate the allocation of affordable housing through the Regional Housing Needs Assessment process. In addition, the Panel expressed concerns that the region’s Managed Lanes could be counterproductive toward transit if not properly implemented and operated, and suggested that SANDAG should monitor transit productivity as the Managed Lanes and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) systems are implemented.

- **Project Prioritization:** The process to prioritize the funding of transportation projects needs to be easily understood by policymakers and the public, and needs to be conducted through a transparent process. A “policy audit table” example was provided. The audit helps to bridge the gap between the goals and objectives included in policy documents and the proposed transportation projects to help identify which transportation projects align with which policies, and alternatively which policies may not be addressed by any transportation projects.

- **Leadership and Champions:** Places that have successful transit systems have had strong leaders and champions to promote transit. Increasingly, bicycle and pedestrian advocates are supporting transit when they see opportunities for enhancements between the various modes. All successful transit systems need proactive and well-informed champions.

- **Dedicated Funding Sources:** Obtaining dedicated funding sources for transit is critical. In some cases, placing initiatives on the ballot solely for transit (versus for additional transportation modes and/or for other services) has culminated in success. (Within this context, the Panel recognized the difficulty of reaching California’s two-thirds voter approval threshold for new special taxes.) The Panel also noted the potential of exploring a subregional funding approach in San Diego as an innovative concept that should be pursued.
AIDAN HUGHES – PRINCIPAL, ARUP

Strengths

1. SANDAG has a strong relationship with the two transit operators and has good relationships with the Cities. This allows you to establish bold visions and work together to deliver on the vision. A more fractured relationship can get mired in delay and compromise.

2. SANDAG and the two operators have a very capable and experienced staff complemented with strong and committed leadership at the political and executive level. This translates into an ambition for leadership – learning from global best practice and seeking innovation in delivery and operation.

3. The existing system is operating successfully with strong farebox recovery and good coverage in the core areas. Much of the backbone system is in place through the LRT, Coaster and Sprinter systems linked into regional and international transport networks. While from the “inside” there is a recognition of some of the operational difficulties (for example, operating the trolley in the downtown), the public perception appears to be very positive. This establishes a strong platform for getting acceptance of system expansion and support for raising new capital. This also brings a responsibility to continue to deliver high quality service with clear benefits for riders as new projects are delivered.

Weaknesses

1. The Smart Growth plan is valuable as a comprehensive tool and it is being used appropriately as the basis for the transit networks. However, it is a bottom-up plan (the best the Cities are prepared to do right now) and it is not directly related to the availability of transit. There is an opportunity for SANDAG to take a lead in punching up the Smart Growth plan by using the carrot of transit investment to encourage Smart(er) Growth. Where there are proposed transit investments, they should be directly linked to some “threshold” metrics for smart growth.

2. The discussion we had around elevated light rail was interesting. It points to a fundamental issue that will face all projects, namely whether a case can (or should) be made to give transit priority in terms of road space at the expense of the auto. A greater commitment should be made to support trade-offs in favor of transit – case studies around the nation and world have demonstrated that this can be achieved with little downside. The upside is an ability to increase ridership, demonstrate the benefits of transit and make more complete communities with transit at its core. In many ways, this philosophical change in emphasis will be the platform for the world class community vision.

3. As we noted “parking is a big issue” and it is interesting that you have experience of the negative consequences in relation to parking for the downtown ballpark. We didn’t have time to address parking in all its complexities as part of the peer review, but parking policies should be dealt with as essential complementary measures to support successful transit.

GEORGE HAZEL – CHAIRMAN, MRC MCLEAN HAZEL LTD

Strengths

1. Enthusiasm, understanding, and competence of the team.

2. History of what you’ve done to date to build on.

3. In general, an exciting plan to deliver in a potentially world class city – you’re not there yet!

Weaknesses

1. Attitudes to not inconveniencing cars - unless you sort this out and the leadership backs and understands that it is the city’s and the car drivers’ best interests to have a world class transit system and give it top priority and road space, then you will find it very difficult. Discussion on elevated section of Mid-Coast is a key example.

2. Governance needs to be sorted - too many agencies saying different things and doing different things.

3. I worry about managed lanes as a transit policy, specifically that they could be counterproductive toward the performance of transit. I would suggest experimenting with peak time express transit service or local off-peak service and monitor the results.

In addition you should really look at the potential of Intelligent Commuting Technology (ICT) and the Transport Retail Model, building on the Compass Card you have, and also the potential regarding capturing increased land value to fund transit.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With the preparation of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is seeking a new and innovative vision for transit that will result in a more significant role for transit in addressing the region's mobility, land use, and sustainability goals. To help guide development of a new transit strategy, a review has been conducted of other regions that have successful transit systems, relatively high levels of transit use, and unique transit services or facilities. These areas offer examples of how transit has been applied successfully, and provide a point of reference or a standard from which comparisons can be made.

Three regions that might be considered “benchmark” cities for San Diego were researched in some detail. These cities are:

• Portland, Oregon
• Sydney, Australia
• Vancouver BC, Canada

Seven additional “comparison cities” are highlighted because they have characteristics similar to San Diego or provide examples of unique transit applications that have helped raise the profile of transit in their regions. These cities are:

• Brisbane, Australia
• Bordeaux, France
• Denver, Colorado
• Los Angeles, California
• Melbourne, Australia
• Minneapolis, Minnesota
• Seattle, Washington

Appendix A contains comparative data for U.S. cities to help provide a point of reference for San Diego.

Overarching Themes and Considerations for San Diego

Several overarching themes emerged from the benchmark and comparison cities evaluation, many of which may be appropriate for consideration as SANDAG develops the 2050 Transit Strategy. The overarching themes found as part of the case study review are presented on the left side of the following table and their potential applicability to San Diego is presented on the right.
The “success” of transit did not happen overnight.

Successful transit has been an evolutionary process in case study regions during which certain strategies were used until their usefulness was outlived, and then the strategies were modified or new strategies were implemented.

San Diego embarked on an innovative new transit strategy in the early 1980s with the opening of the region’s (and nation’s) first urban rail transit line since WWII from downtown San Diego to the International Border. Over the next 25 years, the region expanded the rail network to provide a backbone transit infrastructure and service network, to one that now includes 75 miles of light rail (San Diego Trolley and Sprinter) and 40 miles of commuter rail (Coaster). Between 1975 and 2005, transit ridership increased 150 percent while regional population increased approximately 75 percent. As the original regional rail program nears completion (the 11-mile Mid-Coast corridor between Old Town and University City is the only remaining rail extension in the Regional Transportation Plan), the regional transit strategy has shifted to a multi-modal, shared right-of-way approach (transit on managed lanes and arterial streets). Looking to the experiences of the case study regions, San Diego may need to develop a new “dramatic strategy” for transit for the next 30-40 years – one that combines past, present, and future strategies to recapture the transit momentum experienced in the 1980s. The new strategy will need to include a stronger connection between transit investment and land use policies to achieve SANDAG’s vision for a larger transit mode share in the urban core, and key corridors and communities.

Transit success depends on regional plans and visions that guide the integration of land use and transportation.

Many regional plans create a hierarchy of centers focused around transit that provide good design, sufficient density, and a land use mix that supports non-auto access to transit. Success is also dependent on a number of agencies working collaboratively to achieve the success of the regional plans and visions.

SANDAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan and Smart Growth strategy have established a hierarchy of centers that are designed to be supported by transit, as well as policies for integrating land use and transportation. Development of a new regional transit strategy should draw heavily on the policies and goals in the Regional Comprehensive Plan for both the region and specific corridors/communities. To achieve success, agencies, transit providers, and stakeholders must work together towards agreed upon transit and land-use goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Theme</th>
<th>Considerations for San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regions use a variety of tools to achieve transit success.</strong></td>
<td>SANDAG and the region already have a variety of policy tools to support transit as defined in the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Smart Growth strategy. Additional policies and tools found in the peer regions/cities that promote and support existing and future transit services for consideration by SANDAG include: improvements to the pedestrian environment, urban growth boundaries, cooperative agreements between public agencies and private developers, tax incentives to foster transit oriented development, parking maximums or limitations, and legislation requiring commute trip reductions by major employers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions used a variety of policy, regulatory, and financial tools that contributed to the success of transit in these regions. Tools were modified or new tools added when they were no longer effective for encouraging ridership or investment along transit corridors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regions generally experienced a shift in policy and investment toward transit over the past few decades.</strong></td>
<td>The San Diego region is also experiencing similar pressures to contain sprawl, protect the environment, promote livable communities, and maintain and improve the quality of life. Through the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the San Diego region has made the policy connection between investments in transit and achieving these goals. Looking toward the future, new transit policies and strategies designed to increase transit mode share will need to understand the effects of regional highway investments and policies on the potential success of the transit investments and system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions moved toward transit as a tool for improving mobility and sustainability in response to public pressures related to sprawl, the environment, livable communities, and quality of life issues. These regions also made significant investments in permanent transit infrastructure, which not only improved transit, but also helped generate awareness and understanding of the transit system and spur transit-oriented development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local bus networks are essential for successful transit systems to provide efficient connections and access to the backbone system.</strong></td>
<td>San Diego’s existing transit network leans toward hub-and-spoke structure with feeder buses connecting to rail based transit centers. However, many trips rely solely on bus transit. A new transit strategy will need to build off the existing rail transit investment, while also considering how best to serve key travel markets (origins/destinations, work trips, etc.) that may not be well served by existing bus/rail connections. The strategy will also need to define the role of local and feeder bus service in relation to the major transit infrastructure investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To efficiently support higher frequency transit stations, feeder services are essential components of the transit system and, depending on the local geography, are often structured along grids or hub-and-spoke networks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Considerations for San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking requirements in transit-supportive communities are reduced.</strong></td>
<td>Abundant and inexpensive parking have proven to be key deterrents to transit use. A new transit strategy for the San Diego region should evaluate how parking policies (location, availability, and cost), particularly in the city center and urban core, impact transit use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Successful transit systems include a variety of transit modes.</strong></td>
<td>All regions include a combination of transit facility and service applications to create their transit networks and systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique applications of transit have occurred in the central cities.</strong></td>
<td>Even cities with similar transit histories and land use characteristics as San Diego have invested heavily in innovative transit facilities and services in their central cities (transit malls, streetcars, underground bus terminals, fare free zones). These investments have proven highly successful in generating transit ridership, supporting the regional transit network, achieving land use objectives, increasing transit mode share, and contributing to the vitality of their downtown core. Many of these strategies may have applicability to downtown San Diego and other key activity centers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Travel Corridors and Areas for Use in Identifying Initial Mode Share Goals

- Major Travel Corridor
- Major Employment Area
- High Activity Area
Urban Area Transit Strategy
Proposed Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges for Identified Corridors and Areas and Supporting Data
Peak-Period, Home-to-Work Trips¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Corridors/Areas</th>
<th>Baseline Data</th>
<th>Supporting Data</th>
<th>Proposed Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008 Existing Transit</td>
<td>2030 RTP With 2050 Land Uses²</td>
<td>25% Increase Over 2030 RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Employment Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otay Mesa/Otay Ranch</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar Airport</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Activity Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Core</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside/Escondido Corridor</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Urbanized Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North I-15 Corridor</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Coastal Area</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coastal Area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal South Bay</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County/El Cajon</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County/Santee</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area Transit Strategy Study Area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Values represent peak period home-to-work trip transit mode-share for destination districts.
² Values reflect projected mode share of either the currently adopted 2030 Reasonably Expected RTP or the 2030 Unconstrained RTP, whichever is higher, combined with 2050 land uses.
Transit Mode Share

Values represent peak period home-to-work transit mode share for destination districts.

2008 Transit Mode Share

Mode Share (%)
- Under 5%
- 5% to 9%
- 10% to 14%
- 15% to 19%
- 20% to 24%
Values represent peak period home-to-work transit mode share for destination districts.
## Urban Area Transit Strategy - Initial Performance of Transit Network Alternatives

**Key:**  
- Green: Most Effective  
- Blue: Middle  
- Red: Least Effective  
- Brown: No Significant Change

### A. Mode Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode Share Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Point-to-Point</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Peak-Period Transit Mode Share as Applied to the Identified Corridors/Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not yet available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. All-Day Transit Mode Share as Applied to the Identified Corridors/Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Change in Peak Period Urban Area Transit Mode Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Transit Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Point-to-Point</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Change in Transit Person Trips (Regional)</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>401,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Change in Transit Passenger Miles (Regional)</td>
<td>1,593,000</td>
<td>5,197,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Change in Transit Peak-Period Person Trips (Regional)</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Change in Mode of Access to Transit (Non-Motorized and Auto)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/Bike to Transit</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto (drove and driven) to Transit</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Cost-Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost-Effectiveness Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Point-to-Point</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1. Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Capital Cost Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not yet available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Cost-Effectiveness of Network (Region)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Operating Subsidy Required (Region)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4. Total Transit System Capital Cost vs. SANDAG Revenue-Constrained Funding Scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5. Ability to Phase Major System Components/Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Efficient Transportation Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Point-to-Point</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit System Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. Passenger Miles to Transit Seat Mile Ratio</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation System Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Change in Auto Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. Change in Auto Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) per capita</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. Change in Auto Vehicle Trips per capita</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Baseline scenario consists of an overlay between the highway and transit networks included in the 2030 RTP and the land use assumptions included in the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast.
### E. Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Point-to-Point</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenhouse Gas Reduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1. Estimated Change in GHG (tentative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. Peak-Period Non-Motorized Mode Share in Urban Area</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. All-Day Non-Motorized Mode Share in Urban Area</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4. Compatibility with Regional Bike Plan (mi. of bike fac. within 1/2 mile of major station)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land-Use/Transportation Connection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5a. % of Jobs within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5b. % of Jobs within 1/4 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6a. % of Housing Units within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6b. % of Housing Units w/in 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations with 10 Minute or Better Service</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6c. % of Housing Units w/in 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations with 15 Minute or Better Service</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7. Compatibility with current Regional Activity Centers (Hospitals, Universities/Colleges, Shopping Malls, and Tourist Attractions within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. Social Equity/Environmental Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Equity/Environmental Justice Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Point-to-Point</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title VI Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1a. % Minority Populations within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (% Improvement)</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1b. % Non-Minority Populations within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (% Improvement)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1c. % Low-Income Households within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (% Improvement)</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1d. % Non-Low-Income Households within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (% Improvement)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Meaningful Social Equity/Environmental Justice Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2a. % of 75+ Population within 1/4 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2b. % of 75+ Population within 1/4 Mile of All Stations</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3. % Zero-Car Households within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (2000 census data)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Title VI requires analysis of the burdens of regional transportation system investments on low-income and minority populations. Measures in this category evaluate the comparative percent improvement between low-income and non-low-income populations and minority and non-minority populations. Key: A "1" indicates disparate impact and a "2" indicates no disparate impact.
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G. Time-Competitiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Competitiveness Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Point to-Point</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1. Oceanside - Downtown San Diego Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2. Escondido - Downtown San Diego Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G3. El Cajon - Downtown San Diego Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G4. Mid City San Diego - Sorrento Valley Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G5. Chula Vista - Sorrento Valley Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G6. San Ysidro - Downtown San Diego Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G7. El Cajon - Sorrento Valley Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: 
DEVELOPMENT OF THE INITIAL UNCONSTRAINED 
TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Introduction

During April and May, staff presented the Urban Area Transit Strategy alternative transit networks to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees, various SANDAG working groups, and at the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) public workshops for public input. The networks also were reviewed by an outside Peer Review Panel. Based on feedback received so far, staff has assembled initial recommendations for a preferred 2050 transit network based on the initial three alternatives evaluated as part of the Urban Area Transit Strategy. This transit network, highway improvements, and other management strategies form the basis for the initial 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network.

Board members are asked to discuss and provide feedback on the initial Unconstrained Transportation Network. Recommendations for a preferred Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented at the July 2010 Board meeting for further discussion and use in the development of the Draft 2050 RTP.

2050 RTP Transportation Network Scenarios

In developing the 2050 RTP, the Unconstrained Transportation Network represents the region’s vision for reasonable transit, highway, and arterial improvements and operations to meet travel demand in 2050. Defining the Unconstrained Network is an important step in developing an updated RTP, because it establishes the broadest multimodal network from which revenue constrained network scenarios will be developed.

Once the Unconstrained Network is defined, staff will prioritize all of the future projects in this network, using the updated transportation project evaluation criteria (see Agenda Item No. 4). Based on revenue projections, various Revenue Constrained transportation network scenarios will be developed using this prioritized project list and other factors. The Revenue Constrained network scenarios will attempt to build and operate as much of the Unconstrained Network as possible, given revenue availability and flexibility, and project priorities. These scenarios will be evaluated using performance measures leading to the eventual selection of a preferred Revenue Constrained Network by the Board of Directors.

As previously discussed with the Board, Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008) (SB 375) requires that the 2050 RTP include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as a new element, in addition to the traditional policy, action, and financial elements. The 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission on April 7, 2010, establish that the RTP must
be an “internally consistent” document (i.e., all four elements of the RTP must be consistent with one another). As a result, transportation investments and the forecasted development pattern in the SCS should be complementary and not contradictory.

Federal regulations require that the RTP be financially constrained and include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented [Title 23 CFR Part 450.322(f) (10)]. The financial plan must demonstrate that projects included in the RTP can be implemented using committed, available, or reasonably available revenue sources (Title 23 CFR Part 450.104). Therefore, to achieve consistency among all RTP elements, the SCS must be developed to match the financially (or revenue) constrained plan. The 2050 RTP Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will analyze the Revenue Constrained plan as the Proposed Project. Project alternatives also will be analyzed in the EIR.

Discussion

Initial Recommendations for a 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network

The Urban Area Transit Strategy will serve as the basis for development of the regional transit network to be included in the 2050 RTP. Through the planning process, staff has developed and begun testing three transit network alternatives with a focus on the urban areas of the San Diego region with the ultimate goal of incorporating one of the networks (or a combination or variation of the networks) into the 2050 RTP Unconstrained Network. The Urban Area is illustrated in Attachment 1.

As discussed in Agenda Item No. 3A, the transit alternatives under study were grouped into three themes: Transit Propensity” (expanding transit in the most urbanized areas); “Commuter Point-to-Point” (emphasizing quick access to work); and “Many Centers” (connecting local smart growth areas and activity centers).

Based on feedback from the 2050 RTP public workshops, the Peer Review Panel, the performance analysis, and the public, staff recommends combining the best overall transit system strategies contained in all three alternatives as the focus for developing and testing a preferred RTP unconstrained transit network. This strategy focuses on developing a strong link between transit and transit-supportive land use patterns, a link that will ensure that future investments made in transit are maximized in terms of cost-effectiveness. Based on this approach, staff recommends developing a Hybrid strategy based on the following key points:

- Improve the current transit network in communities that already have strong transit/land use integration (e.g., Mid-City, coastal South Bay communities, etc.). Improvements would focus on establishing 10-minute, all-day frequencies on most local routes, developing Rapid Bus services along major arterial corridors, and adding new light rail service to better serve high-demand corridors. Streetcar and/or other shuttle/circulator services also would help improve intra-community circulation within smart growth centers (e.g., downtown San Diego, downtown Escondido, downtown El Cajon, etc.). This strategy would incorporate much of Transit Propensity alternative.

- Expand high-frequency local and Rapid Bus services into the largest-scale smart-growth areas that are emerging or planned in the near-term as suggested by the Many Centers alternative. These concentrations of future transit-friendly land uses help justify significant investments in transit infrastructure and services.
• Interconnect the existing, most highly-urbanized areas and future smart growth centers to major employment areas with a system of high-speed, high-frequency rail and Bus Rapid Transit lines that will facilitate easy and convenient access across the region. Using findings from the evaluation of the Commuter Point-to-Point alternative, the addition of selected peak commuter bus services that offer one-seat rides/competitive travel would facilitate access to key regional employment centers.

• Emphasize improvements to the pedestrian environment in and around rail and bus station areas to maximize convenient and safe walking access to transit, and also create interconnections between transit and the Regional Bike Plan as a means to facilitate access to transit stations from areas outside a walking distance and create new last-mile solutions.

These actions, taken together, could serve as a good starting point for the overall strategy for developing the long-range vision for the transit plan that will ultimately be incorporated into the 2050 RTP. The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees are discussing the proposed “Hybrid” approach at their joint meeting on June 4, 2010, and any comments made will be provided verbally at the June 11 Board Policy meeting. A draft list of transit projects for the 2050 Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network is included as Attachment 2a. (Attachment 2b provides definitions of transit services and facilities for the Urban Area Transit Strategy for reference purposes.)

Initial Recommendations for a 2050 Unconstrained Highway Network

Similarly to the process being proposed for the transit network, SANDAG and Caltrans staffs are analyzing potential modifications to the 2030 RTP Unconstrained highway network. These modifications are based on supporting proposed transit investments in key corridors and communities while providing an adequate level of service for the overall transportation system. It is important to note that the 2030 RTP Unconstrained highway network includes an extensive Managed Lanes system that provides tremendous flexibility in serving transit and high occupancy vehicles (HOVs) by maximizing the available rights-of-way in several of the region’s major highway corridors. The goal in reviewing the highway network is to build upon this existing plan by integrating the revised transit network into it, thereby creating the most efficient and balanced transportation system.

Potential modifications include additional operational improvements to relieve bottlenecks, refinements of the HOV and Managed Lane network to support transit services, and adjustments to general purpose lane widening beyond what is included in the 2030 Reasonably Expected RTP for corridors that are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service. A map of the initial 2050 Unconstrained Highway Network is included as Attachment 3.
**Next Steps**

Based on discussion today, the initial Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented to the working groups for discussion and feedback. Recommendations for a preferred Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented at the July 2010 Board meeting for further discussion and use in the development of the Draft 2050 RTP.
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Funds are budgeted in Work Elements #31003 and 31005
Initial List of Transit Projects for the 2050 Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network

An initial list of transit projects to be included in the 2050 Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network is proposed below. (Definitions of transit services are included in Attachment 2b as a reference.) This initial list builds upon transit services currently in operation today and on planned transit services currently included in the 2030 Reasonably Expected Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Based on results of upcoming model runs to test the performance of these transit projects, staff will propose modifications to the mix of projects and adjustments to the levels of service in order to maximize the cost-effectiveness for the unconstrained transit network that will eventually be incorporated into the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan.

Ultimately, the selected transit network will be accompanied by a series of policy recommendations that may enhance the performance of the networks. The policy recommendations may address issues such as urban design, parking, street connectivity, bike and pedestrian access, transit awareness and education, last mile solutions, etc. During the planning process, staff will conduct a series of sensitivity tests that may provide supplemental information on the effectiveness of any potential policies that could be considered in the planning process.

Local Bus Services

Within the Urban Area Transit Strategy study area, service frequencies on most existing local bus services would be increased to 10 minutes or better throughout the day to serve short-distance trip-making and provide connections to regional Rapid Bus, Bus Rapid Transit, and Rail services. Additional local bus services within the study area would include:

- Solana Beach-Carmel Valley-University City
- Carmel Valley-Pacific Highlands Ranch-Sabre Springs
- Mira Mesa-Scripps Ranch North-South Poway Industrial Park

Outside the study area, a basic level of local bus service (30-60 minute service throughout most of the day) would be provided to connect key communities to the urban areas, including:

- Fallbrook
- Valley Center
- Ramona
- Alpine
- Tribal nations

Rapid Bus Services

A network of limited-stop Rapid Bus services would operate in key travel corridors as overlay services to local bus services to serve medium-distance trip-making, including:

- Oceanside-University City via Coast Highway corridor
- Oceanside-Vista via Mission Avenue corridor
- Camp Pendleton-Mira Costa College-Plaza Camino Real
• Escondido-South Escondido
• Carlsbad-San Marcos via Palomar Airport Road corridor
• Old Town-Pacific Beach-La Jolla-University City
• Mission Valley-University City via Genesee Avenue corridor
• Ocean Beach-Old Town-Mid-City-La Mesa
• Point Loma-Old Town-Linda Vista-Kearny Mesa
• SDSU-Downtown via Adams Ave/First Avenue corridors
• North Park-South Park-Golden Hill-Downtown
• Downtown-Coronado
• Downtown-Southeastern communities-Spring Valley
• SDSU-Mid-City-Lemon Grove-Spring Valley
• SDSU-Mid-City-Southeastern communities-National City
• Chula Vista-Southwestern College-Otay Ranch
• Imperial Beach-Otay-Otay Mesa

**Bus Rapid Transit Services**

All day bus rapid transit services would operate in key freeway/transit guideway corridors to serve long-distance regional trip making, including:

• Escondido-North I-15 communities, Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Downtown
• Otay Mesa-Otay Ranch-Chula Vista-National City-Downtown
• San Ysidro-Chula Vista-National City-Downtown-Old Town-University City

Peak-period commuter bus services would operate in key freeway/transitway corridors to provide point-to-point connections/one-seat ride service between key residential areas and regional employment centers, including:

• Escondido and north I-15 communities to Downtown
• Oceanside-Carlsbad-Encinitas to Sorrento Mesa
• Otay Ranch-Chula Vista to University City/Sorrento Mesa
• Southeastern San Diego communities-Mid-City to University City/Sorrento Mesa
• El Cajon-Santee to Kearny Mesa/University City/Sorrento Mesa
• Santee-El Cajon-Spring Valley to Eastern Urban Center/Otay Mesa
• Inland South Bay-Southeastern San Diego communities/Mid-City to Escondido/Palomar Airport Road corridor

**Commuter and Light Rail Services**

Double tracking of the COASTER would allow 15 minute peak/60 minute off-peak bi-directional service, while double tracking the Sprinter corridor would allow 10 minute all day service, along with express/limited stop service between Oceanside and Escondido.

A commuter rail overlay service on the proposed California High Speed Rail system would facilitate commuter travel needs between the Temecula-Escondido I-15 corridor and south county job centers.
Additional light rail services would operate in the following corridors:

- University City-Mira Mesa via Mira Mesa Boulevard
- University City-Kearny Mesa-Mission Valley-Mid-City-Southeastern San Diego communities-National City-Chula Vista via I-805 and I-15
- Downtown-SDSU via Park Blvd/El Cajon Boulevard
- Pacific Beach-Kearny Mesa-Mission Valley-SDSU-El Cajon via Balboa Avenue/Green Line

**Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator Services**

Several streetcar and/or bus shuttle/circulator services would operate in key community center areas to facilitate both intra-area tripmaking and first-last mile connections to regional transit services.

- Downtown areas in San Diego, Oceanside, Escondido, El Cajon, National City, Chula Vista
- Community centers in University City/Sorrento Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Hillcrest/North Park, Eastern Urban Center (Chula Vista)
Definitions of Transit Services and Facilities
For Urban Area Transit Strategy

High-Speed Rail:

- Designed for very high-speed long-distance intercity trips with long station spacing and dedicated grade-separated lines. Examples include the Shinkansen in Japan, the TGV in France, and the AVE in Spain. California High-Speed Rail (HSR) is currently being planned from Sacramento to San Diego.

- Vehicles are steel wheel on steel track electrically-powered bidirectional train sets.
- Top Speed: 220 miles per hour (mph), but 150 mph maximum expected from San Diego to Escondido and 200 mph maximum from Escondido to Riverside.
- Level boarding.
- Passenger Capacity: Not yet determined in CA. Examples from around the world range from approximately 300 to 1,300 per train but most single level trains have about 400-500.
- Operates on dedicated high speed track with no at-grade crossings.
- California HSR system will be over 600 miles.

Commuter Rail:

- Designed for higher-speed, longer-distance regional trips with stations spacing every four to five miles on average. Examples include the San Diego COASTER, Dallas/Fort Worth Trinity Railway Express, and Southern California Metrolink.

- Commuter rail lines use diesel or electric locomotives (diesel are more common and are used in Southern California).
- Typical speed: 80 mph.
- Typically low floor.
- Supported by Park and Ride lots.
- Typical passenger capacity: 130 seats per car operating with 3-8 car trains (typically no standees).
- Operates on a dedicated right-of-way separate from other vehicles.
- Typical length of line: 25-100 miles.
### Light Rail Transit (LRT):

Designed for medium-distance trips with station spacing about every mile on average. Examples include the San Diego Trolley, the San Diego SPRINTER, Portland MAX, Minneapolis Hiawatha Line, and Houston MetroRail.

- Electric or diesel-powered rail vehicles.
- Typical speed: corridor speed limit, generally not exceeding 55 mph.
- Designed for high-capacity corridors.
- Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.
- Operates on a dedicated guideway within separate right-of-way or on-street.
- Typical passenger capacity: 60-140 seated plus standees (per car), with 1-4 cars.
- Typical length of line: 6-25 miles.
- Typically low floor.

### Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator:

Designed for short-distance trips with station spacing every few blocks or every quarter-mile on average. Streetcar examples include Portland Modern Streetcar, Seattle Streetcar, and San Francisco Historic Streetcar. Shuttle-circulators include MTS Shuttle, University City SuperLoop.

- Typical speed: speeds up to the speed limit of the street they operate on, generally averaging 12 mph (with stops).
- Designed for dense urban areas, such as downtown areas.
- Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.
- Streetcars operate either in mixed-traffic with automobiles or on a dedicated right-of-way.
- Typical passenger capacity for streetcars: up to 100 seated and standees per car (vehicles generally provide few seats due to short distance nature of trips). Operate as single vehicles.
- Typical passenger capacity for shuttles-circulators: up to 20-25 seated, depending upon vehicle size.
- Typical length of line: 2-6 miles.
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT):

- Designed for longer-distance, higher-speed, regional trip-making on a dedicated bus guideway or freeway Managed Lanes/High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) facilities. All-day, all-stop trunk BRT services can be complemented with peak-period commuter express services designed to provide very limited stop connections to major employment centers. Examples include San Diego Interstate 15 BRT, Los Angeles Orange Line, Eugene, Oregon EmX, and the Brisbane South-East Busway.

- Diesel or CNG/alternative fuels standard.
- Typical speed: corridor speed limit, typically 40-60 mph on average.
- Supported by Park and Ride lots.
- Designed for high-capacity corridors.
- Low floor design.
- Operates on dedicated guideway and sometimes in mixed-traffic with automobiles.
- Typical passenger capacity: 50-60 seated plus standees on arterial routes, 50-80 seated on freeway routes (per bus).
- Typical length of line: 8-15 miles on arterial segments, 10-30 miles on freeway segments.
- Typical station spacing: 0.5-1 mile on arterial segments, 4-5 miles on freeway segments.

Continued on next page...
**Rapid Bus:**

Provides higher-speed alternatives to local bus services in high volume arterial corridors and utilizes a range of lower-capital cost signal priority treatments, short segments of transit-only lanes, and limited station stops to achieve faster travel times. Rapid Bus services can be upgraded to BRT over time through implementation of dedicated transit lanes to bypass congested arterial segments. Examples include Los Angeles Metro Rapid and Boston Washington Street Silver Line.

- Diesel or CNG/alternative fuels standard.
- Typical speed: speeds up to the speed limit of the street they operate on, averaging about 25 mph (with stops).
- Low floor design.
- Designed for high-capacity corridors.
- Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.
- Typical passenger capacity: 40 seated plus standees (per bus).
- Typical length of line: 8-15 miles.
- Typical station spacing: 0.5-1 mile.

**High-Frequency Local Bus:**

Facilitates mid-to-short-distance trip-making within local communities, with closer station spacing. Local bus services serve as the backbone of the transit system and provide the primary access into local communities where fixed-route services are warranted.

- Typically standard and single articulated buses.
- Typical speed: speeds up to the speed limit of the street they operate on, averaging 12 mph (with stops).
- Low-floor design.
- Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.
- Operates in mixed-traffic with automobiles, but can benefit from transit-signal priority and queue jump lanes.
- Typical passenger capacity: 37-57 seated plus standees (per bus).
- Typical length of line: ranges from under 5 miles up to 25 miles.
- Typical station spacing: 1-4 blocks.
REPORT FROM THE CONSUL GENERAL OF MEXICO

Introduction

The Consul General of Mexico in San Diego, Hon. Remedios Gómez-Arnau, contributes to the Borders Committee dialogue by providing periodic reports on binational activities within the purview of the Committee. This report highlights President Felipe Calderón and President Barack Obama’s Joint Statement, signed on May 19, 2010, during a visit to Washington D.C. by Mexico’s President Felipe Calderón.

Discussion

The May 19, 2010, visit was the first official state visit of President Felipe Calderón to Washington D.C. to meet with the United States President Barak Obama and to address a joint meeting of Congress.

During the official state visit, the two Presidents signed a Joint Statement (Attachment 1) reaffirming “the shared values that guide [the] approaches to economic competitiveness, environmental conservation, clean energy, climate change, nuclear non proliferation, and the safety, social and economic well-being, and security of our citizens.”

The Joint Statement is divided into five sections, including: Enhancing Mutual Economic Growth; Meeting Energy Needs and Protecting the Environment; Cooperating Against Transnational Organized Crime; Enhancing Social Well-Being and Ties between Our People; and Engaging in the Hemisphere and Around the Globe.

Enhancing Mutual Economic Growth
An important reference for this section is the U.S. - Mexico Declaration on Twenty-First Century Border Management, which was formed to spur further advancements in creating a modern, secure, and efficient border, including the formation of a binational task force.

Meeting Energy Needs and Protecting the Environment
The two Presidents reviewed updates on the efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote green energy, and improve energy reliability. This is in the context of the Bilateral Framework for Clean Energy and Climate Change announced during President Obama’s April 2009 visit to Mexico City.
Cooperating Against Transnational Organized Crime
This section reflects the commitment of both Presidents to confront the organized crime that is threatening the security and well-being of the communities on both sides of the binational border. The Merida Initiative was reviewed to expedite delivery of security-related resources.

Enhancing Social Well-Being and Ties between Our People
During the official state visit, the two Presidents recognized that “human capital is one of the most important assets that our two countries share.” A reference to President Obama’s commitment to a comprehensive immigration reform in the United States is made in this section.

Engaging in the Hemisphere and Around the Globe
This part refers to the strategic partnership between both countries in reference to topics such as democratic governance, security cooperation, and the Pathways to Prosperity Initiative.

Attachment: 1. Joint Statement by President Obama and Mexican President Calderón

Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas, (619) 699-1972; hva@sandag.org
President Felipe Calderón and President Barack Obama today reaffirmed the strategic partnership between the United States and Mexico and underscored their commitment to improve the lives of all citizens in both our countries, building upon our deep ties, and working with mutual respect and mutual responsibility across a broad arc of issues.

The Presidents discussed the wide range of bilateral, hemispheric, and global issues that affect our two countries and reaffirmed the shared values that guide our approaches to economic competitiveness, environmental conservation, clean energy, climate change, nuclear non-proliferation, and the safety, social and economic well-being, and security of our citizens.

**Enhancing Mutual Economic Growth**

Mexico and the United States enjoy a vital economic and trading partnership that the Presidents vowed to enhance, reinforcing efforts to create jobs, promote economic recovery and expansion, and shared inclusive prosperity across all levels of society in both countries.

A key component of our global competitiveness is creating a border for the Twenty-First Century. The Presidents recognize that our border offers singular opportunities for both countries. We must develop it and manage it in a holistic fashion and in ways that facilitate the secure, efficient, and rapid flows of goods and people and reduce the costs of doing business between our two countries. Both the United States and Mexico benefit from expediting legitimate travel through and between our two countries, especially by those who live in the border region.

The Presidents took note of the progress underway in building that Twenty-First Century Border, including the opening of three new border crossings this year, initiation of three additional binational bridge projects, and significant modernization projects at existing border facilities. To spur further advancements in creating a modern, secure, and efficient border, the Presidents directed their respective cabinets to form a bilateral Executive Steering Committee, with appropriate representatives from each government, to implement a Declaration on Twenty-First Century Border Management, that will be released later today, to help make the Twenty-First Century Border a reality. It will include a first-ever binational 24-month plan of action to improve cross-border trade and travel.

The Presidents agreed that safe, efficient, secure, and compatible transportation is a prerequisite for mutual economic growth. They committed to continuing their countries’ cooperation in system planning, operational coordination, and technical cooperation in key modes of transportation.

The Presidents also committed to significantly enhance the economic competitiveness and the economic well-being of both the United States and Mexico through improved regulatory cooperation. Such cooperation can increase economic growth in each country; lower costs for consumers, businesses, producers, and governments; increase trade in goods and services across our borders; and improve our ability to protect the environment, health and safety of our
citizens. To increase regulatory transparency; provide early warning of regulations with potential bilateral effects; strengthen the analytic basis of regulations; and help make regulations more compatible, the Presidents directed the creation of a High-Level Regulatory Cooperation Council, which will be comprised of senior-level regulatory, trade, and foreign affairs officials from both countries.

Innovation and investment in technology and human capital are keys to sustained economic growth and competitiveness in both Mexico and the United States. The protection of intellectual property rights is essential to promote such innovation and investment. With this in mind, the Presidents charged their administrations to work together to formalize and expand the efforts of the existing bilateral Intellectual Property Rights Working Group. These efforts will include industry training (including of small and medium size enterprises); work between Mexican Institute of Industrial Property (IMPI) and the United States Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) to streamline patent reviews; and collaboration, training and increased intelligence sharing among law enforcement agencies to enforce intellectual property rights more effectively. The Presidents also reaffirmed their commitment to the negotiation of the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement and charged their administrations to conclude these negotiations soon.

Reflecting on the progress made in the commercial relationship, the two Presidents noted that Mexico and Mexican companies are among the largest customers in the world for the U.S. Export-Import Bank (EXIM). Mexico is poised to be first country in the world where EXIM exceeds $10 billion in financing to support U.S. exports, in turn supporting investments and the transfer of new technology to Mexico. The Presidents also discussed ongoing differences that inevitably arise from a mature and comprehensive trading relationship, and committed to renew efforts to resolve these pending issues in a cooperative fashion.

Meeting Energy Needs and Protecting the Environment.

The Presidents recognize the close link between economic growth, competitiveness, and sustainable development and their bilateral clean energy and environment agenda. They reaffirmed that the United States and Mexico share a common goal of achieving strong economic growth while addressing the climate change challenge and increasing the reliability of our energy infrastructure. The Leaders reviewed the efforts both countries are undertaking to limit greenhouse gas emissions, promote green energy, and improve energy reliability in the context of the Bilateral Framework for Clean Energy and Climate Change announced during President Obama’s April 2009 visit to Mexico City.

To build on that progress, the Presidents resolved to create a Cross-Border Electricity Task Force to promote regional renewable energy markets between our two countries. The Task Force will review opportunities and obstacles to cross border trade in renewable energy, advancing options on standards, electricity transmission, grid connections, and other policy measures that create market incentives for investment and trade in renewable energy technologies. The leaders also committed to increasing grid reliability and resiliency, including collaboration on smart grid standards and technology to make energy use more efficient and reliable in both Mexico and the United States.

Recognizing that the cleanest source of energy is more efficient energy use, the Presidents committed the relevant agencies in each government to hold joint workshops this fall to accelerate energy efficiency improvements in the building and transportation sectors, including
green building certification, enhanced trade in green building materials, and best practices in light-duty vehicle mileage regulation.

In the context of discussing a shared clean energy future, the Presidents recognized the increasing interplay of trade and climate policies and the importance of engaging directly on these. Both committed to direct their trade authorities to commence a dialogue with other countries on these issues. In particular, the Presidents committed to explore the possibility of early action to liberalize tariffs on climate-friendly technologies as a first step towards encouraging mutually supportive trade and climate policies.

The two Leaders reaffirmed their shared commitment to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and stressed the importance of reaching a successful outcome in Cancun. President Obama supported Mexico’s leadership role as chair of the 16th Conference of the Parties of the UNFCCC and expressed readiness to work with Mexico. Both leaders also underscored their commitment to the Copenhagen Accord and its implementation.

The Presidents noted the long history of bilateral cooperation in the conservation of natural and cultural resources. They recognized that Big Bend National Park and Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River in the United States and the Protected Areas of Maderas del Carmen, Cañon de Santa Elena, Ocampo, and Río Bravo del Norte in Mexico together comprise one of the largest and most significant ecological complexes in North America. In doing so, they recognized that increased cooperation in these protected areas would restrict development and enhance security in the region and within this fragile desert ecosystem. To preserve this region of extraordinary biological diversity, they expressed their support for the United States Department of Interior and the Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources of the United Mexican States to work through appropriate national processes to recognize and designate Big Bend – Río Bravo as a natural area of binational interest. The Presidents underscored their commitment to manage the region in a way that enhances security and protects these areas for wildlife preservation, ecosystem restoration, climate change adaptation, wildland fire management, and invasive species control.

Both Presidents expressed their commitment to ensure energy security in North America and to the safe, efficient and equitable exploitation of transboundary reservoirs with the highest degree of safety and environmental standards, and instructed their teams to take steps, consistent with the findings of key investigations into the BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill, toward advancing that shared commitment. In this regard, they instructed their teams to seek a moratorium on exploitation activities along the maritime boundary in the Western Gap in the Gulf of Mexico. President Obama thanked President Calderon for the offers of assistance Mexico has provided with regard to on-going efforts related to the BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico in accordance with the United States-Mexico Joint Contingency Plan for Maritime Pollution.

**Cooperating Against Transnational Organized Crime**

The Presidents highlighted the abiding importance of safeguarding communities on both sides of our shared border and reaffirmed their mutual commitment to confront criminal organizations that represent a serious threat to the security and well-being of Mexicans and Americans. They recognized that the United States and Mexico share responsibility for defeating and dismantling the illicit criminal networks that traffic drugs into the United States, and illegal weapons and illicit revenues into Mexico, and that these transnational networks are associated with much of the
crime and violence occurring in Mexico today. Both Presidents evaluated on-going efforts to stem the illegal flow of weapons and bulk cash into Mexico and will seek to reinforce cooperation and efforts in this critical area.

The Presidents recognized that the Twenty-First Century Border must ensure the safety and security of residents in communities along both sides of the border and affirmed the mutual interest of Mexico and the United States to prevent entry into our countries of people who pose a threat to the national security of both nations. The Presidents affirmed their commitment to close, continuing, and constant bilateral cooperation and coordination to combat illicit activities and transnational criminal organizations. They pledged to work together to prevent human smuggling and trafficking.

The Presidents reviewed and endorsed the work of the U.S.-Mexico Mérida Initiative High-Level Group, which met in March, 2010, in Mexico City to lay out a shared vision for on-going and future security cooperation between the United States and Mexico. Consistent with that vision, the Presidents directed that cooperation focus on four elements: disrupting the capacity of criminal organizations that act in both countries by weakening their operational, logistical, and financial capabilities; supporting efforts to strengthen public institutions responsible for combating organized crime, including the promotion of the full observance of rule of law, human rights, and active civil society participation; developing a secure and competitive Twenty-First Century Border; and, building strong and resilient communities in both countries by supporting efforts to address the root causes of crime and violence, especially concerning youth, promoting the culture of lawfulness, reducing illicit drug use, and stemming the flow of potential recruits for the cartels by promoting constructive, legal alternatives for young people.

The Presidents recognized the particular importance of these four elements, and of robust bilateral cooperation to act upon them, in border communities that unite our two countries, such as Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua, and El Paso, Texas. From the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific, communities on both sides of the border share deep economic and social ties, and an interest in their own safety and welfare as well as that of their neighbors. The Presidents committed to work together against organized criminal groups in the border region and to cooperate to promote public safety and social resiliency, and to bring people and institutions together across our shared border.

They also received a progress report and took stock of the on-going efforts to define a bilateral implementation plan that includes a roadmap of next steps and the benchmarking necessary to measure success.

President Obama discussed with President Calderón a number of enhancements to U.S. civilian law enforcement efforts in the Southwest Border region to ensure that the United States is doing all that it can to safeguard the population there and deter illegal flows in both directions across that border, including the deployment of increased resources and personnel from the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice.

Both Presidents reviewed the implementation status of the Merida Initiative and the steps taken to expedite delivery of security-related resources under the Initiative to Mexico. As a follow up to discussions at the recent High-Level Group meeting in Mexico, President Calderon welcomed President Obama’s commitment to deliver, earlier than planned, a number of fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft that will complement the Government of Mexico’s efforts against transnational organized criminal organizations.
The Presidents recognized that illicit drugs take a heavy toll on the health of our citizens and our communities and acknowledged that we must work to reduce drug use and minimize the consequences of such use, emphasizing both treatment and prevention. They endorsed the shared priorities established at the Binational Conference on Drug Demand Reduction in February, 2010, and at the meeting of the Mérida Initiative High-Level Group. These priorities include the development of a Bilateral Assessment on Drug Demand and Prevalence of Use; making addiction treatment a part of mainstream medical practice; implementing broadly drug screening, intervention, and referral for treatment techniques; expanding drug prevention efforts in the schools and the wider community; implementing accreditation standards for drug treatment providers; and expanding the role of the criminal justice system in ending drug abuse and reducing recidivism.

Enhancing Social Well-Being and Ties between Our People

Both Presidents underscored that human capital is one of the most important assets that our two countries share.

President Obama underscored his commitment to comprehensive immigration reform in the United States and detailed his Administration’s extensive work to engage partners in the United States Congress from both political parties to create a modern immigration system that honors our tradition as a nation of laws, and a nation of immigrants. President Calderón reaffirmed his vision for creating a Mexico where all Mexicans have an opportunity to work and educate their children, while reiterating the importance that all immigrants be treated with full respect of their civil and human rights and acknowledging their significant contributions to the economic, social and cultural vitality of the United States. Both acknowledged the importance of fixing the broken immigration system, securing the common border and dismantling human trafficking groups, and to set clear rules and priorities for future immigration that level the playing field for American workers while providing a mechanism to fill labor demand in the United States in excess of domestic capacity.

The Presidents also took note of the strong educational ties and close academic collaboration that the people of the United States and Mexico have enjoyed for many years. They looked forward to expanding these programs by initiating a new exchange program for high school students to promote mutual understanding. The Presidents committed their governments to build upon this pilot program, co-financed with the private sector, to help bring together the next generation of leaders from the United States and Mexico.

The Presidents acknowledged the contributions of the Peace Corps to the bilateral relationship and directed their respective authorities to work together to expand the presence of Peace Corps volunteers in Mexico, increasing cooperation with civil society organizations and promoting community development and volunteerism. Since 2004, hundreds of Peace Corps volunteers have worked with Mexicans to transfer technologies, create business opportunities, and promote conservation and sustainable livelihoods.

Engaging in the Hemisphere and Around the Globe

Recognizing the importance of cooperation in various multilateral fora, President Obama and President Calderón reaffirmed their intent to coordinate closely on key issues pending before the Organization of American States, the United Nations, and the G20, among other
international, multilateral institutions and fora. In the Americas, the Presidents reaffirmed the importance of defending the core principles and values of democratic governance, respect for human rights, and self-determination in the Hemisphere and around the world. They stressed the need for regional consensus-building to achieve greater cooperation. The Presidents discussed the importance of working together to help foster more systematic security cooperation, particularly among the United States, Mexico, Colombia, Central America, and the Caribbean, to confront the challenge of transnational illicit networks. They also underscored the important work underway in the context of the Pathways to Prosperity Initiative and the Inter-American Social Protection Network that is promoting greater economic and social inclusion throughout the Americas.

The Presidents reaffirmed the importance of defending the core principles and values of democratic governance, respect for basic human rights, non-intervention, and self-determination in the Americas. In the case of Honduras, President Obama and President Calderón recognized the important strides the country has taken since the elections held in November 2009 to restore the democratic and constitutional order following the June 28, 2009 coup, and expressed their support for the on-going process of national reconciliation and for Honduras’ prompt return to full participation in the Organization of American States and in all inter-American institutions. In the case of Haiti, both Presidents reviewed their respective actions as part of the massive international relief effort following the January 12 earthquake. President Calderón commended the United States for the vital role it played in facilitating disaster response and relief actions, and President Obama thanked Mexico for its important contributions to that effort. Both Presidents agreed to continue bilateral consultations and coordination to help consolidate Haiti’s reconstruction efforts.

As global partners who share common values, as members of the most relevant international bodies, and as part of their efforts to continue expanding the strategic dialogue between both nations, the Presidents exchanged views on several global issues of common concern. Taking into account the presence of both the United States and Mexico in the United Nations Security Council, they paid special attention to the current situation of the non-proliferation regime and to nuclear disarmament issues in the context of the on-going Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference. The two leaders committed to work to achieve a successful Review Conference and in that regard expressed their readiness to cooperate to strengthen the capacity of the international community to enforce this regime and to progress on the full access to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for countries that comply with their international obligations. In this regard, the Presidents underscored their full determination to decisively support the IAEA and its verification efforts by addressing situations of special concern in the relevant international bodies of the United Nations System and its Security Council, including Iran’s continued failure to meet its international obligations on its nuclear program. President Obama and President Calderón reaffirmed the importance of the G20 as the premier international economic forum, and discussed the need for continued focus on economic recovery and job creation. The Leaders also discussed their efforts to implement the Pittsburgh Summit commitments, and call on all G20 members to make progress on fulfilling G20 commitments in advance of the Toronto Summit.

The bilateral dialogue between Presidents Obama and Calderón underscores their commitment to strengthening the strategic partnership between both countries, and they will continue working closely together in bilateral, trilateral, and multilateral forums over the coming months, as befitting two partners and nations uniquely important for the well-being, prosperity and security of one another.
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Background on 2050 Regional Transportation Plan
2050 RTP Goals

2050 RTP

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

2050 Regional Growth Forecast

Millions

Population
Jobs
Housing
SB 375 Key Provisions

- Greenhouse gas targets
- Sustainable communities strategy
- Sensitive resource lands
- Regional housing needs assessment
- Public involvement
- California Environmental Quality Act

2050 RTP Process and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Summer 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Early 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>Network Development</td>
<td>Project Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Ranked Projects by Category</td>
<td>Revenue Projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>Plan Performance Measures</td>
<td>Unconstrained Network</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained/SCS Network Scenarios</td>
<td>Draft 2050 RTP and EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status Report on the Urban Area Transit Strategy

Goals
**Initial Transit Concepts**

**Transit Propensity:**
Expands transit in the most urbanized areas

**Commuter Point-to-Point:**
Emphasizes quick access to work

**Many Centers:**
Connects local smart growth areas and activity centers
Transit Mode Share Goals

2008

2030

2050

Performance of the Networks
Results

- All three scenarios yield significantly better results than existing transit network
- All three scenarios yield improvements over baseline scenario
- None of the scenarios performs best in all of the categories
- Many Centers has highest overall performance but has highest capital and operating costs
- Opportunity to incorporate most effective features of all three scenarios into a combined “Hybrid” strategy

Development of the Initial Unconstrained Transportation Network
2050 RTP Transportation Network Scenarios

- Unconstrained network
- Alternative revenue constrained scenarios
- SCS based on revenue constrained scenario

2050 RTP Process and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Summer 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Early 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>Network Development All Modes</td>
<td>Project Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Ranked Projects by Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network

- All three scenarios yield improvements over the existing transit network
- Opportunity to incorporate most effective features of all three scenarios into a combined “Hybrid” strategy
- Pedestrian and bike improvements

Base Network

- High Speed Rail
- COASTER Rail
- Light Rail Transit
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Rapid Bus
- Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator
- High Frequency Local Bus Services
Initial 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network

- High Speed Rail
- COASTER Rail
- Light Rail Transit
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Peak Bus Rapid Transit Commuter
- Rapid Bus
- Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator
- High Frequency Local Bus Services

Potential modifications to the 2030 RTP unconstrained highway network

Build upon existing plan to create an efficient and balanced system
- Additional operational improvements
- Refinements to the HOV/Managed Lane network and adjustments to general purpose lanes
Next Steps

- Your comments on:
  - Initial transit network
  - Initial highway network
- Draft unconstrained network to SANDAG Board meeting on July 23, 2010
Our Region. Our Future.

2050 Regional Transportation Plan
FINAL CONCEPT

San Ysidro Land Port of Entry
June 25, 2010 - SANDAG Meeting

PROJECT BACKGROUND

SYLPOE GOALS
1. Incorporate the latest in security and antiterrorism enhancements
2. Improve pedestrian and vehicular processing
3. Increase operational efficiency
4. Provide greater officer and public safety
5. Decrease operational and maintenance costs
6. Improve the traveler’s experience
PROJECT PHASES

STAGING OVERVIEW

Project Schedule and Complexity
- 24/7/365
- Schedule:
  - Phase 1b Schedule: April 2011 thru March 2014 (3 years)
  - Phase 2 Schedule: February 2012 thru January 2014 (2 years)
  - Phase 3 Schedule: February 2013 thru January 2015 (2 years)
LANDSCAPE - FINAL CONCEPT

VIEW SOUTH FROM PED BUILDING EAST EXIT

VIEW SOUTH TOWARD WATER WALL
LANDSCAPE - FINAL CONCEPT

VIEW SOUTH TOWARD STAIRS AT HISTORIC CUSTOMS HOUSE

SYLPOE - Port of the Future