MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT WORKING GROUP

Wednesday, May 5, 2010

3:30 to 4 p.m. Project Working Group Meeting
4 to 7 p.m. Scoping Meeting

SANDAG, 7th Floor Boardroom
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Anne Steinberger
(619) 699-1937
ast@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT ALTERNATIVES FOR SCOPING

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

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.
### MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT WORKING GROUP

**Wednesday, May 5, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td><strong>SUMMARY OF APRIL 7, 2010, MEETING</strong> APPROVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group (Mid-Coast PWG) is asked to review and approve the meeting summary from the April 7, 2010, meeting.

| 2. | **PUBLIC COMMENT** COMMENT |

Members of the public who would like to address the Mid-Coast PWG on a topic not on the agenda should do so at this time. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

| +3. | **MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT ALTERNATIVES FOR SCOPING** INFORMATION |

Staff will present an update on the scoping process and schedule, as well as next steps for the Mid-Coast PWG.

| 4. | **NEXT MEETING** INFORMATION |

It is recommended that the June 2010 meeting be cancelled and the next meeting be held July 14, 2010, to coincide with the release of the final Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report.

| 5. | **ADJOURN AT 4 P.M. FOR SCOPING MEETING** |

+next to an item indicates an attachment
Agenda Item No.: 1

Action Requested: APPROVE

Summary of April 7, 2010, Meeting

Members in Attendance:
Ron Roberts, Supervisor, County of San Diego (Chairman)
Anette Blatt, Scripps Health
Greg Fitchitt, Westfield Corporation
Janay Kruger, University City Planning Group
Brian Gregory, UCSD
Joe LaCava, La Jolla Community Planning Group
Lani Lutar, San Diego County Taxpayers Association
Barbara Obrutz, La Jolla resident
Brooke Peterson, Clairemont Community Planning Group
Ann Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage, Inc.
Chris Westling, UCSD student
Andrew Poat, San Diego Regional EDC
Brad Gessner, San Diego Convention Center General Manager
David Allen, La Jolla resident
David Potter, Clairemont resident
Debra Gutzmer, SAIC

SANDAG Staff in Attendance:
Leslie Blanda
Greg Gastelum
Anne Steinberger
Jim Linthicum
John Kirk

Mid-Coast PWG Chair Ron Roberts called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

Agenda Item #1: Summary of March 17, 2010, Meeting

Brooke Peterson, Clairemont Community Planning Group, made a motion to approve the March 17, 2010, meeting summary. Joe LaCava, La Jolla Community Planning Group, seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
AGENDA ITEM #2: PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public were given the opportunity to address the Mid-Coast PWG on any topic. Debbi Knight, Friends of Rose Canyon, gave a presentation about Rose Canyon. Ms. Knight explained that Rose Canyon is part of the Multiple Species Conversation Plan and is a wildlife corridor extending across the city to Miramar. Rose Canyon is an active restoration area for native plants, including wetland and upland. There are several vertical hillsides in the park near existing tracks. She stated that adding the Trolley would require the addition of retaining walls and grading, creating noise, and environmental and visual impacts for users of the park. She requested that the Mid-Coast PWG recommend the elimination of Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternative 3 and focus on an alignment along Interstate 5 (I-5). The Associated Students of University of California San Diego (UCSD), Sierra Club, San Diego Audubon, and San Diego Canyonlands all oppose a route through Rose Canyon and support a route along I-5. Chair Roberts pointed out that Ms. Knight’s comments should have been included under Agenda Item #4.

AGENDA ITEM #3: SELECTION OF PROJECT WORKING GROUP MEMBER(S)

Chair Roberts reported that William Beck, who was serving on the Mid-Coast PWG as a community representative from University City Planning Group, has resigned. Staff returned to the selection committee appointed by the SANDAG Board of Directors to request a recommendation from the original application list for a new community representative. The selection committee has made a recommendation to replace Mr. Beck and appoint Janay Kruger, University City Planning Group, in this category. Mr. LaCava made a motion to approve this recommendation. David Potter, Clairemont resident, seconded the motion. Mr. LaCava agreed that Ms. Kruger will be a good addition to the Mid-Coast PWG, bringing a wealth of knowledge of the University City area. The motion was approved unanimously, and Ms. Kruger was seated with the Mid-Coast PWG members.

AGENDA ITEM #4: MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT-ALTERNATIVES FOR SCOPING

Leslie Blanda, SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Director, and Dennis Henderson, Parsons Brinckerhoff, gave an overview of the information covered at the March 17 Mid-Coast PWG meeting. Staff provided an abbreviated version of that presentation to Mid-Coast PWG members, with the inclusion of information on ridership modeling in response to questions raised at the previous Mid-Coast PWG meetings.

Ms. Blanda explained that the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is a TransNet Early Action Project. The project was included in the original ordinance approved by San Diego County voters in 1987, but remains uncompleted. Under the TransNet Ordinance, it receives high priority for implementation.

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts program funds fixed guideway projects such as LRT and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). New Starts is a discretionary funding program, with very high competition for funding. SANDAG is seeking New Starts funding to match TransNet capital funds. Staff believes that the Mid-Coast project will compete very well for funding. SANDAG and the FTA are jointly preparing the environmental documents (Draft and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report) for the project. The environmental
documents will build on prior plans and environmental approvals for the project. SANDAG is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the FTA is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act.

The first step in developing the environment document is the evaluation of project alternatives. Staff has just completed the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report, which summarizes the purpose and need for the project, examines changed conditions within the Mid-Coast Corridor since prior environmental approval, and defines and recommends alternatives to bring forward to the scoping period for the project.

Mr. Henderson explained that the project team evaluated a range of alternatives in the report including:

- **No-Build Alternative**: This alternative includes all highway and transit improvements proposed under the Regional Transportation Plan
- **Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative**: This is a low-cost alternative providing minimal transit improvements
- **Build Alternatives (LRT, BRT, Commuter Rail [CR])**

**LRT Alternatives:**

The current Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2003, would extend the trolley system from the Old Town Transit Center north to University City, with service to UCSD and University Towne Centre (UTC). Seven different LRT alternatives were developed, and all would provide for an extension of the San Diego Trolley Blue Line. These alternatives were developed in response to some of the changed conditions in the corridor, such as widening for I-5 high occupancy vehicle lanes, proposed addition of Direct Access Ramps at Voigt Drive, and realignment of Voigt Drive.

**BRT Alternatives:**

Four different BRT alternatives were developed to determine the effectiveness of the BRT as an alternative to LRT. The BRT alternatives range from an all fixed guideway alternative through the entire corridor to an exclusive guideway only in the most congested areas.

**CR Alternative:**

The CR alternative would utilize existing San Diego-Los Angeles-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor (LOSSAN) heavy rail tracks, construct a tunnel from the LOSSAN Right-of-Way under Genesee Avenue to UTC, and include an underground station at UTC.

**Transit Ridership:**

All of the alternatives were modeled to determine their effectiveness in increasing transit ridership. Staff used the SANDAG regional travel demand model, which was updated in accordance with standards the FTA has developed for New Starts projects.
Using the updated model, staff evaluated the number of daily new boardings for all of the alternatives. The data shows that LRT alternatives would increase the number of transit boardings system-wide far more than any of the other alternatives. A table was presented showing the number of boardings by mode, BRT appears to be comparable with LRT; however, the number of new boardings system-wide is far greater with LRT. The BRT alternatives do not offer an advantage over buses in the TSM alternative.

Staff evaluated the number of new transit trips for the LRT alternatives by travel market and determined that the majority of trips will come from within the study area, followed by the South Bay area, South San Diego, and downtown.

**Cost Effectiveness:**

Based on projected ridership results from the regional model, a cost effectiveness index (CEI) for each of the alternatives was determined. Mr. Henderson reviewed a summary of the FTA CEI results and explained the CEI is a ratio calculated by dividing an alternative’s total capital costs plus operating and maintenance costs, by the alternative’s user benefits. The alternatives with the lowest CEI are considered to be most cost effective in the FTA New Starts rating system. Alternatives were evaluated for their cost effectiveness using the FTA CEI and yielded the following range of results in Costs Per Benefit Hour:

- **TSM Alternative:** $16.49
- **LRT Alternatives:** Ranged from $23.90–$26.60, depending on the alternative
- **BRT Alternatives:** Ranged from $184.50–$371.80 depending on the alternative
- **CR Alternative:** $135.20

The TSM and all of the LRT alternatives were found to be cost effective; BRT and CR were not considered to be cost effective. The LRT alternatives are more cost effective because of the significantly higher number of benefit hours than the CR and BRT alternatives. Benefit hours are higher for LRT because it generates more new transit riders, it provides a direct service between major travel markets, it benefits both existing and new riders, it is highly reliable, and it builds on the current investment in the existing regional trolley system.

**Evaluation of Alternatives Summary:**

Each alternative’s effectiveness was measured against the goals and objectives of the project and other considerations (environmental impacts, financial feasibility, etc.). A rating was assigned to the alternatives for each item, ranging from “more effective” to “less effective.” This analysis demonstrated that LRT alternatives are much more effective than other alternatives in meeting the project’s goals and objectives than BRT or CR alternatives.

**Staff Recommendation:**

After conducting the analysis outlined in the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report, staff recommends that three LRT alternatives be carried forward into the scoping period. These three alternatives all:
• Meet the goals and objectives of the project
• Improve regional mobility
• Are cost effective
• Are competitive for New Starts funding

The LRT alternatives recommended for scoping are:

1) LRT Alternative 1 (combines LRT alternatives 1, 4, and 5)
2) LRT Alternative 3
3) LRT Alternative 6

LRT Alternatives 2 and 7 and all BRT and CR alternatives are recommended for elimination from further study.

Ms. Blanda then showed aerial simulations for the alignments of the recommended alternatives for scoping from Old Town Transit Center to the University City area.

Ms. Blanda reviewed the schedule of meetings that will be conducted prior to scoping:

• SANDAG Transportation Committee: April 16, 2010 (recommendation on alternatives to carry forward to scoping)
• SANDAG Board of Directors: April 23, 2010 (recommendation on alternatives to carry forward to scoping)

The project will go through a 30-day scoping period, tentatively scheduled for May 3, 2010–June 1, 2010. Once the scoping period is complete, staff will finalize the Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report, which will include a summary of scoping comments, responses to issues and concerns shared during scoping, a recommendation of an LPA or a group of alternatives to take through the environmental document. The SANDAG Board of Directors and the FTA will make a decision on the alternative(s) to carry through to the environmental document in the summer of this year.

Ms. Blanda asked whether the Mid-Coast PWG had questions. Questions and comments included:

Brad Gessner, San Diego Convention Center General Manager, clarified LRT Alternative 1 access to the Scripps medical complex. Chair Roberts confirmed that LRT Alternative 1 is the alternative that gets the closest to Scripps. Mr. Gessner asked whether staff anticipated any Right-of-Way acquisition issues for the project. Ms. Blanda replied that, generally speaking, the Right-of-Way needed would be sliver land purchases and, in some cases, only temporary Right-of-Way for use during construction.

Daniel Allen, La Jolla resident, asked which station would be ideal for users in La Jolla. Ms. Blanda thought the Nobel station would be convenient since it is close to the freeway and parking is available. Mr. Allen asked about the past idea of the Nobel COASTER station. Ms. Blanda explained that federal funding for the COASTER station is being utilized to supplement the UTC Transit Center, and the Nobel station project has been placed on hold.
Andrew Poat, San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation, thanked staff for holding a special information session for the Mid-Coast PWG members. He made the following conclusions about the analysis on transit ridership and cost effectiveness:

- The LRT alternatives bring one-third more new transit boardings than BRT. Mr. Henderson clarified that LRT actually brings three times the number of new boardings system-wide than the BRT alternatives.
- The LRT alternatives are the only options under the $30 Costs Per Benefit Hour threshold, which is important for federal funding. Mr. Poat asked whether that was the reason that no BRT alternatives were recommended. Mr. Henderson confirmed that was one of many reasons that BRT was not recommended for scoping.

Annette Blatt, Scripps Health, stated her support for LRT Alternative 1, which serves both UCSD and Scripps most efficiently, provides the best service to Scripps users, and accommodates Scripps’ future expansion plans.

Barbara Obrzut, La Jolla resident, asked how the LRT alternatives would affect Bus Route 150, which currently serves the Veterans Affairs San Diego Healthcare System. Ms. Blanda explained that the hospital is two blocks from a proposed station, but SANDAG would work with Veterans Affairs on a shuttle service.

Mr. Kruger explained that the planning group strongly supports UCSD and Scripps and is generally in favor of LRT Alternatives 1 and 6, but against LRT Alternative 3. Ms. Kruger added that the community thinks it is a waste of time and energy to study the Rose Canyon alternative. She stated her excitement about the project and noted the success of the SuperLoop in the University City community. She stated her support for LRT Alternatives 1 and 6, but suggested that LRT Alternative 3 be eliminated from further study.

Chair Roberts noted that there was one request to speak from Elyse Lowe, Move San Diego. Ms. Lowe expressed her excitement about a transit project in the Mid-Coast Corridor. The Move San Diego board has not formalized a position on the project yet. She requested that SANDAG staff consider what would happen if the project is not awarded federal funding and suggested bringing forward a BRT alternative to scoping in case that happens. She asked that staff address the differences between LRT and BRT in the report.

Mr. LaCava requested clarification of the figures used for daily new transit boardings in Table 6-1 of the report and in the figures used in the presentation. In the table, the daily new transit boardings are listed in the 8,000-13,000 range. In the presentation slide on ridership, the number of 2030 daily new boardings is different. Mr. Henderson explained that the FTA has requirements on which alternatives are used as a baseline in the analysis. The calculation in Table 6-1 uses the TSM alternatives as a baseline; the presentation uses the No-Build Alternative as a baseline.

Mr. LaCava voiced his concern about not including a fall back in case the project does not receive federal funding. He believes LRT Alternative 3 is a nonstarter, but supports the other alternatives. He suggested expanding the proposed Balboa Station to a transit center, including reworking the surrounding roadways and additional parking. He asked staff to address the impact of not having a transit center at UTC. Chair Roberts explained that the Mid-Coast PWG is not in a position to require those items currently. Instead, the group should focus on the alternatives now and at a later date.
look at what can be done around the various stations. He clarified that Balboa Station would function like a transit center. Ms. Blanda confirmed that Balboa Station would operate like a transit center, offering parking and opportunity for kiss and ride and park and ride services. Mr. LaCava voiced his concern about adequate parking for residents of University City. Ms. Kruger explained that the SuperLoop is being utilized in the community and would provide access for University City residents.

Lani Lutar, San Diego County Taxpayers’ Association, echoed the comments of Ms. Lowe. She requested clarification on how benefit hours are defined in the report, and she recommended including a BRT alternative in case federal funding is not awarded. She asked staff whether parking structures at stations have been included in the cost effectiveness calculation. Ms. Blanda explained that the parking structures would be included in overall capital costs.

Ms. Lutar then made a motion to eliminate LRT Alternative 3. Mr. LaCava seconded the motion.

Mr. Potter recommended that the Mid-Coast PWG leave in all three LRT alternatives for scoping. There are impacts in all of the alternatives; some are environmental, and some are urban in nature.

For clarification purposes, Chair Roberts asked whether the Mid-Coast PWG could select a preferred alternative without eliminating any alternatives. Ms. Blanda stated that all the alternatives would be available during scoping regardless, so there will still be an opportunity for the public to provide comments on the eliminated alternatives. Chair Roberts suggested that the Mid-Coast PWG still work toward agreeing on a preferred alternative.

Ann Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage, agreed with Mr. Potter’s comments that all of the LRT alternatives should remain.

Mr. LaCava recommended removing LRT Alternative 3 because it is a waste of resources to spend time analyzing an alternative with such opposition.

Brian Gregory, UCSD, supported Mr. Potter and Ms. Van Leer’s comments. He believes it would be unfair to the University City community not to evaluate all of the alternatives proposed by staff and allow broader community to look at all the alternatives during scoping.

Mr. Gessner offered an amendment to Ms. Lutar’s motion, recommending that the Mid-Coast PWG move LRT Alternative 1 forward to scoping and eliminate LRT Alternatives 3 and 6 from consideration. SANDAG Counsel deferred to Ms. Lutar to agree to the proposed amendment. Ms. Lutar did not accept the amendment to the motion.

SANDAG Counsel clarified that Mr. Gessner’s amendment actually served as a substitute motion to Ms. Lutar’s motion. Chair Roberts asked for a second to the substitute motion, which was provided by Ms. Blatt. Chair Roberts clarified that the substitute motion would recommend LRT Alternative 1, which is a combination of previous LRT Alternatives 1, 4, and 5, and this option is preferred by Scripps and UCSD.

Chris Westling, UCSD student, stated that the Associated Students of UCSD unanimously supports LRT Alternatives 1 and 6 and supports the motion on the floor.
Ms. Van Leer was concerned about eliminating alternatives from consideration and was not comfortable with the motion.

Chair Roberts explained that LRT Alternative 1 provides two additional stations that are not included in the other alternatives. LRT Alternative 6 is problematic because of the curves, and it does not serve the entire medical area.

Ms. Obrzut asked if staff could investigate service access to Scripps Hospital in the event that LRT Alternative 6 is recommended. Ms. Blanda responded that staff would need to investigate that further.

Ms. Van Leer agreed with Mr. LaCava's comments, but stated that her concerns pertain to the larger project footprint, affecting Rose Creek Watershed. If LRT Alternative 3 is eliminated and impacts are avoided to Rose Canyon, there will still be impacts in other areas. She recommended not eliminating any alternatives at this time.

Chair Roberts called for a vote on the substitute motion, which failed to pass, 5–9.

Chair Roberts returned to Ms. Lutar's original motion, which recommended the removal of LRT Alternative 3. The motion carried, 9–7.

Mr. Allen was surprised to see such low numbers for BRT alternatives, based on what he has heard about BRT. He recommended that a BRT alternative move forward because of its user benefit. Ms. Obrzut agreed with Mr. Allen.

Mr. Poat asked what would happen if the project is not awarded federal funding. Chair Roberts explained that if the application for LRT is turned down, there would be an opportunity to adjust the proposal.

Ms. Peterson asked how Mr. Allen’s comments about the low numbers for BRT could be addressed. Chair Roberts explained that the analysis for all of the alternatives uses figures that are understated and fairly conservative. LRT will exceed those expectations and has proven to do so in other areas of San Diego.

Mr. LaCava pointed out that BRT in the context of the Mid-Coast Corridor does not cut it. Since market studies show that ridership is coming from the south, riders would need to make multiple transfers. Incorporating the type of BRT that would be necessary would require a policy-level decision, not within the scope of this project. Chair Roberts agreed and stated that BRT makes sense in other areas such as the Interstate 15, just not in the Mid-Coast Corridor.

Mr. Potter agreed that BRT is great in some cases, but not in the Mid-Coast Corridor. LRT makes sense because it is an extension of a system. Mr. Potter then made a motion to designate LRT Alternative 1 as the Mid-Coast PWG’s preferred alternative. Ms. Van Leer seconded the motion.

Mr. Poat questioned the reasoning for the Mid-Coast PWG to vote on a preferred alternative.

Ms. Kruger explained that this project has been studied for 15 years, and this is the closest to what University City has envisioned for years.
Mr. Westling agreed with Ms. Kruger’s comments and suggested an amendment of the motion to recommend that LRT Alternatives 1 and 6 are the preferred alternatives. Mr. Potter did not accept the amendment to the motion.

Debra Gutzmer, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), explained that SAIC views LRT Alternative 1 as the alternative that best serves their interests.

Ms. Blatt stated that LRT Alternative 1 comprehensively meets the needs of the community and Scripps, and she supports the motion.

Ms. Peterson extended her support of the motion on the floor.

Greg Fitchitt, Westfield Corporation, asked whether it was anticipated that the Mid-Coast PWG would continue through the environmental analysis. Anne Steinberger, SANDAG, thought perhaps the Mid-Coast PWG would go on hiatus while the environmental analysis was underway and once that work is completed, staff could poll the group to see who would still like to stay involved.

Chair Roberts called for a vote on Mr. Potter’s motion, which passed 11-5.

Mr. Potter asked whether BRT has been eliminated from scoping. Ms. Blanda explained that during scoping, the public will be provided with an opportunity to comment on all of the alternatives. Information on the eliminated alternatives (LRT Alternatives 2 and 7, CR, and BRT) will be available at the scoping meetings, allowing an opportunity for input to be provided.

Ms. Van Leer asked whether the eliminated alternatives would be evaluated in the CEQA process. Ms. Blanda explained that the scoping period will provide the SANDAG Board with additional information regarding which alternatives move forward to the environmental document.

Mr. Potter made a motion to eliminate LRT Alternatives 2 and 7 and the TSM, BRT, and CR alternatives. Mr. Gessner seconded the motion. Mr. Fitchitt asked staff to review how the BRT alternatives were developed for this project because they are not competitive. Mr. Henderson explained that the BRT alternatives were developed as alternatives to LRT. The primary reason that BRT is not competitive is that it does not service the travel markets well, requiring a transfer at downtown. LRT is reliable and provides an extension of the regional system. To implement BRT, it would require development of a regional system.

Mr. Allen explained that the BRT system he was thinking of is different, with a state-of-the-art system serving communities. Mr. Potter clarified that this project is not looking at a regional system; we are dealing specifically with the Mid-Coast Corridor.

Chair Roberts called for a vote on Mr. Potter’s motion, which passed 10-5.

Ms. Van Leer encouraged Move San Diego to address some of the comments about the bus system and BRT.
AGENDA ITEM #5: NEXT MEETING

Ms. Steinberger announced that the next Mid-Coast PWG meeting will be May 5, 2010, and following the meeting, the scoping meeting will be held where comments can be received.

AGENDA ITEM #6: ADJOURN

Chair Roberts adjourned the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

Key Staff Contact: Anne Steinberger, (619) 699-1937, ast@sandag.org
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will extend transit service from the Old Town Transit Center north to the University City community, serving major destinations including Westfield University Town Centre (UTC) shopping mall, University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and downtown San Diego.

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

Please join us at one of five open house Scoping Meetings in locations throughout the Mid-Coast Corridor. Come anytime during the Scoping Meetings to review information and provide comments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in the Scoping Meetings listed above. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5620 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request materials in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5620, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.