TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, January 7, 2011
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• OVERVIEW OF SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AND THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT WHITE PAPER

• TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY

• METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM MOU AND BUDGET TRANSFER: NEW SECURITY FIBER OPTIC CAPITAL PROJECT

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

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

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

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

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Transportation Committee meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Transportation Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Friday, January 7, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 10, 2010, MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### CONSENT (Items 3 through 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+3.</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM: LOS ANGELES TO SAN DIEGO VIA INLAND EMPIRE SECTION QUARTERLY UPDATE (Linda Culp)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+4.</th>
<th>LOS ANGELES-SAN DIEGO-SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY BOARD MEETING REPORT (Linda Culp)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Known as Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner corridor, it is the second busiest intercity passenger rail corridor nationwide and Amtrak’s fastest growing. The report summarizes recent LOSSAN Board Actions.
OVERVIEW OF SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AND THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT WHITE PAPER (Bridget Enderle)

The draft white paper, "Overview of Safe Routes to School and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan," describes the role of Safe Routes to School strategies in regional planning and proposes a preliminary strategic framework for potential integration in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. Model regional strategies are identified as well as implications for next steps. The white paper is presented for the Transportation Committee’s information.

2010 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 4 (MICHELLE MERINO)

On September 24, 2010, the Board of Directors adopted the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the multiyear program of proposed major highway, arterial, transit, and bikeway projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2011 to FY 2015. SANDAG received a request from Caltrans to process an amendment in order to eliminate state funds and increase the federal share for the State Minor Lump Sum program (CAL213). Due to the additional programming of federal funds, there is an urgency to obligate these funds immediately following the federal approval of the 2010 RTIP, which occurred on December 14, 2010. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Amendment No. 4 to the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY UPDATE, FY 2011 FUNDING ALLOCATION, AND FY 2011 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT CRITERIA (Keith Greer)

The Transportation Committee is asked to: (1) provide input on the proposed project selection criteria for the TransNet and Environmental Mitigation Program; and (2) recommend that the Board of Directors approve the updated Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategic Plan, the proposed management and monitoring activities and budget for FY 2011 totaling $4 million, and, subject to Board Policy No. 017, authorize staff to solicit proposals and enter into contracts or amend existing contracts accordingly.

METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AND BUDGET TRANSFER: NEW SECURITY FIBER OPTIC CAPITAL PROJECT (John Haggerty)

Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) has secured a $3.38 million federal grant to expand its fiber optic network for improved security on the Trolley system and would like SANDAG to implement the project. This action would approve a memorandum of understanding with MTS to accept these funds and will create
The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) authorize the Executive Director to execute the Security Fiber Optic Cable Project MOU with MTS in substantially the same form as attached to the report in an amount not to exceed $5,960,445, contingent on prior MTS Board approval of the MOU; and (2) establish a new capital project CIP 1144400 Security Fiber Optic Cable Project with a total budget of $5,960,445; pending approval by the MTS Board of Directors.

+9. AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2010 AND FY 2011 BUDGETS: APPROVE

COMPASS CARD PROGRAM (James Dreisbach-Towle)

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve revisions to the FY 2010 and FY 2011 Program Budgets for OWP #3310600, including: (1) a carryover of $80,635 of unspent FY 2010 budgeted funds into FY 2011; (2) an increase in the FY 2011 Program Budget by $62,454 for new card fee revenue; and (3) an increase in the FY 2011 Program Budget by accepting additional funds from Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District in the total amount of $123,115 in substantially the same form as attached to the report.

+10. MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT STATUS UPDATE INFORMATION

(Leaside Blanda, Greg Gastelum)

Staff will provide a report on the status of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. The report will provide an overview of the project; describe the status of the current phase of project development; and describe the upcoming project development activities.

11. UPCOMING MEETINGS INFORMATION

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for January 21, 2011, at 9 a.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT

+next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

* next to an agenda item indicates a San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission item
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF DECEMBER 10, 2010

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Jack Dale (East County) at 9:01 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Pro Tem Carrie Downey (South County) and a second by Chairman Harry Mathis (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the November 12, 2010, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Laurie Berman, Executive Director, Caltrans District 11, stated that several projects were designated Catalyst Projects and recognized at a recent awards presentation sponsored by the state Department of Housing and Community Development. Funded by Proposition 1C, fourteen awards were given statewide to incentivize innovative land use planning and green building strategies. Our region received three awards: two in the City of San Diego, The Village at Market Creek and the Quarry Falls Projects, and one in National City, the Paradise Creek Revitalization Project.

Coleen Clementson, Principal Regional Planner, stated that staff proposed removing Item 5, San Ysidro Freight Rail Improvements Project, from the agenda and Chair Dale directed staff to bring the item back to the Committee at a future meeting.

REPORTS (3 through 6)

3. EXTENSION REQUESTS FOR FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT AUDITS (RECOMMEND)

The Cities of Chula Vista and San Diego, and SANDAG have requested an extension for their fiscal year 2010 Transportation Development Act (TDA) audits.

Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, Senior Accountant, presented the item.

Action: Upon a motion by Chairman Mathis and a second by Mayor Pro Tem Downey, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve TDA audit extension requests for the Cities of Chula Vista and San Diego, and SANDAG, until March 27, 2011, as permitted by the Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations.
4. 2010 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 2 (APPROVE)

On September 24, 2010, the Board of Directors adopted the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the multiyear program of proposed major highway, arterial, transit, and bikeway projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2011 to FY 2015. Amendment No. 2 includes the Board-approved projects as part of the Robust Scenario for TransNet as well as project changes requested by member agencies.

Michelle Merino, Financial Programming Analyst II, presented the item.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Pro Tem Downey and a second by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), the Transportation Committee adopted Resolution No. 2011-09, approving Amendment No. 2 to the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, subject to federal approval of the 2011 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

5. SAN YSIDRO FREIGHT RAIL YARD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT: FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (ADOPT)

This item was not heard.

6. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: PREFERRED REVENUE CONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK SCENARIO (RECOMMEND)

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

Heather Adamson, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item.

Ben Nichols, Hillcrest Business Association, commented in favor of this item, specifically including funding for streetcars in Hillcrest in the Plan.

Kathy Keehan, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, commented in favor of this item.

Michael Taotay, Hillcrest Business Improvement District, spoke in favor of this item, specifically including funding for streetcars in Hillcrest in the Plan.

Elyse Lowe, Executive Director Move San Diego, submitted written comments and spoke in favor of this item and the revenue constrained scenario.

Dan Allen, member of the public, spoke in favor of this item and the hybrid scenario with the exception of the I-5 widening.
Duncan McFetridge, Save Our Forests and Ranchlands, spoke in favor of this item with some specific exceptions which he detailed in his presentation.

Hannah Cohen, Sustainable San Diego, spoke in favor of this item.

Action: Upon a motion by Chairman Mathis and a second by Mayor Pro Tem Downey, the Transportation Committee recommended the Hybrid Scenario as the preferred Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenario to the Board of Directors with the following change:

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

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

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, January 7, 2011, at 9 a.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Dale adjourned the meeting at 9:57 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
### DECEMBER 10, 2010

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

12/23/2010 3:04 PM
Introduction

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

The passage of Proposition 1A in November 2008 resulted in $9 billion in bond funds for the entire statewide network. The CHSRA also has received $3.5 billion in federal rail capital grants since January 2010. At its December 2, 2010, meeting, the CHSRA Board of Directors approved the initial phase of work to build 65 miles through the Central Valley, from Hanford/Corcoran to Fresno at a cost of $4.15 billion. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the state’s federal partner on this project, agreed with this alignment. Furthermore, at its December 20, 2010 meeting, the CHSRA Board approved extending this line to Bakersfield, mainly due to the recent FRA announcement to provide an additional $616 million in additional federal funds. None of these funds will be spent in San Diego County. While the CHSRA did submit a request to FRA for planning funds for the San Diego section, this grant request was not awarded.

The Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire HST section is 160 miles long, and traverses four counties and more than 100 local jurisdictions (Attachment 1). Currently, this section is in the Alternatives Analysis phase of the project-level Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement. A Preliminary Alternatives Analysis report is scheduled for release by the CHSRA for public comment on March 2, 2011. This work is funded solely through state funds.

Attachment 2 shows the alternatives currently under study for the San Diego portion, which could be at-grade, aerial, or tunnel. From the Airport Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) proposed station location, alignment options share the existing rail corridor north to the Old Town area. Alignment alternatives then split and either continues along the existing rail corridor and future Mid-Coast light rail corridor to University City or State Route 56 (SR 56), or head east from Old Town along Interstate 8 (I-8) where alternatives either continue north along SR 163 or I-15. Particular attention is being given to both the section between the ITC and University City as this alignment is already very constrained, and the I-15, also very constrained once the Managed Lanes project is completed.

The CHSRA continues to coordinate efforts with the SANDAG Mid-Coast team, City of San Diego staff, Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) to ensure that HST alignments and design options do not impact the light rail alignment or other transportation projects along these shared corridors. This is one factor in the evaluation of these alignment alternatives.
Discussion

Southern California Inland Corridor Group (SOCAL ICG)

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

The San Diego County Technical Working Group (TWG), including staff from the corridor jurisdictions, Caltrans, MTS, and NCTD, meet periodically to review the draft alignments and design options. Similar groups meet in Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties. It is anticipated that the TWGs will meet following the March 2, 2011, release of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis document.

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

Work during the next quarter will focus on:

- Release of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis document for public comment on March 2, 2011.
- Continue monthly SOCAL ICG Meetings and other staff meetings as needed.
- Scheduling a number of open houses and the San Diego TWG meeting after March 2, 2011.

Related Planning Work

The same consultant team that is working on the main HST section also is assisting SANDAG on the Airport Multimodal Accessibility Plan (AMAP), required by Senate Bill 10 (2007), to be completed in FY 2011. The AMAP is to be conducted in cooperation with the SDCRAA and will address ground access improvements to airports that are under development through the SDCRAA’s Regional Aviation Strategic Plan (RASP). Major findings from the AMAP and RASP will be completed in FY 2011, in time for inclusion in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. SANDAG and SDCRAA staff will provide an update on the RASP and AMAP at the January 21, 2011 Transportation Committee meeting.

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

Attachments: 1. Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire Section Alternative Alignments
2. Alternative Alignments in San Diego County

Key Staff Contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957, lcu@sandag.org
Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor

AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING REPORT

Introduction

The Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Known as Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner corridor, it is the second busiest intercity passenger rail corridor nationwide and Amtrak’s fastest growing. A LOSSAN membership roster is provided (Attachment 1).

The LOSSAN Joint Powers Board of Directors and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meets monthly. SANDAG serves as staff to both through a cooperative funding agreement with the member agencies.

The LOSSAN Board of Directors continues to work with the chief executive officers (CEOs) of each member agency to begin the initial work on implementation of a shared vision for the corridor. In early 2010, each member agency approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to work cooperatively to complete the Corridorwide Strategic Implementation Plan. SANDAG, on behalf of LOSSAN, hired HNTB to serve as the project manager for this planning effort. Funding for this effort is split between member agencies based on county shares of ridership.

The major components of the Corridorwide Strategic Implementation Plan are:

- Develop Business Case for Future Passenger Rail Service including ridership forecasts and operations modeling (March 2011)
- Develop a Preferred Service Plan including a capital improvement plan and organizational options in order to implement the Business Case, including new intercity service between Los Angeles and San Francisco (June 2011)
- Complete a number of key early success and quick service improvements in the corridor including integrated customer information, flexible ticketing, limited stop/express intercity service between Los Angeles and San Diego, and commuter-friendly service between Ventura County and Santa Barbara (Ongoing)
- Build corridorwide consensus for the Preferred Service Plan and organizational recommendations (December 2011)
- Complete member agency, stakeholder, and public outreach (Ongoing)

The work is scheduled for completion in December 2011.
LOSSAN also continues to be supportive of efforts to apply for federal and state rail capital funds for corridor projects, including Positive Train Control (PTC) and double tracking projects in San Diego (PTC is a safety system designed to avoid train-to-train collisions, speeding, and other detrimental situations and is an unfunded federal mandate for all rail corridors shared between passenger and freight services required to be in place by December 2015). To date, the state has received $270 million for intercity passenger rail projects, including at least $63 million for San Diego County.

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

Attachment: 1. LOSSAN Membership Roster

Key Staff Contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957, lcu@sandag.org
LOSSAN
(LOS ANGELES–SAN DIEGO–SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY)

MEMBERSHIP

This board is composed of current and former elected officials representing rail owners, operators, and planning agencies along Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner corridor between San Diego and San Luis Obispo. LOSSAN is staffed by SANDAG. The objective of the agency is to coordinate planning and programs that increase ridership, revenue, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Luis Obispo to Los Angeles to San Diego.

The Los Angeles - San Diego – San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency meets every quarter.

Staff contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957; lcu@sandag.org

MEMBERS

Chair: Arthur Brown
Orange County Transportation Authority

Vice Chair: Jacki Bacharach
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Diane DuBois
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Fred Strong
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Chris Orlando
North County Transit District

Richard Dixon
Orange County Transportation Authority

Jerry Rindone
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Keith Millhouse
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Salud Carbajal
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Bill Bronte
Caltrans, Division of Rail

Joe Kellejian
San Diego Association of Governments

ALTERNATES

Harry Mathis
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Brian Humphrey
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Helene Schneider
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Mary Anne Reiss / Jan Howell Marx
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Jerome Stocks / Julianne Nygaard
North County Transit District

Karen Heit / Beatrice Proo
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

EX-OFFICIO MEMBER

Paul Glaab
Southern California Association of Governments

ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Amtrak
BNSF Railway
California Public Utilities Commission
Southern California Regional Rail Authority
Union Pacific
OVERVIEW OF SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AND THE
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT WHITE PAPER

Introduction

The draft white paper, Overview of Safe Routes to School and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP), describes the role of Safe Routes to School strategies in regional planning and proposes a preliminary strategic framework for potential integration in the 2050 RTP. Model regional strategies are identified as well as implications for next steps.

Discussion

SANDAG is in the process of developing a regional Safe Routes to School strategy that will establish regional policies and implementation actions to facilitate local, comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs throughout the region. The initial stage in this process includes developing a draft white paper to identify broad strategic focus areas and actions for possible integration into the 2050 RTP and to serve as the foundation for the Safe Routes to School strategy.

Throughout November and December 2010, staff has solicited input on the preliminary draft white paper from the following SANDAG working groups and committee: the Public Health Stakeholders Group, Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, Regional Planning Stakeholder Working Group, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee. The attached draft white paper addresses comments provided by these working groups and committee.

Next Steps

SANDAG already is aggressively pursuing some of the actions presented in this white paper, whereas others may be more appropriately reserved for future analysis. SANDAG will work with its member agencies, key stakeholders, and professionals with expertise in Safe Routes to School, to expand upon and refine the proposed framework. Crucial to this process is identifying participating agencies and their respective roles in implementing the strategy. Anticipated in March 2012, the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan will present the complete regional Safe Routes to School strategy which will include detailed recommendations and responsible agencies required to effectively implement the strategy.

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

Attachment: 1. Overview of Safe Routes to School and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan – Draft White Paper

Key Staff Contact: Bridget Enderle, (619) 595-5612, ben@sandag.org
INTRODUCTION

Safe Routes to School programs share the principal goals of increasing the number of children and adolescents walking and bicycling to school, improving pedestrian and bicycle safety, and decreasing school-related vehicle trips to improve air quality and reduce traffic congestion in school zones. Safe Routes to School efforts also heighten awareness about the built environment, air quality, health, and quality of life benefits associated with these programs. To accomplish these goals, Safe Routes to School programs utilize five strategies: planning and evaluation, infrastructure improvements, traffic law enforcement, education, and other activities that encourage children to walk and bicycle to school. Comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs encompass all of these components commonly referred to as the “Five E’s” (engineering, education, enforcement, encouragement, and evaluation).

Safe Routes to School programs initially emerged in response to child pedestrian safety issues in school areas and to a precipitous decline in the numbers of children walking and biking to school and acknowledgement that this trend contributed to an overall decrease in physical activity amongst children. Largely correlated with physical inactivity, childhood obesity rates have risen exponentially over the last few decades and currently persist at critical levels, with approximately 32 percent of United States youths ages two to 19 classified as overweight and 17 percent considered obese. This trend is equally severe in the San Diego region, with approximately 31 percent of fifth, seventh, and ninth grade students categorized as overweight.

Numerous studies have examined the impact of school mode choice on physical activity levels, finding that children who walk or bike to school tend to meet recommended physical activity levels and have a greater propensity to be active throughout the day. Further, physical activity has proven to have a significant impact on cognitive functioning and academic performance amongst youths.
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In addition to positive effects on youth health, Safe Routes to School programs have been shown to significantly reduce traffic congestion, and consequently, improve air quality. In Marin County, for example, school-related trips constitute 21 percent of morning peak period trips compared to 11 percent in most United States geographic areas.7 Responding to this challenge, Marin County’s robust Safe Routes to School program is credited with decreasing single-student automobile school trips by 15 percent.8

Studies examining the impact of California’s state-legislated Safe Routes to School grant program indicate that Safe Routes to School-funded infrastructure projects significantly influence mode choice in favor of walking and biking.9 The body of research that examines the impacts of Safe Routes to School programs on travel behaviors and safety is relatively diminutive, yet growing.10 In recent years, Safe Routes to School programs have generated significant attention among planners, policymakers, and public health professionals, increasing the amount of research, data collection and standardization, and funding devoted to Safe Routes to School.

Within the regional planning context, Safe Routes to School is gaining prominence as an effective transportation demand management (TDM), air quality, and greenhouse gas reduction strategy in addition to an essential component to regional active transportation planning. It also plays a developing role in addressing transportation equity by targeting public health impacts and serving low-income communities. Accordingly, this paper provides an overview of model regional Safe Routes to School strategies and delineates a potential Safe Routes to School policy direction for the San Diego region.

Relative to the goals of the SANDAG 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP), the objectives of this white paper are to:

- Provide contextual information about Safe Routes to School.
- Summarize Safe Routes to School strategies initiated by regional planning agencies throughout the United States that may prove applicable within the San Diego region.
- Propose preliminary strategic actions for potential inclusion in the 2050 RTP and as a possible framework for developing a regional strategy to advance Safe Routes to School within the region.

This white paper is an initial task in the development of the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan, which will articulate the details of the regional strategy, including specific implementation actions, responsible agencies, and estimated costs required for successful
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7 U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (August 2007) National Household Travel Survey Brief.
8 Transportation Authority of Marin County (2009) Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Measure Strategic Plan.
10 Weigand, L. (June 2008) “A Review of the Literature: the Effectiveness of Safe Routes to School and Other Programs to Promote Active Transportation to School.” Initiative for Bicycle and Pedestrian Innovation, CUS-CTS-0801.
implementation. The San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan development is funded by the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency “Communities Putting Prevention to Work” (CPPW) program.\footnote{Note: Communities Putting Prevention to Work is a program of the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency funded by the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA).}

**BACKGROUND**

In the United States, a proliferation of programs to facilitate safe walking and biking to school has occurred in response to a drastic decline in the numbers of children walking and biking to school, from approximately 48 percent of youths 5 to 14 years old in 1969 to 13 percent in 2009.\footnote{National Center for Safe Routes to School (April 8, 2010) News Release: “U.S. Travel Data Show Decline in Walking and Bicycling to School has Stabilized.”}

The safety and health implications of this trend spurred several local efforts in New York, Florida, and Chicago beginning in the mid-1990s and ultimately led to state and federal legislation to authorize Safe Routes to School programming and funding.

California’s pioneering Safe Routes to School program was established in October 1999 with the passage of California Assembly Bill 1475 (AB 1475). AB 1475 allocated one-third of California’s federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) safety funds toward Safe Routes to School, thus creating the first statewide Safe Routes to School construction program in the United States. A coalition of urban planning, engineering, public health, education, law enforcement, active transportation advocacy groups, and other professional organizations were instrumental in advancing the bill.

The initial two-year program administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) restricted funding to infrastructure projects. However, succeeding program cycles have authorized funds to be used for education and encouragement programs at the schools that the infrastructure projects serve. Under the current grant program guidelines (Cycle 9), incorporated cities and counties are eligible to apply for up to $450,000 toward construction projects that target grades K–12 schools and may apply ten percent of project funding toward education, enforcement, and encouragement activities and/or school grounds improvements. A ten percent match of funds is required for the California state program. The non-infrastructure program allowance is sometimes underutilized; however, in many communities this component of the program is a pivotal part of the strategy to support travel behavior change.

At the federal level, Safe Routes to School commenced in 2000 when the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) awarded $50,000 each to launch pilot programs in Marin County, California and Arlington, Massachusetts geared toward increasing rates of walking and biking to school. The successes of these and other programs, particularly in Marin County, ultimately led to federal Safe Routes to School legislation. In 2005, the federal surface transportation bill, Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), authorized $612 million in funding under Section 1404 to state departments of transportation for Safe Routes to School programs through September 2009. The funding is allotted to states based on
their relative proportions of total enrollment in primary and middle schools. The federal surface transportation bill is currently operating under another short-term extension through March 4, 2011.

Under the current federal Safe Routes to School grant program guidelines, state, regional, and local agencies, school districts and non-traditional entities are all eligible to apply for funding toward infrastructure or non-infrastructure projects that affect children in grades K–8. California’s approximate allocation of funds over this five-year period is $68 million, with a target of 70 percent of those funds provided to infrastructure projects and 30 percent toward education, encouragement and enforcement activities.

While primary funding for Safe Routes to School programs has historically derived from the state and federal programs, the planning and implementation of Safe Routes to School programs is inherently local, relying on collaboration between local jurisdictions, school districts, schools, and community-based and nonprofit organizations. A substantial number of cities and local communities are working together to develop Safe Routes to School plans that include the following key components:

- Existing conditions and needs assessments;
- Priority infrastructure improvements to facilitate safe walking and biking to school routes;
- Education, encouragement, and enforcement strategies; and
- Monitoring and evaluation strategies.

Nonprofit organizations, such as the National Center for Safe Routes to School, Safe Routes to School National Partnership, and California Active Communities also play a vital role in Safe Routes to School, providing extensive information and resources to communities interested in initiating programs.

The role of regional planning agencies in Safe Routes to School has been relatively limited except in a few locations, although this tendency is changing. In California and throughout the United States, regional planning agencies are increasingly integrating Safe Routes to School initiatives into their work programs and planning efforts to advance Safe Routes to School programs regionally.

**DISCUSSION**

The emerging role of Safe Routes to School in regional planning has significant implications for the San Diego region. While several effective Safe Routes to School programs exist throughout the region, there is an opportunity to coordinate and build upon the accomplishments of these programs. This section of the white paper provides a brief synopsis of Safe Routes to School efforts in the San Diego region and then summarizes other regions’ Safe Routes to School strategies with the purpose of identifying model approaches to a possible San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy. The following discussion is not exhaustive; greater detail on current local initiatives and relevant model strategies will be included in the future Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan.
Safe Routes to School in the San Diego Region

Several cities in the San Diego region have planned or implemented successful Safe Routes to School programs within the region; however, the region currently lacks an overall strategy to build on these successes.

In 2007, Chula Vista launched a two-part Safe Routes to School program, expanding upon two years of Safe Routes to School infrastructure improvements. The City of Chula Vista and Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) partnered to submit complementary federal-legislated Safe Routes to School grant applications for approximately $620,000 toward infrastructure improvements led by the City and about $500,000 in programmatic activities led by CVESD.

The City of La Mesa’s Safe Routes to School program also consists of a combination of infrastructure improvements and programs and is a critical element of its citywide health and wellness policies. Both of these jurisdictions are continuing these programs with 2010 state-legislated Safe Routes to School grant awards.

The cities of National City, Lemon Grove, and San Marcos and the County of San Diego also received Safe Routes to School funding through the current state program cycle, generating a combined total of $1.6 million toward Safe Routes to School related infrastructure improvements.13

The City of San Diego has submitted grant applications since the inception of the state Safe Routes to School program, resulting in nine grant awards totaling approximately $4.3 million toward infrastructure and non-infrastructure activities. For several years, the City of Encinitas has prioritized and secured funding for Safe Routes to School improvement projects and programs. Many cities, including Encinitas, also have integrated Safe Routes to School assessments and project identification into broader planning efforts, such as their bicycle master plans and pedestrian master plans. Collaboration with non-governmental organizations is a vital element to Safe Routes to School implementation throughout the San Diego region. Walk San Diego, Rady Children’s Hospital, City Heights Community Development Corporation, and several community-based organizations partner with cities to implement non-infrastructure program components.

Some support is currently provided at the regional level to encourage local Safe Routes to School programs. SANDAG iCommute’s SchoolPool Program is a free matching system to connect parents of children who attend the same school and are interested in carpooling. Approximately 400 parents from 41 schools currently participate in the SchoolPool program. Carpooling is a vital element to many Safe Routes to School programs, particularly for schools where a significant portion of the student population lives further from school than is a reasonable distance to walk or bike. Carpooling reduces vehicle congestion in school zones, which promotes cleaner air and safety around the school. With funding from the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency CPPW program, iCommute is developing a “Walk, Ride and Roll to School” campaign to expand school and parent participation in SchoolPool and to launch “Walking School Bus” and “Bike Buddies” elements to the program. These program elements encourage students to walk or bike to school as a group, supported by adult-supervision and safety education.
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13California Department of Transportation, Cycle 9 SR2S Final Project List (October 14, 2010).
The regional Active Transportation Program funds bicycle, pedestrian, and neighborhood safety (traffic calming) projects and programs including projects that improve access and safety in school areas. Funding for the Active Transportation Program derives from the TransNet ½-cent transportation sales tax program and the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Non-motorized funds. Since the program's inception in FY 1988, SANDAG has provided approximately $28 million in TransNet revenues and $37 million TDA funds to active transportation projects throughout the region, primarily through a local competitive grant process. Including TransNet and TDA, future revenues for the Active Transportation Program between FY 2011 and FY 2048 are projected to be approximately $373 million in 2010 dollars.

Regional plans also note the importance of Safe Routes to School programs. Riding to 2050: San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan provides a description of Safe Routes to School, emphasizing the process of launching new programs. Chapter 8 of the current 2030 RTP, entitled Demand Management: How can we Take the Pressure off the System, includes a brief discussion of Safe Routes to School, encouraging local jurisdictions to aggressively pursue state and federal Safe Routes to School grant funding. In the 2030 RTP, Safe Routes to School is presented as one facet to promoting “Walkable Communities,” which is one of six subsections to the region’s TDM strategy.

To enhance support for local Safe Routes to School efforts, SANDAG is in the process of developing the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy. The anticipated benefits of this strategy are substantial and would help contribute to meeting the regional greenhouse gas reduction targets for the 2050 RTP Sustainable Communities Strategy. Specifically, implementing the Safe Routes to School Strategy is anticipated to increase school walk and bike trips by 10 percent in 2020 and 20 percent by 2035, resulting in about 8,900 fewer pounds of CO₂ by 2020 and approximately 18,300 fewer pounds by 2035. Other benefits derived from implementing the strategy will be captured through a comprehensive evaluation process.

**Model Strategies**

This section of the white paper describes exemplary strategies employed by other regional planning agencies to advance Safe Routes to School within their jurisdiction. Several initiatives not presented in this white paper also have been reviewed, and elements are under consideration, including those initiated in Pima, Maricopa, and Coconino counties, Arizona; Miami-Dade, and Orange counties, Florida; the Nashville metropolitan area; Benton County, Oregon; and San Luis Obispo and Riverside counties, California. In this section, emphasis is placed on agencies with comparable authority and responsibility as SANDAG; however, nonprofit organizations and other public agencies also play vital roles in regionwide implementation of Safe Routes to School efforts. Common elements between model strategies include:

- Institutionalizing Safe Routes to School in regional planning strategies;
- Utilizing partnerships to implement programs;
- Committing funding;
- Providing technical planning and program development assistance; and
- Delivering select education and encouragement programs to participating communities.
This review is intended to assist in developing the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy.

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission**

The San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) recently committed to a substantial investment in Safe Routes to School programs within its nine-county jurisdiction. In 2009, MTC allocated $80 million over three years toward its Climate Initiatives Program. The funding for the Climate Initiatives Program derives from the agency’s anticipated $1.4 billion six-year (Cycle 1 and 2) STP and Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) federal revenues.

A key component of the Climate Initiatives Program is the MTC Safe Routes to School Program, composed of $17 million in funding to Bay Area counties. This $17 million investment is allocated in two ways: $2 million is awarded through a competitive grant program intended to advance innovative Safe Routes to School-related greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies; and $15 million is distributed directly to counties proportionate to their percentage of the region’s total school enrollment population. Leveraged with county, state, federal, and other sources of funding, funding support from MTC is expected to contribute to some of the most comprehensive and effective Safe Routes to School programs in the United States.

**Transportation Authority of Marin County**

Marin County’s Safe Routes to School initiative is nationally recognized for its innovative and comprehensive approach, extensive participation levels, and effectiveness at shifting school travel modes from single-student vehicle trips to alternative modes. During the 2007/2008 school year, 90 percent of students living within a half-mile of school walked or bicycled to school. The program continues to impact countywide mode choice, with a three percent shift from single-student automobile trips to active transportation modes between fall 2006 and spring 2007. The Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) attributes the program with more than 15 percent mode shift since its inception.

The Marin County Bicycle Coalition initiated the effort in 2000 as a pilot program funded with monies from the Marin Community Foundation, California Department of Public Health, and the federal NHTSA. Since its inception, the scope and impact of the program has grown significantly particularly after TAM acquired administration of the program in 2005. Currently, the initiative consists of three main components: the Safe Routes to School program, Crossing Guards, and Safe Pathways to School.

The Safe Routes to School program facet of the Marin County effort focuses on education and encouragement, program delivery, technical planning assistance, and program evaluation. TAM contracts with a consulting firm, Parisi Associates, and its subconsultants, the Marin County Bicycle Coalition, to implement the program. The consultant team develops, facilitates, and recruits schools to participate in school teams and task forces, classroom curriculums, and events and contests such

---

14 Attachment A to MTC Resolution No. 3925, Revised, New Surface Transportation Authorization Act Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy.
16 Transportation Authority of Marin County (2009) Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Measure Strategic Plan.
as SchoolPool, Pollution Punch Card, and Walk and Roll to School Days. The TAM Safe Routes to School Web site provides downloadable guidebooks for each of its major education and encouragement programs to assist schools in the implementation of these programs. In coordination with school teams, the contractor also develops Safe Routes to School Travel Plans. The plans include capital improvement plans and program recommendations. Another key element of the Safe Routes to School program is a two-fold annual evaluation that measures participation levels and school-specific mode shift.

The Crossing Guards component of the initiative provides up to 70 crossing guards (63 during the 2009/2010 school year) at high-priority locations identified by criteria developed by TAM and the region’s public works directors, with input from the Marin County Measure A Technical Advisory Committee. Crossing Guards is implemented through a contract with a professional traffic safety company.

Safe Pathways is the capital improvement facet of the TAM initiative. The program funds the design and construction of capital projects identified in Safe Routes to School Travel Plans developed through the Safe Routes to School program. Approximately $1.5 million will be available in FY 2011 to fund Safe Pathways projects.

The Marin County initiative is funded by Measure A, the half percent transportation sales tax approved by local voters in 2004 to span a 20-year period. Eleven percent of Measure A revenues are allotted for the Safe Routes to School initiative and distributed among the three efforts as follows: Crossing Guards (4.2%), Safe Pathways (3.5%), and Safe Routes to School Program (3.3%).

Safe Routes to School Alameda County

Safe Routes to School Alameda County provides a variety of educational, encouragement, and planning resources to participating schools throughout the County. The program is coordinated through the Alameda County Safe Routes to School Partnership, a countywide collaborative effort among TransForm, the Alameda County Public Health Department, Cycles of Change, and several other agencies with smaller roles. TransForm, the lead agency, and Cycles of Change are nonprofit organizations focused on advancing alternative transportation in the Bay Area. The Partnership works with school staff and parent volunteers to deliver programs, such as pedestrian rodeos, bicycle physical education classes, family cycling clinics, walking school buses, parent workshops, and school assemblies.

Safe Routes to School Alameda County is funded in part through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Grant Program of Measure B, Alameda County’s half-cent transportation sales tax. Over a 20-year period, Measure B will generate more than $3 billion for transportation improvements, including $80 million (five percent) allocated toward improving bicycle and pedestrian safety and access. This $80 million is distributed through two avenues: 75 percent is pass-through funding allocated to cities and the County of Alameda based on population, and 25 percent funds countywide efforts including a Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator and the competitive grant program. Measure B is administered by Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA).
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17 See: www.tam.ca.gov/index.aspx?page=95
18 TAM (2009) Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Strategic Plan Update.
19 TAM (September 2010) Public Notice: “2010 Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Strategic Plan Update.”
which recently merged with Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) to form a new countywide transportation agency, Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC).

In 2009, the Safe Routes to School Alameda County program was awarded $820,000 through the Measure B grant program, which was matched with an additional $1,075,000 from foundations, Caltrans Safe Routes to School program, Kaiser Permanente, and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The current grant cycle spans two school years, 2009/2010 and 2010/2011. It builds on the successes of the first program cycle initiated in 2007, which supported the establishment of 50 comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs.20

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

The currently adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035 (MTP 2035) for the Sacramento region commits Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) to strengthening its existing Safe Routes to School efforts. SACOG currently facilitates Safe Routes to School by providing technical assistance such as: consulting with local jurisdictions or schools that are initiating a program; providing input on outreach, educational, and other materials; assisting agencies with completing grant applications and reporting requirements; and suggesting general planning strategies. SACOG also maintains a Safe Routes to School list serve and offers related presentations by request through their Speakers Bureau.

As outlined in the current MTP 203521, SACOG will do the following: develop a regional policy to promote Safe Routes to School; convene cities, counties, school districts, and transit operators in workshops to identify opportunities to collaborate on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, including Safe Routes to School strategies; and launch a pilot Safe Routes to School mini-grant program. SACOG was recently awarded the mini-grant funding through Caltrans and plans to release a call for projects in late winter/early spring 2011.22

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on a review of model strategies and guidelines, this section presents a preliminary Safe Routes to School strategic framework for possible integration into the 2050 RTP and to guide the ongoing development of a Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan. First, general recommendations for the 2050 RTP are presented. Then, a preliminary framework is outlined that consists of strategic areas and potential actions intended to advance the region within those respective areas.

Considerations for the 2050 RTP

The chief recommendation for the 2050 RTP is to develop a more robust discussion of Safe Routes to School than is included in the current 2030 RTP. Consideration should be given to integrating the following elements into the 2050 RTP Safe Routes to School section.
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20ACTIA (2009) “Safe Routes to Schools Alameda County Partnership Fact Sheet”

21Note: SACOG is in the process of updating the MTP 2035: Blueprint for Sustainable Communities.

22Personal communication with SACOG staff (September 17, 2010)
• Contextual information such as Safe Routes to School overarching goals and key components, state and federal funding programs, methods to collect data, and the role of Safe Routes to School programs in TDM.

• A summary of the Safe Routes to School strategic framework that consists of preliminary actions within the following focus areas:

Regional Planning and Evaluation: Integrating Safe Routes to School into regional planning efforts establishes a vision for Safe Routes to School throughout the region and helps local jurisdictions, schools, and communities to administer effective programs. It also advances the region’s goals of monitoring, projecting, and promoting active transportation.

Funding: Strategically funding Safe Routes to School initiatives is essential to broadening participation and leveraging existing funding sources, particularly as interest in Safe Routes to School and competition for resources increases.

Technical Training and Support: Providing trainings and technical support to encourage local Safe Routes to School programs helps ensure that programs will be effective and comprehensive.

Collaboration and Partnerships: Establishing partnerships and fostering collaboration with agencies and organizations that may play a vital role in advancing Safe Routes to School within the region is crucial to sustainable program implementation.

Outreach and Education: Identifying and administering select education and encouragement programs provides communities beneficial tools, such as SchoolPool, that might otherwise be too costly or onerous for local administration. Also, serving as an information clearinghouse to local jurisdictions, school districts, and schools facilitates local Safe Routes to School program development and maintenance. Additionally, raising awareness through public outreach efforts and regional campaigns can increase school and parent participation in Safe Routes to School initiatives.

Table 1 proposes preliminary actions within the strategic areas identified above. The forthcoming Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan will more thoroughly define these potential actions, indicate implementing agencies, outline an implementation schedule, and identify cost estimates and potential funding sources.
### Table 1: Preliminary Safe Routes to School Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Planning and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>1. Include a Safe Routes to School Strategy in all subsequent RTPs and Regional Comprehensive Plans.&lt;br&gt;2. Capture active transportation demand by incorporating active transportation trip data into future transportation models including journey to school data, if possible.&lt;br&gt;3. Develop a Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan to articulate the Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy and implementation actions.&lt;br&gt;4. As a component to an overall active transportation monitoring and evaluation program, establish a program to evaluate Safe Routes to School program participation levels, impact on mode shares, and potential program improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>1. To catalyze local Safe Routes to School programs, develop and administer a pass-through Safe Routes to School grant program with funding awarded to SANDAG through the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency CPPW program. The pass-through grant program consists of $250,000 toward comprehensive Safe Routes to School planning and capacity building efforts and $50,000 toward education, enforcement, and encouragement programming.&lt;br&gt;2. As part of the Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan, develop cost estimates and a funding strategy to implement the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Training and Support</strong></td>
<td>1. Review and provide input to local jurisdictions, school districts, and nonprofit organizations on planning efforts, including:&lt;br&gt;   - Comprehensive plans;&lt;br&gt;   - Infrastructure improvement plans;&lt;br&gt;   - Suggested route maps;&lt;br&gt;   - Education, encouragement, and enforcement program strategies and materials;&lt;br&gt;   - Monitoring and evaluation plans.&lt;br&gt;2. Promote successful, local grant writing by reviewing, providing feedback, and offering technical assistance to grant applicants for state and federal Safe Routes to School funds.&lt;br&gt;3. Provide the Safe Routes to School National Course by request to groups of local planners, policy-makers, school administrators and teachers, parent organizations, and other community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Area</td>
<td>Potential Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Collaboration and Partnerships | 1. Foster communication and cultivate partnerships by soliciting input on the Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy from SANDAG Policy Advisory Committees and working groups, nonprofit organizations, school districts, and other Safe Routes to School implementers, experts, and local agencies.  
2. Facilitate the convening of a Regional Safe Routes to School Coalition that will serve as a forum to connect implementing agencies and share relevant information.  
3. Work with universities and community colleges, County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency, and other agencies and institutions to identify opportunities to collaborate on Safe Routes to School program development and implementation.  
4. Work with school districts and schools to identify school-related institutional barriers to walking and biking to school and to support curricula, school transportation policies, and school wellness policies that facilitate walking and biking to school.  
5. Participate in the California Safe Routes to School State Network meetings and Action Teams. |
| Outreach and Education      | 1. Continue to promote and administer the iCommute SchoolPool program.  
2. Work with Safe Routes to School experts and implementers, including local jurisdictions and schools, to identify and develop one or more high-priority programs that may be best administered at a regional level by SANDAG, or through another countywide agency, institution, or organization.  
3. Consider developing a San Diego region Safe Routes to School Web page that consists of the following possible elements:  
   o A summary or listing of Safe Routes to School programs and resources offered throughout the San Diego region;  
   o Announcements of Safe Routes to School events or related activities in the region;  
   o Links to Safe Routes to School resources and publications available throughout the United States including the National Center for Safe Routes to School, iWalk International Walk to School Day, and California Active Communities Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance Resource Center Web sites; and  
   o Integration with the iCommute SchoolPool interfaces.  
4. Raise awareness about Safe Routes to School resources and opportunities through public awareness campaign efforts such as the upcoming iCommute SchoolPool “Walk, Ride and Roll” campaign. |
CONCLUSION

The proposed strategic framework presented in this white paper is intended to serve as a foundation for developing a Safe Routes to School strategy for the region. SANDAG already is aggressively pursuing some of the actions presented, whereas others may be more appropriately reserved for future analysis. SANDAG will work with its member agencies, key stakeholders, and professionals with expertise in Safe Routes to School, to expand upon and refine the proposed framework. Crucial to this process is identifying participating agencies and their respective roles in implementing the strategy. Anticipated in March 2012, the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan will present the complete San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy, which will include detailed recommendations, responsible agencies, and estimated costs required to effectively implement the strategy.
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2010 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 4

Introduction

On September 24, 2010, the Board of Directors adopted the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the multiyear program of proposed major highway, arterial, transit, and bikeway projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2011 to FY 2015. The 2010 RTIP is a multibillion dollar program of projects funded by federal, state, TransNet local sales tax, and other local funding sources. The 2011 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP), which incorporates the SANDAG 2010 RTIP, was approved on December 14, 2010.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Amendment No. 4 to the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

Background

There are two types of RTIP amendments, formal and administrative. Formal amendments require, among other things, a 15-day public notice period, while administrative amendments are considered minor in nature and do not require a public notice period. Chapter 2 of the adopted 2010 RTIP provides additional details regarding the differences between formal and administrative amendments. Amendment No. 4 is considered administrative because the proposed change revises the fund type with no changes to the total project programmed. This is consistent with the federally accepted administrative amendment procedures. The federal agencies delegated the approval of administrative amendments to the state, thereby streamlining the approval process.

Discussion

SANDAG received a request from Caltrans to process an amendment due to the urgency related to the obligation of the federal funding immediately following the federal approval of the 2010 RTIP. The proposed change is described below and additional details are included in Table 1 (Attachment 1).

Caltrans

Grouped Projects for State Minor Program (CAL213): Currently this lump sum program is funded with federal funds matched with state cash. However, due to the lack of state funds available, Caltrans will be using only federal funds for all eligible projects such as this Minor program. In lieu of using nonfederal funds as the match (state cash), Caltrans has opted to use toll credits as the match and increasing the total federal amount to fund the entire project. Toll credits allow states to use toll revenue expenditures as a credit toward the nonfederal match share. The state received approval to use toll credits from the Federal Highway Administration and the final guidelines for using toll credits were distributed on June 30, 2010.
The projects within this lump sum remain the same, this amendment proposes to eliminate state funds and increase the federal share. The total program remains $5,402,000.

**Fiscal Constraint Analysis**

Federal regulations require the 2010 RTIP to be a revenue-constrained document with programmed projects based upon available or committed funding and/or reasonable estimates of future funding. Funding assumptions are generally based upon: (1) authorized or appropriated levels of federal and state funding from current legislation; (2) conservative projections of future federal and state funding based upon a continuation of current funding levels; (3) the most current revenue forecasts for the TransNet program; and (4) the planning and programming documents of the local transportation providers.

As an administrative amendment, an updated fiscal constraint analysis is not required. The proposed change included in Amendment No. 4 does not affect the fiscal constraint submitted as part of Amendment No. 2 to the 2010 RTIP, the last formal amendment that updated the financial capacity of the 2010 RTIP. Chapter 4 of the Final 2010 RTIP discusses in detail the financial capacity analysis of major program areas, including discussion of available revenues. The 2010 RTIP, including Amendment No. 4, continues to be reasonable when considering available funding sources.

**Air Quality Analysis**

On September 24, 2010, SANDAG found the 2010 RTIP in conformance with the Regional Air Quality Strategy/State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the San Diego region. All of the required regionally significant capacity increasing projects were included in the quantitative emissions analysis conducted for the 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan: Pathways for the Future (2030 RTP) and the 2010 RTIP. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) approved the conformity determination for the 2010 RTIP and the conformity redetermination for the 2030 RTP as part of the 2011 FSTIP on December 14, 2010.

The proposed amendment does not reflect a change in the design, concept, or scope of the project or the conformity analysis years as modeled for the regional emissions analysis of the 2010 RTIP and 2030 RTP. The project in RTIP Amendment No. 4 meets the conformity provisions of the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR §93.122(g)) and all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450. The project in Amendment No. 4 is considered exempt from the requirement to determine conformity according to the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR §93.126) and no further conformity determination is required. SANDAG followed interagency consultation procedures to determine that this project is exempt. Amendment No. 4 does not interfere with the timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures. The 2010 RTIP, including Amendment No. 4, remains in conformance with the SIP.

LAUREN WARREM
Director of Finance

Attachment: 1. Table 1, 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, Amendment No. 4

Key Staff Contact: Michelle Merino, (619) 595-5608, mmer@sandag.org
## Table 1

### 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

#### Amendment No. 4

#### San Diego Region (in $000s)

**Caltrans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID:</th>
<th>CAL213</th>
<th>RTIP #:</th>
<th>10-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Project Title:** Grouped Projects for the State Minor Program

**Project Description:** Projects are consistent with 40 CFR Part 93.126 Exempt Tables 2 and Table 3 - railroad/highway crossing, safer non-federal-aid system roads, shoulder improvements, traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects, intersection signalization projects at individual intersections, pavement marking demonstration, truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area, lighting improvements, emergency truck pullovers.

**Change Reason:** Delete fund source

**Capacity Status:** NCI

**Exempt Category:** Safety - Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation

**Est Total Cost:** $5,402

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Program</td>
<td>$5,402</td>
<td>$5,402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$5,402</td>
<td>$5,402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Program</td>
<td>$4,782</td>
<td>$4,782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Program - St Cash</td>
<td>$620</td>
<td>$620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$5,402</td>
<td>$5,402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## San Diego Region (in $000s)

### 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
#### Amendment No. 4

### RTIP Fund Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARRA</td>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Federal Stimulus Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP/CBI</td>
<td>Border Infrastructure Program/Corridors and Borders Infrastructure Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO</td>
<td>High Priority Demonstration Program under TEA-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO-Sec 115</td>
<td>High Priority Demonstration Program under FY 2004 Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO-Sec 117/STP</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program under FHWA Administrative Program (congressionally directed appropriations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Federal Railroad Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5307</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5309 (NS)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary - New Starts Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Elderly &amp; Disabled Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5311</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Rural Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5316 (JARC)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Jobs Access Reverse Commute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5317 (NF)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration New Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBP</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Program under SAFETEA-LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation under TEA-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>Hazard Elimination System (administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>High Priority Program under SAFETEA-LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>Housing and Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Interstate Maintenance Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Indian Reservation Roads program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>National Highway System (administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLH</td>
<td>Public Lands Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Recreational Trails Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School (administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSP</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Community &amp; System Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>Transportation Enhancement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGER (ARRA)</td>
<td>Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (Federal Stimulus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGGER (ARRA)</td>
<td>Transit Investment for Greenhouse Gas and Energy Reduction (Federal Stimulus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
Amendment No. 4
San Diego Region (in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARVEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1A - High Speed Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-Border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-BPNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-BRT/Ops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-REMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-SMIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-TSI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

January 7, 2011

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 7

Action Requested: RECOMMEND

TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY UPDATE, FY 2011 FUNDING ALLOCATION, AND FY 2011 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT CRITERIA

File Number 1200201

Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, approved by the voters in November 2004, includes the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) which provides funding to mitigate habitat impacts from regional and local transportation projects, and provides funding for regional land management and biological monitoring. The EMP is a unique component of the TransNet Extension Ordinance in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities to help implement the regional habitat conservation plans. This funding allocation is tied to mitigation requirements and the environmental clearance approval process for projects outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan.

The purpose of this report is to discuss minor updates to the approved five-year EMP funding strategy, the allocation of FY 2011 funding for regional management and monitoring activities, and modifications to land management grant criteria for FY 2011.

Discussion

Five-Year Funding Strategy and FY 2011 Allocations

On February 22, 2008, the Board of Directors entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the EMP. A provision of the MOA allocates $4 million annually for 10 years to implement regional habitat management and monitoring efforts to help maintain the region’s biological integrity, thus avoiding the future listing of endangered species. Allocation of the $4 million is done on an annual basis by the Board of Directors pursuant to a Five-Year Funding Strategy (original approved on December 15, 2006, and subsequently updated by the Board of Directors on September 25, 2009). This five-year funding strategy is designed to chart a course for the funding of land management and monitoring activities under the EMP with allocations to implement this strategy approved annually.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to: (1) provide input on the proposed project selection criteria for the TransNet and Environmental Mitigation Program; and (2) recommend that the Board of Directors approve the updated Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategic Plan, the proposed management and monitoring activities and budget for FY 2011 totaling $4 million, and, subject to Board Policy No. 017, authorize staff to solicit proposals and enter into contracts or amend existing contracts accordingly.
Based upon input from the EMP Working Group (an advisory group to the Regional Planning Committee on TransNet EMP implementation), the Regional Planning Committee reviewed the Five-Year Funding Strategy and developed recommendations for funding allocations for FY 2011 and revisions to the Five-Year Funding Strategy (Attachments 1 and 2). Beyond some minor edits to the task names, the only new activities being recommended to the Five-Year Funding Strategy are: “Invasive Animal Species Removal” and an “Emergency Land Management Fund.” The former task reflects a need to target non-native invasive animal species in open space areas that are impacting native habitat and species (e.g., bullfrogs, exotic turtles, parasitic birds). The latter task is a result of identification by regional land managers of the need for a source of contingency funds to address land management emergencies that occur between funding cycles (e.g., fire, floods, sudden outbreak of aggressive weed species or disease).

The Emergency Land Management Funding task was discussed extensively by the EMP Working Group and subsequent by the Regional Planning Committee, who recognized the need for such a fund, but with strict parameters on its approval and use. The Regional Planning Committee is recommending a process of allocation as shown in Attachment 3. If approved, this process would give strict control over the type of projects that would qualify for the funding and authorize the Executive Director’s approval, in accordance with the delegation granted in Board Policy No. 017, based upon the written support from a cross-section of technical experts not affiliated with the request. It is expected that if approved, this task this would be reviewed to determine its success prior to any additional requests for future funding allotments.

The proposed funding levels for FY 2011 are consistent with the adopted TransNet EMP MOA, and the TransNet Extension Ordinance.

**TransNet EMP FY 2011 Land Management Grant Criteria**

The Transportation Committee’s input is requested on revisions to the proposed FY 2011 Land Management Grant Criteria. The proposed Five-Year Funding Strategy and proposed FY 2011 funding allotments, contains a competitive grant program to assist land managers in the region to maintain the existing habitat and native species. This in turn will help to reduce the need to list species as endangered and avoid delay to regional infrastructure projects. Four previous cycles of the competitive grant program have occurred; each time improving in the quality and focus of the submitted grants (see Transportation Committee agenda item 3 from October 1, 2010, for more details).

The Regional Planning Committee, based upon input from the EMP Working Group, has reviewed the past four cycles of the land management grant program to try to seek improvements and better streamline the process. The Regional Planning Committee concluded that the competitive land management grant process has proven to be a successful in the distribution of needed funding to the land managers in the region, and that the funding is being distributed across the region.

For FY 2011, the Regional Planning Committee is recommending revisions to eligibility and ranking criteria to align the competitive grant program funding to better reflect the most at risk habitats and species, while still maintaining some funding for general habitat related management. For the proposed FY 2011 funding of $1.95 million, the recommended eligible projects and the proposed funding allotment are as follows:
1. Invasive Control and Habitat Restoration ($950,000);
2. Species-Specific Management ($650,000); and
3. Habitat Maintenance, Access Control/Management and Volunteer Coordination ($350,000).

These eligible activities are similar to previous cycles, but with more specificity in key habitats, species and division of available funding. Details on these eligible activities are described in Attachment 4. The Regional Planning Committee has recommended that the eligible projects be evaluated against a revised evaluation and prioritization criteria specific to the three types of eligible projects as shown in Attachment 4. No other changes in process or content are proposed for the land management grants in Fiscal Year 11.

**Next Steps**

Transportation Committee recommendations on the Five-Year Funding Strategy and the FY 2011 allotments, and any input on the proposed revisions to the land management grant criteria, will be presented to the Board of Directors for approval in January 2011.

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

Attachments: 1. Summary of Recommended FY 2011 Funding Allocations  
2. Updated Conceptual Five-Year Funding Strategy  
3. Recommended Criteria for Emergency Land Management Funding Proposed FY 2011  

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org
## Summary of Recommended FY 2011 Funding Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Funding Allocated Prior Years FY 06-10</th>
<th>Proposed Funding FY 2011</th>
<th>Recommended Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Developer/Administrator</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>RFP once existing contract expires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Specialist</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Continue to fund SANDAG staff and USFWS staff working on these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Support</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Coordination</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,590,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserved Lands Database</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Continue to fund SANDAG staff working on these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Management Implementation</td>
<td>$5,280,000</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>Competitive grant process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Land Management Fund¹</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Contract to qualifying land manager ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Animal Species Removal¹</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Vegetation Mapping</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Management</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,935,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,575,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Fire Monitoring</td>
<td>$1,725,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing MOA with USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Monitoring</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing contract with SDSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare Butterfly Monitoring</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Corridor Monitoring</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Wildlife Monitoring</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Monitoring</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,475,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$925,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some activities will require implementation over multiple years.

¹ Proposed new task added to the Five-Year Funding Strategy
² See Attachment 3 for details on use of the fund
Five-Year Funding Strategy for Management and Monitoring
SANDAG Board of Directors approved December 15, 2006
Last updated by SANDAG Board September 25, 2009
Proposed Board of Directors Update January 2011

Background

This attachment provides specific details on the activities and funding allocations related to management and monitoring under the TransNet Environmental Mitigation. This includes a conceptual five-year funding strategy (page 9) to serve as a future blueprint for management and monitoring activities and funding allocations.

Regional Coordination

Currently, there is an effort to close the gap in the regional coordination of management and monitoring. SANDAG, through its Regional Conservation Fund, has assisted with the coordination of the habitat preserve activities at a regional level. Coordination is required to comprehensively identify gaps in resources, knowledge, leveraging funds, and developing cost-effective programming. Initial starts by the South County Land Manager Group and by the newly formed North County Lands Managers Group are starting to close these gaps. The following activities will help to assist these efforts.

Program Developer/ Program Administrator

The Program Developer helped to create the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program (SDMMP). After this contract ends in July 2011, it is envisioned that this position will take on more of the overarching administrator functions to coordinate among federal, state, local agencies and nonprofits, to assist in leveraging funding, and to guide regional monitoring efforts. Until a regional funding source is identified, the Program Administrator will be an independent contractor of SANDAG.

Role and functions of the Program Administrator:

- Review other regional habitat preservation programs, institutional structures, and operations as models for a San Diego regional coordinating entity.
- Define the roles and functions of staff of the regional coordinating entity, with a reporting structure.
- Draft mission statement, charter, and other governing documents.
- Draft a scope of work and contract for the next three to five years based on the TransNet needs assessment.
- Draft a scope of work and structure for science advisors.
- Identify complementary roles and in-kind contributions of agencies and partner groups, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), San Diego Natural History Museum, Conservation Resource Network, etc.
• Re-evaluate Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) implementation committees (e.g., Interagency Coordinating Committee, Habitat Management Technical Committee.)

• Prepare and oversee the work plan for the Management and Monitoring Coordinator

• Identify and collaborate with other state and federal programs (e.g. FWS Landscape Conservation Collaborative, Partners In Flight, etc.) to help them implement actions/programs complementary to the monitoring and management goals in San Diego County.

• Prepare annual budget recommendations to implement the monitoring, management and connectivity strategic plans and annually oversee their updates.

Management and Monitoring Coordinator

The Management and Monitoring Coordinator is the lead for bringing the regional management and monitoring efforts into close coordination, ensuring that monitoring data is used to inform management of preserves, monitoring efforts are focused at providing the data needed by preserve managers, and that management actions implemented by preserve managers will, in aggregate, help achieve species and habitat goals.

Specific Roles and Responsibilities include:

• Utilize existing (or establish additional) land management groups to help identify regional management issues (management/focal species, invasive species, habitats and threats/stressors etc.), identify priorities for management actions based on priorities, risk levels and other considerations.

• Identify land managers for each preserve area by watershed, utilize their experience to identify cost-effective methods to address specific threats/stressors and identify appropriate technical assistance to help land managers.

• Work with an advisor group and land managers to develop a multiyear budget, to address high priority actions identified in the strategic plan (including invasive species) and establish a time frame for periodic review of management actions and evaluate their success at meeting specific objectives.

• Develop a regional Geographic Information System (GIS) database of management action locations including habitat restoration efforts, location of invasive species, and edge effects (increased urban runoff which modifies habitats, illegal trails, trash dumping etc.) common to multiple preserves. Track efforts including costs and evaluate their success.

• Work with an advisor group, land managers, public agencies, and stakeholders within the watershed to allocate available funding for implementation of priority actions identified in the strategic plan. Review budgets annually.

• Oversee and manage contracts for funded projects

• Coordinate the collection and analysis of monitoring data throughout San Diego County with an emphasis on permitted jurisdictions within the NCCP.

• Coordinate with the wildlife agencies on monitoring priorities.
- Coordinate and make recommendations for future grant proposals.
- Work with the wildlife agencies and science advisors to develop training workshops for field data collection efforts.
- Prepare and oversee the work plan for the program science support biologist.

This position would be an independent contractor and report to the Program Developer/Administrator with oversight from SANDAG.

**Biologist/Scientist**

The Biologist/Scientist will provide the science support for the Management and Monitoring Coordinator and the Program Developer/Administrator. This position will be the lead for on-the-ground activities and evaluations of activities.

Specific Roles and Responsibilities include:

- Providing biological input for updating the 5-year horizon monitoring and adaptive management program documents.
- Organizing workshops to obtain input from scientists on priority monitoring and adaptive management needs.
- Literature review and synthesis.
- Synthesizing and analyzing monitoring data.
- Reviewing biologically based management practices.
- Designing monitoring strategies/protocols (including cost analyses) for monitoring Risk Group 2 species (and any other species identified as a priority monitoring species).
- Developing a prioritized research needs list.
- Preparing grant proposal to help implement elements of the adaptive management and monitoring programs and identified research needs.
- Assisting with the design and coordination of the connectivity monitoring efforts.
- Developing a matrix of similarities/differences in preserve management issues including habitats and species.
- Identifying mechanisms to engage preserve managers’ participation in preserve management coordination efforts/meetings; preparing synthesized and analyzed data sets utilizing the multi-taxa database and using the products to inform the stakeholders on the benefits and use of the database to help inform management and monitoring efforts.

This position would be an independent contractor (or part of a university lead effort) and report to the Monitoring and Management Coordinator with oversight from SANDAG.
GIS and Database Support

The GIS Specialist would take data collected by the region and incorporate it into a geographic information system for analysis. The GIS Specialist would also initiate a regional database for management and monitoring data that could serve as a regional hub for information collection, analysis and sharing.

Additional contract positions and support may be required in future years depending on the progress and needs of the regional coordination entity. Annual funding requests would be required to be approved by the SANDAG Board in the future prior to pursuing any new contract positions.

Administrative and Science Support

Implementing a countywide effort to coordinate the coordination and logistical functions of land managers and biological monitoring will require administrative support (office space, computers administration, etc.) and specific scientific support to address key issues that arise. It is envisioned that the science support would be a short-term, specific issue assist that could come from local universities or species specific experts.

Regional Management

Lands preserved as part of the regional habitat conservation plans need to be actively managed to retain and, in many cases, enhance their quality as habitat for the covered species. The EMPWG identified a preliminary list of regional management issues. These included invasive plants, invasive animals, off-road vehicle impacts, use of grazing as a management tool, fire management, and restoration of native habitats, erosion, and control of runoff.

Conserved Lands Database

This completed project developed a GIS data layer of all the existing lands conserved in San Diego County. The data layer was reviewed by regional stakeholders and land managers. Future activities include adding more information on the management and monitoring activities associated with each parcel and keeping the database current.

Regional Land Management Grants

Since 2006, SANDAG has solicited land management grant applications from land managers around the region to provide funding to address regional habitat management issues such as: invasive species, post wildfire recovery, habitat restoration and access control and litter removal. This program is designed to provide critical funding to address management efforts that, if left unaddressed, could lead to regional impediments to protecting habitats and endangered species. For FY 2011, the focus of the call for projects will be on weed removal and habitat restoration; projects to help specific imperiled species; and general land stewardship.

Emergency Land Management Actions (proposed new task added FY 2011)

Emergencies can arise in the course of the management of land that need to be addressed promptly or severe ramification could occur. This proposed new funding allotment would allow a small contingency of funds to be reserved to address emergencies where no other funding source exists. The funding would only be used if findings could be made to the satisfaction of the SANDAG Executive Director, or his/her designee, with the support of an oversight committee comprised of members including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game,
TransNet EMP Program Manager, and an at-large member of the EMP Working Group representing land managers.

**Invasive Weed Control and Removal**

This project has been initiated and would create a strategic plan(s) for invasive weed removal. Timing and allocations of the funds would be established in the strategic plan(s). This multiyear effort would identify the key species and priority areas, and methods to address invasive species in the region. The goal is to identify where funding would most efficiently be spent to address invasive species.

**Invasive Animal Species Removal (new task added FY 2011)**

Similar to invasive weeds, several non-native, exotic animal species have been impacting the regional preserve system. Species like bullfrogs and red-eared slider turtles are displacing native amphibian species. Cowbirds, a non-native bird that parasites the nest of other birds, have been shown to decrease the populations of endangered bird species in San Diego. This task would allow funds to be made available to address the removal of these species and enhance the population of native fauna.

**Updated Vegetation Mapping**

The existing regional vegetation database is, in some areas, over ten years old. In addition, the vegetation classifications have error rates of 35 percent to 45 percent (San Diego State University [SDSU] 1995) and 34 percent (USFWS 2002). This update is approximately half way completed. A new classification system for mapping vegetation in San Diego is being finalized. The new system is more applicable to track changes in vegetation over time and, thus, will aid land managers in tracking their management efforts. This classification system would be used to revise the current vegetation mapping starting in winter of 2011.

**Open Space Enforcement**

Illegal off-highway vehicle use, dumping of litter, hunting, and other illegal uses impact the open space areas set aside for habitat conservation and legal public recreation. A one-year pilot project is underway which is allowing SANDAG to work with the Sheriff Department Off-road Enforcement Team and the California Department of Fish and Game Enforcement Branch to determine the success of the increased presence of enforcement as an effective means to deter illegal uses in open space. The results of this one-year effort will determine a course of action for future enforcement recommendations.

**Standardized Management Plans**

Standardization of Natural Resource Management Plans is critical to assure coordination among the region’s land managers. This standardized plan or template would identify and prioritize the specific species populations and vegetation communities to be managed in a given area and identify activities, specific to individual regions, core areas, or linkages of the jurisdiction, that address specific covered species requirements and the individual preserve objectives. The management plan template will include recommendations and protocols for how to collect this type of data and how the preserve managers could adapt their management as new information is provided from monitoring or changes in methodologies. The goal would be to develop a unified resource management plan that is grounded in an adaptive management framework.
Regional Monitoring

Lands preserved as part of the regional conservation plans need to be actively monitored to evaluate their success at effectively conserving the covered species and maintaining the processes that allow for their persistence. Contractors are in various stages of updating the biological monitoring plans for the MSCP, which can serve as a model for all other San Diego conservation plans. The contractors working on the monitoring plans have consistently commented on the need for regional coordination and an institutional structure. The following list of actions is needed to address biological monitoring in the region.

Post-Fire Monitoring

Approximately 300,000 acres were burned in the Cedar and Otay Fires in San Diego County in the fall of 2003. This included approximately half of the natural lands of the County of San Diego MSCP planning area. The USGS, in coordination with the USFWS, CDFG, and County of San Diego, have completed a five-year study on the impacts of these massive fires, and resultant changes in vegetation communities, vegetation structure, and prey availability over the period beginning in 2005. The USGS also has pre-fire data (some dating back to 1995) from within the footprint of both the Cedar and Otay Fires providing for an excellent pre- and post-burn analysis.

What has been learned from these studies has helped refine future post-fire monitoring efforts. Specifically the five-year funding strategy envisions continued monitoring of focal small vertebrate communities that have not recovered since the fires, a 4th year of monitoring for riparian birds located in the 2007 burn areas and control sites, and synthesized data collected across all species’ taxa on the fire responses to develop adaptive management actions that will be implemented to manage for diversity following similar future fire events.

Vegetation Monitoring

Monitoring the conditions of the vegetation provides a surrogate for the conditions of the habitat of endangered species. Monitoring has been started through SDSU to look at the most efficient and cost-effective approaches towards monitoring the vegetative conditions of the open space lands. This is especially critical since the 2003 and 2004 wildfires. The following activities are envisioned for the five-year strategic plan:

- Continued vegetation monitoring in the spring of 2011 to determine the inter-annual variation in vegetation communities. The addition of a structural monitoring element to look at physical aspects such as shrub height, gap size, and bare ground to address correlates with the vegetation conditions;

- A comparative analysis of the vegetation conditions to other vegetation monitoring data to determine the repeatability, compatibility and increase the same size of the current efforts;

- A direct comparison of various vegetation monitoring efforts and techniques (field vs. remote sensing) to determine the cost-effectiveness of these approaches to establish a best management practice.
Rare Plant Monitoring Protocols

This activity would provide standardization for the required monitoring of rare and endangered plants in the NCCP preserves. The analysis of 11 years of rare plant monitoring data has been completed by the U.S. Geological Survey under contract to SANDAG. The next steps for this activity include:

- Development of an expert oversight committee to assist in the development of the rare plant protocol development.
- Prepare standardized final protocols for monitoring rare plants.
- Train others to utilize the protocols.

California Gnatcatcher Monitoring

As the flagship species of the NCCP, monitoring of the California Gnatcatcher is required for the regional preserves. The USFWS has developed a new protocol for conducting California Gnatcatcher monitoring. The protocol was peer reviewed, and monitoring was completed in 2002 (Orange County and parts of San Diego County), 2004 (MSCP areas only) using this new protocol, and 2007 and 2009 throughout the San Diego region. Information provided by these efforts has lead to the conclusion that monitoring for this species could be reduced to one every three years redirecting efforts to other taxa.

Burrowing Owl Monitoring

Western Burrowing owls have been reported to be on the decline across the majority of their range for over a decade. The decline is recognized by ornithologists working in California, where it is a Species of Special Concern, and in San Diego, the decline could be described as precipitous. The San Diego Bird Atlas reports that only eight of the 28 locals prior to 1997 still have owls. Burrowing owls also are a covered species under the San Diego MSCP, as well as other Habitat Conservation Programs. Systematic surveys in Southern San Diego County were completed in 2010 and the results are being analyzed. A coordination committee led by the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program, which includes the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, SDSU, U.S. Geological Survey and the San Diego Zoological Society, will be discussing options for future burrowing owl efforts.

Rare Butterfly Monitoring

San Diego County contains several rare butterflies that are declining for unknown reasons. These butterflies are part of the regional open space system and additional monitoring is needed to determine the distribution, abundance and threats to their populations and habitat. Currently survey work is being conducted for the Thorne’s hairstreak and Hermes copper butterflies. Both of these species were dramatically impacted by the 2003 and 2007 wildfires.

Wildlife Corridor Monitoring

It is well understood in the scientific literature that fragmentation and isolation of open space areas will lead to the extinctions of native species. Maintaining the connectivity between open space and enhancing existing connections is critical. Currently the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program is working with specific experts to design a strategy for wildlife corridor monitoring that includes specific objectives and a scope of work.
Other Wildlife Monitoring

SDSU has conducted a peer review of the monitoring plan for the region and has indicated a prioritization for various faunal monitoring. The key species (priority 1) have been addressed above. There are several priority 2 species that should also be addressed. The specific species and scope of the study would still need to be established prior to initiating the monitoring over the coming years.
## TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program
### Conceptual Five-Year Funding Strategy
#### Proposed FY 2011 Update

The following table outlines the budget allocations for various programs over the five-year period, from FY 2010 to FY 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL COORDINATION</th>
<th>Approved Prior FYs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED FYR-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGIONAL MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Approved Prior FYs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED FYR-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGIONAL MONITORING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Approved Prior FYs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED FYR-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Funding Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Approved Prior FYs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED FYR-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

- Some activities will require implementation over multiple years.
- Funds encumbered in FY 2010 are available in FY 2011.
Recommended Criteria for Emergency Land Management Funding
Proposed FY 2011

If approved, this funding would allow for an emergency response to address land management issues that arise between land management grant cycles. This program would be structured to fund “first year” emergency actions where no other funding sources are readily available within the time period needed to address the emergency. It is assumed that follow up adaptive management and monitoring actions could be funded through the annual allocation of management and monitoring funds via the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) annual budget approval process or other local, state, or federal funding sources. This program would apply to the covered species, habitats, linkages and corridors identified in the San Diego county Natural Communities Conservation Planning program.

The initial funding allocation ($150,000), if unused, would roll over to subsequent years until an account of $500,000 was established. The fund would be replenished as needed during the annual TransNet EMP annual budget cycle.

Authorization to utilize these funds would occur pursuant to SANDAG Board Policy No. 017 (Delegation of Authority) using the following criteria as guidance:

- A sudden and clear threat to a major population(s) of a covered species or sensitive habitat has been documented and a clear method to address the issue has been proposed; or

- A catastrophic event that severely impacts population(s) of covered species or wildlife movement (examples include fires, flooding, landslides, hazardous waste spills);

- Immediate action necessary to rehabilitate or eliminate illegal human activities that severely threaten the integrity of a preserve, by impacts to large populations of covered species, sensitive habitats or wildlife linkages (examples include restoration of illegal grading, elimination of the sudden expansion of feral invasive animals, controlling access of the sudden increase in off-highway vehicles);

- A documented rapid or early invasion of habitat by aggressive invasive species with the potential to severely alter ecosystem dynamics (e.g., fire frequency, flooding, salinity). Examples include the identification of an aggressive invasive species new to the County, or an invasive species known to occur in the County but previously undocumented in a regional preserve.
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP)
FY 2011 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS -
ELIGIBLE PROJECTS AND EVALUATION AND PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

Eligible Projects

It is being recommended to the SANDAG Board of Directors that $1.95 million of Fiscal Year 2011 funding be allotted to a competitive land management grant program to address invasive species control and restoration of degraded habitat areas, management to preclude damage caused by human use, and species-specific management. Review of the monitoring data collected since 1997 indicates some species and habitats are at significant risk due to a variety of stressors and that action is needed to reverse downward trends in habitat or species conditions. It is envisioned that the $1.95 million would be part of a multiyear strategic approach that includes one or more of the following eligible activities:

1. **Invasive Control and Habitat Restoration ($950,000)** - Projects that reduce existing or emerging invasive species that threaten endangered and/or other sensitive species **AND** that engage in active habitat restoration on degraded habitat lands to promote recovery of native vegetation communities and/or threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species habitat. Projects that focus on the following vegetation communities will be given the highest priority for funding:
   - Grasslands
   - Maritime succulent scrub/Coastal bluff scrub
   - Coastal sage Scrub
   - Riparian and Inland aquatic systems, including vernal pools.

2. **Species-Specific Management ($650,000)** - Projects that focus on managing species at risk of extirpation to species covered under the regional habitat conservation plans, generally by identifying and reducing threats, and that include monitoring to demonstrate success at increasing or stabilizing populations. Pursuant to a regional assessment of monitoring efforts conducted in 2010, the following species have been determined to be the highest at risk species in the region where land management activities could benefit existing populations. Projects that focus on the following species will be given the highest priority for funding:
   - Western pond turtle
   - Coastal cactus wren
   - Golden Eagle
   - Nuttall’s lotus
   - San Diego ambrosia
   - San Diego thornmint
   - Short-leaved dudleya
   - Sticky dudleya
   - Orcutt’s spineflower

3. **Habitat Maintenance, Access Control/Management, and Volunteer Coordination ($350,000)** - Regular day-to-day habitat maintenance, management of public use combined with monitoring of effects on species and habitats, and the coordination of volunteer programs to implement management actions. This includes signage (both interpretive and cautionary), education, erosion control, culvert maintenance, fencing, patrolling public use,
costs related to volunteer coordination, law enforcement, and efforts to remove garbage in existing preserve systems to allow habitat areas to recover. Eligible projects also include data collection/monitoring to:

- Determine the effects of public use on species and vegetation communities
- Track types, quantity, and seasonality of public use
- Assess areas for compatible public use prior to allowing access

Projects that are not ready to start within 12 months of submission of the application to SANDAG will not be eligible for this funding cycle. Projects approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors for funding, that do not start within one year of the awarded grant agreement’s execution will be at risk of losing their funding. Projects will only be funded for a maximum of three years initially.

Project Evaluation and Ranking

The following evaluation and ranking criteria will be used by an evaluation committee made up of EMP Working Group Members and outside technical experts NOT applying for land management grants.

Eligible Activity: 1. **Invasive Control and Habitat Restoration Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Maximum Score Possible</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of management of vegetation communities and/or exotic species may result in extirpation of covered species</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project addresses species or vegetation community at highest risk of loss</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical linkage parcels or in regional wildlife corridor</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results which will reduce future land management costs. Success criteria have been identified and will be monitored and reported. (High cost-effectiveness)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent action is needed to address a problem that would severely degrade a sensitive vegetation community</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project part of a larger strategic effort which covers a large area with multiple partners and multiple benefits? High economy-of-scale</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient matching funds available to complete the project</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Maximum Project Evaluation Criteria Weight Total Score Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Maximum Score Possible</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land management through public outreach and participation</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligible Activity: 2. **Species-Specific Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Maximum Score Possible</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of management of vegetation communities and/or exotic species may result in extirpation of covered species</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project addresses species or vegetation community at highest risk of loss</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical linkage parcels or in regional wildlife corridor</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results which will reduce future land management costs. Success criteria have been identified and will be monitored and reported. (High cost-effectiveness)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent action is needed to address a problem that would severely degrade a sensitive vegetation community</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project part of a larger strategic effort which covers a large area with multiple partners and multiple benefits? High economy-of-scale</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient matching funds available to complete the project</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land management through public outreach and participation</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eligible Activity: 3. **Habitat Maintenance, Access Control/Management, and Volunteer Coordination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Maximum Score Possible</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of management of vegetation communities and/or exotic species may result in extirpation of covered species</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project addresses species or vegetation community at highest risk of loss</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical linkage parcels or in regional wildlife corridor</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results which will reduce future land management costs. Success criteria have been identified and will be monitored and reported. (High cost-effectiveness)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent action is needed to address a problem that would severely degrade a sensitive vegetation community</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project part of a larger strategic effort which covers a large area with multiple partners and multiple benefits? High economy-of-scale</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient matching funds available to complete the project</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land management through public outreach and participation</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AND BUDGET TRANSFER: NEW SECURITY FIBER OPTIC CABLE PROJECT

Introduction

SANDAG implements light rail improvement projects for the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). These projects include the installation of fiber optic cable. This action recommends approval of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a fund transfer agreement with MTS and establishes a new capital project as a result of the MOU. The new project provides for the design and construction of fiber optic cable on MTS Trolley Lines. The new project would be funded from MTS federal transit security grants and state Proposition 1B funds. Approval of the MOU will be recommended to the MTS Board in January 2011.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) authorize the Executive Director to execute the Security Fiber Optic Cable Project MOU with MTS in substantially the same form as Attachment 1 in an amount not to exceed $5,960,445, contingent on prior MTS Board approval of the MOU; and (2) establish a new capital project CIP 1144400 Security Fiber Optic Cable Project with a total budget of $5,960,445; pending approval by the MTS Board of Directors.

Discussion

SANDAG is responsible for designing, bidding, and constructing improvements for MTS including systems improvement projects. The proposed action transfers funds to SANDAG through an MOU with MTS for the purpose of having SANDAG implement fiber optic cable construction.

MTS has secured several federal grants and state funding for a project to expand its fiber optic cable network to improve security on the Trolley system. The proposed SANDAG project budget is $5,960,445. Because of the size of the project and the need for project management, design, construction management, and procurement of construction, MTS is requesting SANDAG implement the project. MTS will retain a portion of the grant funding to cover its administration costs. Therefore, an MOU facilitating the project and the fund transfer of $5,960,445 is being recommended in substantially the same form as attached.

Upon approval of the MOU, SANDAG would establish the Security Fiber Optic Cable Project (CIP 1144400) and implement the work. The project would install fiber optic cable on sections of the Green Line in Mission Valley and the Orange Line, and at other various locations on the Trolley system to close gaps between existing MTS fiber optic cable runs. This project is an important step toward completing a high capacity communications network on the Trolley system and is key to improving security including improving closed-circuit television and other vital communications.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Implementation

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

Attachment: 1. Security Fiber Optic Cable Project MOU
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING  
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
AND METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM  
REGARDING THE SECURITY FIBER OPTIC CABLE PROJECT

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is made and entered into effective as of this _____ day of January 2011, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments ("SANDAG") and Metropolitan Transit System ("MTS").

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Agreement:

WHEREAS, MTS currently has a capital improvement project 11288 Security Fiber Optic Cable Project in its approved FY 2011 capital budget in the amount of $3,381,000 funded by the federal Transportation Security Administration (TSA) for improvement to security communications systems and a capital improvement project 11277 Enhance Infrastructure in its approved FY 2011 capital budget in the amount of $2,779,455 funded by State Proposition 1B for rail infrastructure enhancements; and

WHEREAS, the contemplated work for both projects is fiber optic cable and appurtenance installation on the Orange and Green Lines, and at other locations on the MTS Trolley system to close gaps in its fiber optic communications system (herein after “the Project”); and

WHEREAS, MTS does not have the design and construction resources available to manage the Project; and

WHEREAS, MTS desires to utilize SANDAG project management resources and construction procurement methods including invitation for bid and Job Order Contracting (JOC) to implement the Project in order to reduce costs and save time in the procurement of a regional security enhancement; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has authority to construct the Project on behalf of MTS pursuant to Senate Bill 1703 (Peace, 2003) and therefore has created capital improvement project number CIP 1144400; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG currently has project management and delivery resources available and has contracting capacity to implement this Project; and

WHEREAS, the parties wish to memorialize their agreement in this MOU to carry out the purposes set forth above;
AGREEMENT

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

SANDAG AGREES:

1. To provide administration, design, and construction management services for the Project; and contract for construction of the Project. Design and construction management services may be through SANDAG staff, consultant services, or a combination thereof.

2. To provide design services for the Project as needed for construction procurement through invitation to bid or by one or more JOC job orders. Design shall be limited to the production of plans and specifications as necessary and agreed upon by SANDAG and MTS. Design services shall be performed by SANDAG staff or one of its on-call General Engineering Consultant(s), not the Job Order Contractor.

3. To bid for construction or issue JOC job orders to one or more of the SANDAG JOC contractors to procure and install fiber optic cables and other necessary equipment for the Project in accordance with SANDAG Policy No. 024 Procurement and Contracting - Construction.

4. To assign a project manager to manage the design and construction of the Project.

5. To provide MTS with design products and submittals for review and comment during the development of the scope, plans and specifications, as requested; invite MTS to attend design, construction contract and job order development meetings; and respond to MTS comments and requests for information including plans, specifications, estimates and job order proposals. SANDAG shall not issue a design task order, construction bid or construction job order without written concurrence from MTS.

6. To assign a Resident Engineer and inspectors, as needed, to manage the construction of the Project.

7. To provide MTS with copies of consultant task orders, JOC job orders and amendments, invoices, payment requests, and to maintain all Project records for ten years.

8. To invoice MTS for all costs of the Project including administration, professional staff, consultant and contractor costs, incidentals and other direct costs including any Project-related costs charged by MTS including those for field costs, flagging and acceptance inspection. Invoices shall include names, hours, and rates for SANDAG personnel, contractor invoices with backup for task order and job order payment; and backup for other costs for equipment or services.

9. To provide MTS final As-Built drawings upon completion of the Project.

10. Neither MTS nor any officer thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by SANDAG under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to SANDAG under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, SANDAG shall fully defend, indemnify and save harmless MTS, all officers and employees from all claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in...
MTS AGREES:

1. To pay SANDAG for the actual cost of the Project including administration, design, construction management, and construction in an amount not to exceed $5,960,445 without prior written approval. This amount is the sum of the available funds in MTS projects 11277 Security Fiber Optic Orange and Green Line and 11277 Enhance Infrastructure less $200,000 for MTS administration and Project support including meetings and plan reviews. Claims, suits or actions by third parties arising from the Project shall be Project costs.

2. Upon receipt of an invoice from SANDAG with appropriate backup, MTS shall pay SANDAG within 30 calendar days.

3. In the event that SANDAG notifies MTS that the original Project estimate will be exceeded, MTS will meet with SANDAG to discuss whether an amendment to this MOU is appropriate. In no event shall SANDAG have the responsibility to move forward with the Project until the parties are able to identify sufficient funds to complete the work.

4. To provide timely response to design review submittals and other operational input/assistance when requested by SANDAG.

5. To provide staff support for project review and coordination on the Project at no cost to SANDAG, including, but not limited to, any staff support or cooperation needed to defend any contractor or other claims that may arise on the Project.

6. Neither SANDAG nor any officer thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by MTS under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to MTS under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, MTS shall fully defend, indemnify and save harmless SANDAG, all officers and employees from all claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by MTS under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to MTS under this MOU.

THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE:

1. That all obligations of SANDAG under the terms of this MOU are subject to the appropriation of the required resources by SANDAG and the approval of the SANDAG Board of Directors.

2. Any notice required or permitted under this MOU may be personally served on the other party, by the party giving notice, or may be served by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the following addresses:

   **For SANDAG**
   401 B Street, Suite 800
   San Diego, CA 92101
   Attn: Ray Rizman

   **For MTS**
   1255 Imperial Avenue
   San Diego, CA 92101
   Attn: Office of General Counsel
3. That unless it is amended by the parties in writing, this MOU shall terminate on June 30, 2012, or on such earlier or later date as the parties may agree to in writing.

4. The indemnification provisions of this MOU shall survive termination of the MOU.

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

6. All terms, conditions, and provisions hereof shall inure to and shall bind each of the parties hereto, and each of their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns.

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

8. No alteration or variation of the terms of this MOU shall be valid unless made in writing and signed by the parties hereto, and no oral understanding or agreement not incorporated herein shall be binding on any of the parties hereto.

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

10. This MOU may be executed in any number of identical counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, and all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument when each party has signed one such counterpart.

11. In the event that SANDAG notifies MTS that the amount in Section 1 of MTS obligations above will be exceeded, MTS will meet with SANDAG to discuss whether an amendment to this MOU is appropriate. In no event shall SANDAG have the responsibility to move forward with the Project until the parties are able to identify sufficient funds to complete the work.

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

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM

____________________________  ______________________________
GARY L. GALLEGOS               PAUL C. JABLONSKI
Executive Director             Chief Executive Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Office of General Counsel      Legal Counsel
AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2010 AND FY 2011 BUDGETS:
COMPASS CARD PROGRAM

Introduction

The Compass Card Program provides for the distribution and sales of regional transit passes, as well as the distribution of regional transit pass revenues to the operators. The program budget includes the purchase and distribution of passes to employers, social service agencies and third-party outlets; account management for Compass Card holders; and technical support for the Compass Card system. Since the launch of the Compass Card system for public use in May 2009, SANDAG and the transit operators have converted the majority of monthly pass holders from a non-Compass paper product to the reloadable Compass Card. Attachments 1 and 2 are proposed budget amendments which will fund the need for additional Compass Card inventory purchases and additional staff time to support the program in fiscal year (FY) 2011.

Discussion

Currently there are approximately 70,000 users of Compass Cards each month. The Compass Card system allows patrons to use a single card for all transit fare needs. The card is easy to use, secure, and reloadable for a wide variety of transit fares. SANDAG manages approximately 70 retail outlets where customers may purchase or reload their Compass Cards. In addition to the retail network, users can purchase or reload their cards at ticket vending machines located at more than 70 rail stations, via a secure internet site, at Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) operated Transit Stores, and over the telephone through the Compass Card Customer call center operated by SANDAG.

SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD launched the Compass Card system for public use in May 2009. Since that time SANDAG has managed the program, including maintaining a Customer Service Center (CSC) staffed Monday through Friday 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. and on Saturdays from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. The CSC handles approximately 10,000 calls each month processing orders for passes, providing information and support, and managing individual accounts. In addition, SANDAG manages an employer program with over 30 companies currently enrolled. The employer program enables employees to receive their transit passes automatically each month and have billings managed by their employers.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve revisions to the FY 2010 and FY 2011 Program Budgets for OWP #3310600, including: (1) a carryover of $80,635 of unspent FY 2010 budgeted funds into FY 2011; (2) an increase in the FY 2011 Program Budget by $62,454 for new card fee revenue; and (3) an increase in the FY 2011 Program Budget by accepting additional funds from Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District in the total amount of $123,115 in substantially the same form as Attachment 1.
SANDAG also is responsible for monthly revenue distribution to MTS and NCTD as well as maintaining inventory and managing the distribution of Compass Cards and other fare media products. In addition to these “front office” activities, SANDAG is responsible for the “back office” which includes the computer systems necessary to run and manage the Compass Card programs. This is accomplished through a technical team who supports the central system, third-party retail outlets, and also maintains a regional Compass Card help desk system serving as the interface between transit agency users of the system and the various software and hardware vendors that provide ongoing support for the system.

Budget Amendment

The Compass Card Program is funded entirely from pass sales revenues received from MTS and NCTD and is governed by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) executed by all three agencies that has established the cost sharing between MTS and NCTD at 75 and 25 percent respectively. The Fare Ordinance and MOU also provide for Compass Card fees, which can be used as program revenue to offset costs.

The budget increase is being requested to accommodate the additional Compass Card inventory purchases, additional staff time, and telecommunications costs needed to support the program. Staff worked with the transit operators to program the FY 2011 budget with a $185,000 reduction from the FY 2010 budget of $1.8 million. However, the need for additional card inventory, staff support for Compass Card enhancements, and staff support for the retail outlets has increased expenses.

Carryover from FY 2010

Limited Use Compass Cards have been planned as a lower cost solution to the regular plastic Compass Cards and are primarily used by social service agencies. The Limited Use Compass Cards have the same capability as the regular plastic card; however, the cards have a limited life of three to six months. Currently, the region supports these users with non-Compass paper passes. The goal is to move these users and agencies to a Limited Use card.

This purchase of Limited Use Compass Cards was provided for in the FY 2010 Compass Card budget; however, the region was not prepared to deploy those cards by the close of the fiscal year. As part of this budget amendment staff is proposing to carry over to FY 2011 the funds budgeted, but not spent in FY 2010 to support the purchase, distribution, and conversion of the remainder of non-Compass paper pass holders, offset by an identical decrease to the FY 2010 budget.

Revenue from Card Fees

In May 2010, a $2 nonrefundable administrative fee was instituted for new Compass Cards purchased. This was done to encourage transit patrons to retain their Compass Cards and reload them, as the cards are designed to last three to five years, as well as cover administrative costs of the purchase of the cards. The fee has slowed the need for new inventories of cards; however, SANDAG has still been issuing approximately 20,000 new cards each month. The administrative fees collected from sales of new Compass Cards are eligible to offset program costs at the discretion of the transit operators. To date, approximately $162,000 has been collected. In October, SANDAG under the authority of the Executive Director, as reported to the Board of Directors at its
November 19, 2010, meeting as a Delegated Action, and with the agreement of both transit agencies, amended the Compass Card budget by $100,000 to purchase additional Compass Cards. The remaining funds of $62,454 are included in the proposed FY 2011 budget amendment.

Operator Cost Impact

MTS and NCTD share the cost of the Compass Card Program as established through a three-party MOU that established the revenue split at 75 percent for MTS and 25 percent for NCTD. Currently the proposed increase for both operators is a total of $123,115 with the NCTD portion at $30,779 and the MTS share at $92,336. The executive management at both transit agencies have reviewed and approved this increase.

Summary

The proposed budget increase has been approved through the Compass Card Executive Team, which provides management oversight for the operations of the program. Included in the table below are the proposed new revenue resources to fund the proposed FY 2011 budget increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds in new card fee account</td>
<td>$62,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover funds from FY 2010</td>
<td>$80,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS additional contribution at 75 percent</td>
<td>$92,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD additional contribution at 25 percent</td>
<td>$30,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$266,204</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments: 1. FY 2010 Budget Amendment-Work Element 33106, Compass Card Program
2. FY 2011 Budget Amendment-Work Element 33106, Compass Card Program

Key Staff Contact: James Dreisbach-Towle, (619) 699-1914, jdr@sandag.org
PROGRAM WORK ELEMENT:  33106.23
TITLE:  COMPASS CARD PROGRAM

FY 2010 BUDGET:  $1,813,179 $1,732,544

AREA OF EMPHASIS:  SMART MOBILITY PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Source</th>
<th>Funds Application</th>
<th>(FY 2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA MPO Planning (5303)</td>
<td>Salaries, Benefits, Indirect</td>
<td>862,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Transit Planning (5307)</td>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>24,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Metropolitan Planning</td>
<td>Outside Graphics (0104)</td>
<td>325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA CMAQ (5309)</td>
<td>Temporary Employees (0106)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning/Administration</td>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>562,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Funds</td>
<td>Material and Equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,163,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,732,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,813,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this work element is to implement and support the Regional Fare Ordinance by offering monthly passes and other fare products on the Compass Card. The Compass Card program uses advanced technology to: (1) improve fare collection activities; (2) enhance data availability for ridership and product usage; and (3) introduce a common fare product for regional transit customers. The emphasis of the program in FY 2010 includes: (1) continuing deployment and utilization of the Compass Card program, including centralized and consolidated fare payment management for the region’s transit operations; (2) completing the transition path from the manual pass sales system to an automated, self-service system; (3) overseeing the operations of the regional customer account management service center for Compass Card customers; and (4) furthering the effort to develop brand identity adoption of the Compass Card and recognition of the new card.

PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Under the Automated Fare Collection (AFC) project, SANDAG has procured and implemented a back-office system for the management of regional fare collection devices, including ticket vending machines, regional buses, and ticket office locations. The delivered system needs continued staffing, promotion, and continued transition from the existing manual system. This work element builds upon the equipment and system procurements previously accomplished under the AFC project and the creation of a program office under the FY 2009 operational budget.

Project Manager:  James Dreisbach-Towle, Mobility Department
Committee(s): Transportation Committee
Working Groups: Joint Committee on Regional Transit; Intelligent Transportation System CEOs Policy Management Working Group
## PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK NO.</th>
<th>PERCENT EFFORT</th>
<th>TASK / PRODUCT DESCRIPTION(S) / SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.0      | 35             | Task Description: Manage ongoing customer accounts.  
Product: Customer account records  
Completion Date: 6/30/2010 |
| 2.0      | 30             | Task Description: Manage Compass Card media distribution.  
Product: Ongoing  
Completion Date: 6/30/2010 |
| 3.0      | 10             | Task Description: Implement marketing, customer education, and outreach efforts with regional partners and potentially with public-private ventures.  
Product: Ongoing and potential joint venture agreement(s)  
Completion Date: 6/30/2010 |
| 4.0      | 15             | Task Description: Maintain ongoing services agreement(s) for software maintenance, support services, and minor enhancements.  
Product: Consultant agreement(s)  
Completion Date: 6/30/2010 |
| 5.0      | 10             | Task Description: Manage promotional advertising agreement to maximize funding and retail outlet availability  
Product: Additional revenue  
Completion Date: 6/30/2010 |

## FUTURE ACTIVITIES

This system will allow SANDAG to establish a universal transportation account system, manage transportation demand, and provide a potential for public-private ventures that could offset operational costs.

This amendment request is to move unspent monies in outside graphics (0104) to FY 2011 OWP 3310600.
WORK ELEMENT: 33106.00  Compass Card Program
FY 2011 BUDGET: $1,628,554 $1,894,758
AREA OF EMPHASIS: Smart Mobility Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Source</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning/Administration</td>
<td>$569,318</td>
<td>$569,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local funds</td>
<td>$1,059,236</td>
<td>$1,059,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,325,440</td>
<td>$1,325,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,628,554</td>
<td>$1,628,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,894,758</td>
<td>$1,894,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Application</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits, Indirect</td>
<td>$767,485</td>
<td>$767,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$922,034</td>
<td>$922,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$494,695</td>
<td>$494,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$483,363</td>
<td>$483,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>$366,374</td>
<td>$366,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$489,361</td>
<td>$489,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,628,554</td>
<td>$1,894,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,628,554</td>
<td>$1,894,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIVE
The objective of this work element is to implement and support the Regional Fare Ordinance by offering monthly passes and other fare products on the Compass Card. The Compass Card program uses advanced technology to: (1) improve fare collection activities; (2) enhance data availability for ridership and product usage; and (3) introduce a common fare product for regional transit customers. The emphasis of the program in FY 2011 includes: (1) continuing deployment and utilization of the Compass Card program, including centralized and consolidated fare payment management for the region's transit operations; (2) completing the transition path from the manual pass sales system to an automated, self-service system; (3) overseeing the operations of the regional customer account management service center for Compass Card customers; and (4) furthering the effort to develop brand identity adoption of the Compass Card and recognition of the new card.

PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS
The Compass Card was launched for public use as a replacement to paper passes in May 2009. During FY 2009, the paper passes for COASTER, Premium Bus, and Regional services were discontinued. Vons was established as the primary distribution outlet, supported by a few independent locations, to provide ease of access throughout the region. In early 2010, the online account management feature for ordering, reloading, and managing Compass Card accounts was launched to the public.
Project Manager: Dreisbach-Towle, James
Committee(s): Transportation Committee
Working Group(s): Intelligent Transportation System CEOs Policy Management Working Group

PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>% of Effort</th>
<th>Task Description / Product / Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | 35          | **Task Description:** Manage ongoing customer accounts.  
**Product:** Customer account records  
**Completion Date:** 6/30/2011 |
| 2        | 20          | **Task Description:** Manage the Compass Card and other media distribution.  
**Product:** Ongoing  
**Completion Date:** 6/30/2011 |
| 3        | 25          | **Task Description:** Maintain ongoing services agreements for software maintenance, support services, and minor enhancements.  
**Product:** Consultant agreements  
**Completion Date:** 6/30/2011 |
| 4        | 20          | **Task Description:** Periodic application system management, including support of fare price and policy changes.  
**Product:** Change control documents  
**Completion Date:** 6/30/2011 |

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Ongoing operation and enhancements to improve program management, reduce fraud, and comply with changes in the Regional Fare Policy.
MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

Introduction

On July 23, 2010, the Board of Directors reconfirmed the previously adopted Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) as refined to include direct service to the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and University Towne Centre by selecting LRT Alternative 1 (combines 1, 4 and 5) as the LPA. The Board of Directors approved LRT Alternative 1 and the No Build Alternative for evaluation in the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR). The Board of Directors also included the evaluation of a station at the San Diego VA Medical Center (VA Medical Center) during development of the draft environmental document and approved the final Public Involvement Plan. A map of the LPA is included in as Attachment 1.

Based on the July 23, 2010, Board action several project development activities are underway. This report presents a summary of these activities.

Discussion

Environmental Review and Advanced Conceptual Engineering

Development of the Draft SEIS/SEIR is proceeding and engineering work needed to support development of the Draft SEIS/SEIR is underway. Environmental studies are proceeding in the areas of traffic and biological resources. Document research on historical structures in the corridor has been initiated. Advanced conceptual engineering work is proceeding and includes: survey work; hydrology and hydraulics studies; utility investigation and mapping; and alignment studies and refinement. Development and evaluation of a station location at VA Medical Center also is proceeding.

During development of the Draft SEIS/SEIR SANDAG staff continues to work closely with project stakeholders including Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), UCSD, Caltrans, and City of San Diego staff. Two meetings per month are scheduled with MTS, UCSD, and Caltrans staff to refine the alignment and station locations on the UCSD campus. As work proceeds, SANDAG staff will be coordinating with a broader group of stakeholders.

FTA Preliminary Engineering Application

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is being developed in accordance with the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA’s) New Starts project development process. Under the federal process FTA approval is required to proceed with the Preliminary Engineering, Final Design, and Construction
phases of project development. Once an LPA is selected an application for Preliminary Engineering can be developed and submitted to FTA for approval. Based on Board of Directors approval of an LPA, preparation of the FTA Preliminary Engineering application is well underway. The FTA required Preliminary Engineering application materials are extensive. FTA contracts a private consulting firm, known as the Project Management Oversight Consultant (PMOC), to perform detailed reviews of the Preliminary Engineering application materials on behalf of FTA. The PMOC additionally reviews and assesses the technical capacity and capability of the grantee to undertake the project.

FTA contracted with the Shaw Group to provide PMOC services for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. A Kick-Off Meeting was held with FTA, the PMOC, MTS, and SANDAG staff and its consultants on August 31, 2010, in San Francisco. On September 1 and 29, the PMOC traveled to San Diego to participate in full-day meetings with SANDAG staff, its consultants, and MTS staff to review the scope, schedule, budget, and other Preliminary Engineering application materials for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

SANDAG and FTA staff worked together to develop a Preliminary Engineering Roadmap schedule, an FTA requirement which lists all Preliminary Engineering application document submittals and activities, the schedule for document submittals and the status. Preliminary Engineering Roadmap conference calls were held with FTA Region IX (San Francisco), FTA Headquarters (Washington D.C.), PMOC, MTS and SANDAG staff and its consultants on October 6, October 20, and December 2.

Preliminary Engineering applications materials include: several plans, methodology reports and standardized project information templates; a project schedule, capital cost estimate, operating cost estimate and project engineering plans. Initial submittals of many of these documents were provided to FTA and the PMOC in August 2010 and initial comments were provided by the PMOC. Document submittals, and resubmittals based on PMOC comments, continued through December 2010.

**FTA Risk Assessment**

FTA classifies projects with an estimated capital cost in excess of $1 billion to be ‘mega projects’ which are subject to additional review and scrutiny. An FTA Risk Assessment is required to be performed by the PMOC on all mega projects prior to FTA approval to enter Preliminary Engineering. Risk Assessments are conducted over a 90-day period with a Risk Assessment Report issued by the FTA after completion of the Risk Assessment.

During the Risk Assessment the FTA, through its PMOC, performs a detailed review of the project capital cost estimate and schedule as well as the plans and assumptions that support the capital cost estimate and schedule. FTA requires that no less than 30 percent contingency be included in the project cost estimate prior to entry into Preliminary Engineering. FTA identifies cost risks to the project and assigns project contingency based on the identified risk which may exceed 30 percent. FTA additionally identifies any risks to the schedule and may recommend additional schedule contingency where FTA believes it is warranted.
The FTA Risk Assessment for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project was initiated though a Risk Assessment Kick-Off Meeting held on November 2 and 3. Participants included PMOC, MTS and SANDAG staff, and its consultants. A two-day Risk Assessment Workshop was held in December 2010 and a second workshop is scheduled in January 2011. The Risk Assessment is scheduled to conclude in mid-February 2011 with the issuance of the FTA Final Risk Assessment Report.

It is anticipated that the FTA Final Risk Assessment Report will recommend revisions to the project’s capital cost estimate as well as recommend revisions to the project schedule. Should the Risk Assessment recommend revisions to the project capital cost or schedule, several Preliminary Engineering application materials would need to be revised and resubmitted to the FTA.

The anticipated date for FTA to approve SANDAG’s Preliminary Engineering application for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is undetermined, however, based on the current Roadmap schedule will be subsequent to issuance of the February 2011 Final Risk Assessment Report.

**Project Capital Cost Estimate and Schedule**

The preliminary project capital cost estimate and project schedule were submitted to FTA for review in August 2010. The PMOC provided preliminary comments on the project capital cost estimate and project schedule and based on those comments both the capital cost estimate and schedule were revised.

As noted above, the capital cost estimate and project schedule continue to be under review as part of the FTA Risk Assessment. Any FTA recommended revisions to the capital cost estimate and project schedule will be included in the February 2011 Final Risk Assessment Report.

**Funds Expended to Date**

Funds expended to date on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project total approximately $39.2 million. Of the total funds expended, approximately $20 million was expended by the Metropolitan Transit Development Board in 1992 to buy the railroad right-of-way from Old Town Transit Center (Taylor Street) the northern limit of the City of San Diego.

Approximately $19.2 million of the funds expended to date were expended on project development including preparation of the: Mid-Coast Corridor Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (AA/DEIS/DEIR), February 1995; Mid-Coast Corridor Final Environmental Impact Report, December 1995; Mid-Coast Corridor Balboa Extension Final Environmental Impact Statement, June 2001; Preliminary Engineering for the Balboa Extension; and the Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit Extension Locally Preferred Alternative Update Summary, March 2004, and other related studies.

Funds expended to date also include the work performed from 2008 to 2010 including preparation of the Draft and Final Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Reports; the modeling and engineering work to support these reports; public scoping for the draft environmental document and other public involvement activities; preparation of the FTA Preliminary Engineering Application documents; and initial development of the Draft SEIS/SEIR and the engineering work to support its development.
Public Involvement

Public involvement activities, consistent with the final Public Involvement Plan, have continued. The Project Working Group met on October 6, 2010, and received an update on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project development activities. Presentations on the Project were made to several groups including the La Jolla Village Community Council, the University Community Planning Group, and the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) San Diego Section General Meeting. Regular Mid-Coast newsletters are being distributed to the Mid-Coast stakeholder list. The Project Working Group is scheduled to meet early in 2011.

Next Steps

Development of the Draft SEIS/SEIR and the engineering work to support its development will continue. SANDAG staff will continue to work with FTA and PMOC staff to successfully complete the FTA Preliminary Engineering application documentation.

After FTA issuance of the Final Risk Assessment Report, anticipated in mid-February 2011, staff will report on its recommendations and the potential revisions to the project capital cost estimate and project schedule.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachment: 1. Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Locally Preferred Alternative Map

Key Staff Contact: Leslie Blanda, (619) 699-6907, lbl@sandag.org
Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

July 2010

Locally Preferred Alternative

- Light Rail Transit
- Trolley Station
- Transit Center

Existing Rail

- Trolley – Green Line
- Trolley – Blue Line
- COASTER Line
- Trolley Station
- COASTER Station
- Transit Center

LRT route and transit locations are approximate and for illustrative purposes only.
Christian Chaffee

From: "Christian Chaffee" <finearts@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, January 07, 2011 8:25 AM
Subject: Loss of redevelopment funds

Good Morning trusted members of SANDAG,

You will recall I addressed SANDAG in early December regarding the potential benefits of utilizing the historic Class 1 streetcars on a historic streetcars system in our city.

I want you to know, that whenever I speak, it is being taped. You will see it the video clips on Twitter, Facebook, Youtube, and our website sandiegohistoricstreetcars.org, where it is followed by thousands of San Diegans.

I am here today to bring you, and our city good news ...which can lead to prosperity, and continued growth.

In yesterday's Union Tribune, I read that Jerry Brown may have to divert all redevelopment money, and use it to help the state cover a 28 billion dollar deficit.

San Diego stands to lose more than $400 million in redevelopment money. This will translate into an additional burden on city government, as we will have to fund local bond payments from the regular city budget.

This loss of redevelopment money would delay the building of the Chargers new stadium, and postpone the beautifying of our waterfront, as well as having a negative impact on all revitalization projects all over the county, all of which ...will be delayed or scuttled.

This loss of redevelopment money for one year, will have a trickle effect which will cause years of delays, as underfunded projects will languish, and lead to additional financial burdens, as many private investors will abandon their associated projects.

San Diego's leaders need to look for alternative forms of funding now...to keep our redevelopment projects on track.

Since future state funding will likely be reduced if not entirely cut off, our city's leaders must find ways to garner federal funds, to make continuing redevelopment in our city possible.

Once again, the historic Class 1 streetcars can be part of the solution. Once these big and beautiful antique streetcars are running on any part of the original lines, they will meet the final criteria for National Historic Landmark status. The line to Balboa Park would meet this qualification, and be the best way to celebrate the upcoming Centennial in 2015. The historic Class 1 streetcars provide a unique opportunity for San Diego to tap into federal funds set aside for the restoration of historic transportation systems.

The historic Class 1 streetcar system will be a great way to advertise our city, and will provide needed inner city transportation system that our citizens and tourists will
ride. This will provide for new guidelines for growth, and can be the beginning of the transformation of our city as a whole.

The cost to get the Class 1 streetcars running to Balboa Park, is minuscule compared to the money which can be brought to San Diego once National Historic Landmark status is granted.

Federal funding is not like a bond issue, because it never has to be paid back. In addition, it will make every old inner city neighborhood that the historic streetcars operate in, an official National Historic Streetcar District. This will qualify property owners for grants to improve their properties and will have a trickle effect which will revitalize businesses, create jobs, and benefit all San Diegans. This will increase the tax base for our beleaguered city, and help bring us all prosperity.

Our citizens deserve to be represented by those leaders who bring financial relief to our citizens, who have endured eroding property values and high unemployment rates. Now is the time to pull together, and make this dream a reality.

If you recall I am an antique dealer. I will be exhibiting one of the San Diego Class 1 streetcars at the Del Mar antique show on Jan 21-23, and I am inviting all of you... to come see it for yourselves.

Again, I am requesting the opportunity to make a formal presentation to SANDAG.

Christian T. Chaffee
A road to nowhere...

Subtract road connections, add freeway gridlock

After World War II and through the 1960s, San Diego County saw its share of unprecedented growth—aided by major roads that were built or expanded without opposition. In particular, development in the east, from North Park to El Cajon, saw the establishment and improvement of six major east-west surface roads running parallel to Interstate 8 and state Route 52. Those roads—Mission Gorge Road, Broadway in El Cajon (which becomes Fletcher Parkway), El Cajon Boulevard, University Avenue, Broadway in San Diego and Imperial Avenue— all feature at least two lanes in either direction, giving drivers excellent alternatives to freeways.

Unfortunately, North County and several other areas have not been so lucky. It has seen many road segments opposed and deleted by environmentalists, robbing motorists of valuable alternatives to congested lanes on interstates 5, 15 and 805.

This lack of contiguous surface streets force many drivers to use freeways for short trips, interfering with commuter traffic. In recent years opposition to completion of segments of local road projects has escalated in North City and North County. Opposition continues, resulting in more traffic congestion.

With the lack of affordable housing, more and more workers have bought homes in Temecula, where about 37 percent of new homeowners commute on Interstate 15 to jobs in San Diego. Even El Centro, about 110 miles from downtown San Diego, is becoming a place for commuters to buy more affordable homes.

Commute time from Temecula, 60 miles north, is typically at least two hours. El Centro is quicker.

Environmentalists have led the way in deleting segments of some very important local roads, particularly in northern areas of the city of San Diego. Segments of Camino Ruiz and Camino Santa Fe between state Route 56 and Mira Mesa, and even a segment of Sorrento Valley Road that was only closed temporarily for construction on connection of state Route 55, have been eliminated.

The city has sided with the opponents by eliminating the use of local road alternatives for many drivers who use freeways.

One question is, why was the name of Camino Ruiz on the north side of the Penasquitos Preserve changed to Camino Del Sur? Prior to the change, Camino Ruiz was the name on both sides of the Preserve. Some say it was done to help eliminate the argument that Camino Ruiz should be connected as planned.

Interstate 8 going into the Pine Valley area has a bridge high above the canyon that protects the environment. Why can’t that be done to complete local road connections to Mira Mesa, an area of many jobs.

Another key local road segment that has been deleted is at Regents Road. That would help relieve traffic congestion in the UTC/University City areas, including Genesee Avenue, and tie into state Route 52. A few local residents so far have been successful in opposing completion of a bridge over Rose Canyon. Opponents argue that, for environmental reasons, you shouldn’t build a high bridge over a canyon that has 52 trains a day running through it. The city’s Fire-Rescue Department supports construction of the Regents Road Bridge.

The City Council also voted to oppose extension of the Mission City Parkway Bridge over the San Diego River to Camino Del Rio North. The bridge already continues over Interstate 8 to Camino Del Rio South and ties into Interstate 15 and local streets. The bridge will improve access to the large Fenton Marketplace shopping area, Qualcomm Stadium and Mission Valley.

Environmentalists, led by the Sierra Club, argued that by crossing the river the bridge extension would hurt the environment. The City Council voted to oppose the project and ignored the fact that there are already 30 existing road, trolley and Coaster crossings of the San Diego River from Ocean Beach to Lakeside. Many of the existing crossings go right through the River areas and are not bridges over the river, like the 31st crossing was planned to be.

It’s crucial that we relieve traffic congestion on Interstate 5, Interstate 15, Interstate 805 and Genesee. A key solution: Add back the deleted segments of Camino Ruiz/Camino Del Sur, Camino Santa Fe, Sorrento Valley Road and Regents Road. Also, complete the bridge in Mission Valley. Those local roads will give drivers good alternatives to using freeways for short trips.

Growth is continuing in San Diego with our strong economy, job availability and longer lives. We must have traffic congestion relief on freeways, and more use of local road roads is a must.

Schmidt, a retired banker and attorney, serves on the Housing and Transportation committees for the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce and served in three state transportation positions as Gov. Ronald Reagan’s appointee. Comments regarding this column can be sent to editor@sdut.com and may be published as Letters to the Editor.

The Daily Transcript

Founded April 3, 1886
www.sdut.com
ROBERT L. LOOMIS, Publisher
REO CARR, Editor in Chief
Joseph Guerzini, Managing Editor
Dear Coleen,

I welcome your direct comments and would also appreciate it if you would forward to the members of the Transportation Committee. Your confirmation is requested.

The proposed widening of I-5 to 14 lanes through 2050 must be stopped.

Any local planning or regional organization whose vision to 2050 for the I-5 corridor only seems more lanes for cars and trucks is failing this region in the worst possible way. This is a massive and irreparable failure in foresight for use of a very limited and rare North-South land resource; the I-5 through North County. More lanes for cars and trucks are a failed planning strategy that remains locked in the 1950’s. It fails to address the need to alter people’s transportation preferences by providing a convenient, fast, reliable alternative, in the right locations. If this current plan proceeds, we will reach 2050 with still choked roads and a lost opportunity to use the I-5 land resource to promote change through intelligent management of this very rare and limited land resource.

What should “only” be built along this right-of-way is a dual track extension of the San Diego Trolley, all the way up to Oceanside, connecting with the Sprinter. SANDAG and Caltrans will point to the Amtrak/Coaster route as the rail strategy, but that can only be one part of the system, it runs right along the coast while the I-5 corridor is in the right location for access by the regions residents and for easier station building and location choices. Besides, you can never have a fast frequent system sharing the Amtrak freight lines; a good resource, but in the wrong location.

There are ample opportunities all along the I-5 route for frequent stations where residents can access the trains, which would run every 10mins during rush hours. Further the route would include a station at the Fair Grounds and pass through the high tech areas around Qualcomm around Mira Mesa Blvd., offering the thousand of employees there a better way to get to work.

Forget about the “managed lanes, the direct access overpasses”; they are a waste of time, just look at the I-15 for proof, let’s build train stations and a convenient, fast moving commuter rail system within the I-5 corridor! This is what is needed along with some real foresight and creativity by CALTRANS and SANDAG.

Included is a copy of my submission on the I-5 EIR.

Regards,
Hugh Cree
1051 Freedom Ct
Del Mar CA 92014
Dear Shay Lynn Harrison,

Below contains our response to the EIR: I-5 North Coastal Corridor Project 2012-2050.

We look forward to receiving your responses to our questions and are open to participate with and discuss all items with the Transportation Department at any time, related to our comments and alternatives proposed.

Project statement contained in Chapter 2 – Project Alternatives sec 2.1:

.....This (project) included the goal to provide the full range of transportation modal alternatives that are cost-effective, promote and provide incentives for ridesharing and alternative modes, accommodate regional and interregional freight movements, minimize environmental and community impacts.

Response to the EIR: I-5 North Coastal Corridor Project 2012-2050

The I-5 North Coastal Corridor Project 2012-2050 project cannot proceed as described with the proposed build-out options because none of those options achieve the objectives stated (above) for providing a full range of transportation modal alternatives. More lanes for cars/truck/buses does not to achieve this required goal.

Not only does the proposed project fails to address the stated objectives it fails to recognize the needed social, environmental and transportation systems planning requirements that are required for 21st Century, San Diego North County.
The I-5 corridor & right-or-way is too valuable and limited a resource to restrict solely to cars/trucks/buses, as is proposed.

The options do not include an integrated Commuter Rail system within the I-5 corridor. This is a fundamental transportation element and requirement needed to encourage people to leave cars at home, by providing fast, convenient and reliable public rail transportation systems.

We do not support any of the build-out options as proposed in the EIR.

Please review our comments and subsequent questions and alternative proposals as follows. We look forward to receiving your reply.

1. **Economic and Social Impact:** This project as proposed with produce massive visual and life style damage, negatively impacting the important North County tourist industry and the lives of all who live in North County. A key attraction and current beauty of I-5, in North County to-day are the coastal look & feel from the roadway; the oceans, the lagoon views and even the center divide vegetation. The proposal will destroy that image and we will eliminate a key differentiator of our region to LA and Orange County. This is a tourist region; I-5 is the front door of San Diego and must be maintained to enhance the vacation area, tourist look and feel we still have to-day.

   1.1. Question: *Where does this proposal maintain our regions tourism existing look and feel requirements, the social and the environmental realities for the 21st Century by the “build more lanes” roadway options?*

   1.2. Long term construction: The construction spanning many years will, by itself, have serious negative impact on pollution, noise, and create serious traffic flow disruptions, further impacting traffic flow, Tourist visits and North County resident’s quality of life.

   1.3. Question: *As the EIR does not discuss or describe the impacts of the actual construction process on tourism, traffic flow disruptions and pollution; please provide the details on those aspects.*

2. **HOV Managed Lanes:** HOV Managed and Toll basedLanes do nothing to reduce the number of vehicles on the road; these lanes are always, substantially under utilized compared to non-managed lanes, even during peak commuter hours as you can see on any day on the I-15. HOV Managed Lanes merely continue to encourage car use especially for those who can afford the extra fees. HOV Managed Lanes will consume a very valuable and limited space resource in the I-5 corridor, produce no benefit towards reducing the dependence on private transportation and must be dropped from any proposal.
2.1. Question: What is the expected % utilization for the I-5 proposed HOV Managed lanes compared to a similar unmanaged lane during morning rush hours, mid-day, evening rush hour and night time?

2.2. Question: What is the actual, measured % utilization for the existing I-15 HOV Managed lanes compared to a similar unmanaged lane during morning rush hours, mid-day, evening rush hour and night time?

3. Noise Impact: Our location 1051 Freedom Ct is as shown “A” on the Figure 1 map below. We have a view that extends all the way south the Del Mar Heights Road (and across the Fair Ground to the Ocean). We have measured noise levels that typically reside around 65-70+ dB, onshore winds appear to increase the problem. Measurements from EIR table: 3.15.13 (page 3.15-14) for 1015 Freedom indicate the following dB levels: R6.14 1015 Freedom Court 67 70 72 A/E 68T 4 67 5 66R 6 65 7 65 7 S602 / Feasible

3.1. We can only expect the sound levels to increase with the added lanes proposed and do not believe a sound barrier is feasible in reducing these levels due to the direct orientation of our home towards the highways facing south. dB levels higher that 70 are considered to be “Very Loud”, while levels around 85 dB can cause permanent hearing loss.

3.2. Question: At what location on the property were the sound measurements taken at 1015 Freedom Ct?

3.3. Question: What do your estimates anticipate the dB levels to be at our location, facing the highway, from 2012 through end of construction in 2030?

3.3.1. Figure 1: location of 1051 Freedom Ct “A”
4. **Public Transportation:** Bus Rapid Transit is the sole public transit system proposed. As buses use the same roadway system as cars, on the I-5 and El Camino Real, their progress is impacted greatly by traffic and weather conditions, creating a system that fundamentally produces unreliable schedules and a low average speed. Buses are not widely accepted as a suitable commuter solution outside of core city areas. This proposal that only uses buses is not acceptable.

4.1. **Question:** Where is the study that shows people will use the Bus system as proposed, how many cars will be effectively removed from the road and how many people each day are estimated will use buses along this route?

4.2. **Question:** Where are the proposed bus station stops along the I-5?

4.3. **Question:** What is the estimated travel time(s) between each stop along the proposed Bus route?

5. **Alternative Option to the Proposed Project Options in the EIR:**

The proposed project does not include any commuter rail system within the confines of the I-5 corridor. The project designers and planners have failed to utilize the I-5 right of way, for anything other than the conventional, traditional “build more lanes” for Auto/Truck/Bus use. This is not acceptable 21st Century transportation planning.

The I-5 corridor is a very limited transportation right-of-way resource; there is adequate, existing, space to include a twin track commuter rail system.

Adding more lanes as envisioned does nothing but continue to encourage greater vehicular traffic. The current proposal can not be approved as envisioned to-day without an integrated commuter rail solution as part of the I-5 corridor. See alternative proposal below.

An Alternative Proposal to those listed in the EIR is as follows:

5.1. The I-5 Commuter Rail link should be 100% electrified so to produce zero direct environmental impact and produce minimal noise from the rolling stock. This will be a quiet system like the San Diego Trolley. In fact the rail can be a direct extension to the Trolley system allowing access to all the major business areas from Oceanside to the downtown Ballpark, producing a potential huge reduction of vehicular traffic during special events and during the every day work commute.

5.2. The commuter rail system will be so located and provided at such frequency of service that people will find this system a more enjoyable way to reach work, go downtown, attend Del Mar Fair events etc.
5.3. The commuter rail system cannot co-exist with the Amtrak rail line due to the lack of a full dual track system and because sharing would create a serious conflict for scheduling frequency of the commuter rail system. Commuter rail requires a dedicated track system and the I-5 corridor is the right place to build it.

5.4. By building within the current I-5 footprint/right-or-way the system avoids the Amtrak rail line that has serious access and line expansion issues. I-5 Rail avoids directing more cars to the coast and focuses them around the I-5 corridor where access to all the major roads is already in place.

5.5. The following I-5 Commuter Rail stations should be built (Figure 1), with Park and Ride and drop off service lanes to draw the local commuter population.

5.5.1. A transportation center north of Oceanside that will encourage those from the North (Orange County/Riverside County) to park their cars and use the San Diego rapid rail commuter transportation system that will connect to the Sprinter, I-5 Rail and the Trolley. Ideally the I-5 rail link should extend north into Riverside County to transit centers along the coastal I-5 corridor as well. The twin rail system provides maximum flexibility for station and train schedule management.

5.5.2. I-5 Commuter Rail station at Oceanside Blvd (Sprinter transfer)
5.5.3. I-5 Commuter Rail station at Hwy 78
5.5.4. I-5 Commuter Rail station at Palomar Rd (buses to Palomar airport)
5.5.5. I-5 Commuter Rail station at Poinsettia
5.5.6. I-5 Commuter Rail station at La Costa
5.5.7. I-5 Commuter Rail station at Leucadia
5.5.8. I-5 Commuter Rail station at Manchester (busses to local college)
5.5.9. I-5 Commuter Rail station at Via De La Valle/Del Mar Fair
5.5.10. I-5 Commuter Rail station at Carmel Valley / Hwy 56
5.5.11. I-5 Commuter Rail would service the Mira Mesa Blvd, high-Tech & Qualcomm corridor east of I-5, further encouraging those who work in that area to use the train to reach work.

5.5.12. I-5 Commuter Rail station at Miramar Rd area would connect with or be an integral part of the San Diego Trolley system.
Figure 2: I-5 Commuter Rail Route and Station Proposals
5.6. **Question:** Why isn’t a twin rail, high frequency commuter rail system, fully contained within the I-5 right-of-way, connecting the Sprinter system in the north with the Trolley system at UTC/UCSD with stations a fundamental part of this 38 year I-5 proposal?

Note: “cost” as the one line response is not an acceptable reply.

6. **I-5 Highway Flow Control Toll Fee**

   We should implement a I-5 Highway Flow Control Toll Fee for non San Diego County resident drivers as they enter San Diego County on I-5. This would encourage those entering San Diego County to park in the free parking areas and use the Commuter Rail system on I-5. Those who choose to continue would pay this access fee. We could even offer reduced price Rail passes as part of this. There are all sorts of things that can be done.

6.1. **Question:** Why has this not be proposed as a method to manage traffic flow into San Diego?*

We look forward to your replies and comments to our questions and alternative proposals.

Best Regards,

Hugh & Suzanne Cree
1051 Freedom Ct
Del Mar CA 92014

hughcree@gmail.com
Safe Routes to School and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan

January 7, 2011

Integrating Safe Routes to School in 2050 RTP

- Expand role in 2050 RTP
- Develop white paper
- Create a regional strategy
- Collaborate with partners, communities, and agencies
Implementing Safe Routes to School

- Increase school walk and bike trips
  - By 10% in 2020
  - By 20% in 2035

Regional Strategy Planning Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft SRTS</td>
<td>Grant Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SRTS Grant Program
- SRTS Strategic Plan
Air Quality, Congestion, and Safety
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Review Existing Programs

- Regional, state, and federal programs
- Efforts in the San Diego region
- Other county and regional strategies

Strategic Framework Components

- Regional Planning & Evaluation
- Outreach & Education
- Funding
- Technical Support
- Collaboration

Strategic Focus Areas
Regional Planning and Evaluation

Funding Considerations
Collaboration and Partnership

Outreach and Education
Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW)

- San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency program to address obesity
- Funded by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)
Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) is a $372 million nationwide grant program to combat obesity and tobacco use. The County of San Diego's Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) applied for this grant and was awarded $16.1 million under the obesity control component of the program by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

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

**Program Schedule**

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

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

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

**Grant Funded Projects and Opportunities**

**Health Impact Assessment and Forecasting**

Utilizing consultant assistance and SANDAG staff, this work will:

- "Develop a GIS-based regional health impact assessment tool to identify key areas where public health disparities can best be addressed with planning and infrastructure investments;"
- "Add health outcomes as a component to the SANDAG CommunityViz sketch planning tool; and,"
- "Provide support for the update of the SANDAG activity-based regional transportation model to better account for and forecast nonmotorized trips."

**Regional Comprehensive Planning Policies**

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

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

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

» Develop metrics necessary to monitor progress.

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

» $700,000 for grants to local agencies to add public health components to local planning efforts, and

» $150,000 for grants to local agencies, school districts, or community-based organizations to develop comprehensive approaches for creating bicycle and pedestrian friendly neighborhoods.

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

» Safe Routes to School capacity building and planning grants will provide five grants of $50,000 for a total of $250,000 to support comprehensive Safe Routes to School planning.

» Safe Routes to School education, encouragement, and enforcement grants will provide five $10,000 grants to fund programs that encourage and educate students, parents, school officials, and other community stakeholders on walking and bicycling to school safely.

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

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

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

*December 2010*
Mr Johnston

Please share the following comments about agenda item # 5 with Transportation Committee and staff.

Thank you.

Diane Nygaard

Comments re Safe Routes to School

- need to include land use/location process

Of course many factors weigh in to the decision about where to locate a school/expand a school. But to optimize the benefits of this program it is important that consideration of how people can access the school site without driving needs to be integrated into the site evaluation/facility planning process. Siting a school where few families live within walking distance or building a massive parking lot are counterproductive.

- no discussion of staff

Of course the majority of trips to a school are for the students, but staff are a part of the TDM picture. The program should make sure it is also considering any special access issues for staff and how they can be better integrated.

- "school" doesn't stop at year 12

Several years ago the RTP had a goal of 10% home/school trips on transit- but school included colleges. The formal Safe Routes to School programs are for K-12, but hopefully the RTP is including college trips somewhere. Several of the local colleges (particularly Palomar) have well developed TDM programs and could be helpful.
From: Mike Bullock [mailto:mike_bullock@earthlink.net]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2011 2:15 AM  
To: Johnston, Phillip  
Cc: Diane Nygaard  
Subject: Fw: Comments Transportation Committee Meeting - January 7, 2011 - Item 5

Mr. Johnston,

Please share the following comments about agenda item # 5 with the Transportation Committee and staff. Please provide and display the power point charts that are attached and highlighted in my discussion below.

Thank you.

Mike Bullock

Comments re Safe Routes to School

- need to include land use/location process, need to include a discussion of Transportation Demand Management for Staff, and need to include Colleges

In short, I agree 100% with Diane Nygaard's comments, shown below this message.

- increasing transportation fairness and choice at schools (effective TDM)

Access roads, car facilities to support student drop offs, and car-parking spaces are expensive to provide and should benefit individuals in the group for whom the facilities are built equally, regardless of how often each individual uses the facilities. This can be done with money (charging and then distributing the earnings) and automation. This is especially important at high schools and colleges, where the members of the student body are driving. I have attached a proposal for the new, $90M high school, to be built in Carlsbad.

Here are some highlights.

Charts 1 and 2 summarize the status and the proposal.

Charts 14 through 21 describe the proposal.

Chart 22 describes one vendor’s view, that this could be easily done. This vendor has also stated that, using license plate recognition, he could include an instant notification if an unauthorized car, that belongs to a felon, is driven onto school property.

I would like the Transportation Committee to support a Smart Growth Incentive Plan grant (or some other grant) to get this system designed and installed. It has clear applications at places of employment. It will help achieve the SB 375 GHG reductions needed to meet S-3-05.

Sincerely,

Mike Bullock  
1800 Bayberry Drive  
Oceanside, Ca 92054  
760-754-8025  
Retired Satellite Systems Engineer, 36 years  
Co-author, "A Plan to Efficiently and Conveniently Unbundle Car Parking Cost"  
Sierra Club San Diego's Transportation Chair  
Sierra Club California's Energy-Climate Committee  
La Jolla Democratic Club's Urban Policy Team, Transportation  
Oceanside Bicycle Committee  
MoveSD  
California Democratic Party Delegate, 73rd AD
Mr Johnston

Please share the following comments about agenda item # 5 with Transportation Committee and staff.

Thank you.

Diane Nygaard

Comments re Safe Routes to School

- need to include land use/location process

Of course many factors weigh in to the decision about where to locate a school/expand a school. But to optimize the benefits of this program it is important that consideration of how people can access the school site without driving needs to be integrated into the site evaluation/facility planning process. Siting a school where few families live within walking distance or building a massive parking lot are counter productive.

- no discussion of staff

Of course the majority of trips to a school are for the students, but staff are a part of the TDM picture. The program should make sure it is also considering any special access issues for staff and how they can be better integrated.

- "school" doesn't stop at year 12

Several years ago the RTP had a goal of 10% home/school trips on transit- but school included colleges. The formal Safe Routes to School programs are for K-12, but hopefully the RTP is including college trips somewhere. Several of the local colleges (particularly Palomar) have well developed TDM programs and could be helpful.
Background (Chart 0)

- Ballot Measure → New Carlsbad High School
  » 1,500 students, cost = $90M+
  » 57 Acres (8+ for parking, 1000 spaces)
  » College/Cannon (Calavera Open Space)
  » 3 Lawsuits (City/Preserve Calavera (“PC”), & Other) + Army Corp
- DEIR/FEIR approved Jan. 13, 2009
  » CUSD signed agreement with Preserve Calavera to do TDM
    - Will consider “unbundled” car parking & “cash-out”
    - Will consider the “pricing of parking”
  » TDM work started on Jan 18, 2009
    - Seth Torma, PTP, satorma@koacorporation.com

Will Mr. Torma consider the plan described in this PP file, first put forth on February 11th, 2009? There is no explicit linkage in the agreement.

Parking Policy Proposal for the New Carlsbad High School

Significant & Feasible TDM, Supported by the Settlement Agreement (“PC” & CUSD):

Extend the Parking Lot Benefit to Each Student of Driving Age, Regardless of How Often The Student Uses the Parking

Likewise, for employees

Adopt a compatible policy for drop off and pick up
Reasons For Parking Proposal, 1 of 2

- Environmental mitigation
  » Pricing results in **less driving**
  » **Less parking** needed
- Fairness
  » Students that never drive are equal to those that always drive
  » Parking is expensive
    - Less than 120 cars per acre
    - An acre is expensive
      - Nearby land zoned multi-unit housing
      - Up to 25 units per acre

Reasons For Change, 1 of 2

- What it teaches students
  » Economics of parking
  » Outcomes of free choice, over time
  » Investment strategies
  » Your concern for the future
- Your concern for the future
- Less estranged, alienated students
- More school pride
Global Warming Requires Action

- The June *Scientific American* states that the warming caused by the level of equivalent CO2, expected (!) within a few decades, will result in a 5% chance of an increase of 14 Degrees Fahrenheit and that this poses a risk of “a devastating collapse of the human population, perhaps even to extinction.”

GHG From Driving

Source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center (epic)

  - In San Diego County, emissions from on-road vehicles are about 46% of regional GHG emissions.
- AB32 means we must drive less
  - 1990 levels by 2020
  - 80% less, by 2050

A High School on the edge of town needs mitigation to reduce driving.
The Future is Now, 3 of 4

Need to Drive Less

From Communities Tackle Global Warming, A Guide to SB 375 comes the following words and plot:

The Future is Now, 4 of 4

Required Driving Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>With Respect to Now</th>
<th>With Respect to BAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1AB32 is based on 450 PPM, instead of 350 PPM.

450/350 = 1.29
350/450 = 0.78

The .78 value suggests 2020 GHG should be down 22% from 1990. We need to drive even less than this table indicates.


Mike Bullock Post FEIR Approval Of Jan. 13, 2010, with background, etc
Results of 3 Actions, Including Cashout
Case (#1), Reference Patrick Siegman’s article in Bicycle Pedestrian Federation

- Company: CH2M Hill
  - Location: Bellevue, WA (Seattle suburb)
  - Engineering Firm with 430 employees

- Actions
  - $54/month (1995 $'s), to not drive
  - Improved Transit
  - Improved Bike/Pedestrian facilities

### CH2M Hill Work Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike, Walk</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 100%

Since these changes are brought about by more than just cashout, this case is not used in the tabulation of cashout results (next chart)

### Pricing Reduces Driving

(10 Locations, 3 Groups, 1995 Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Financial Incentives on Parking Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A: Areas with little or no public transportation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University, Ithaca, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Mesa, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average for Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B: Areas with fair public transportation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC Suburbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average for Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group C: Areas with good public transportation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington, Seattle WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Ottawa, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average for Group, but not Bellevue Washington</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over All Average, Excluding Bellevue Washington</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not used, since transit & walk/bike facilities also improved.*
Cashout Results References

At http://moderntransit.org/cashout/cashoutref.html


- Above reference listed the following references:
The Future is Now, 2 of 2

Consider the use of alternative mode programs, congestion pricing, toll roads, and parking strategies. Examples include, but are not limited to the following:

- Road pricing and High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes. To reduce VMT.
- MPOs should model adding pricing to existing lanes, not just as a means for additional expansion. Variable/congestion pricing should be considered.
  - User fees such as fuel taxes and parking charges.
  - Free or reduced fare transit fares.
  - Expansion of Parking Cash-Out Programs
  - Strategies to reduce the impacts of pricing strategies on low-income individuals.

Consider utilizing revenues from these pricing strategies for projects, such as mass transit, that improve mobility without increasing VMT or GHG emissions.

Set Up Description 1 of 2

- All students of driving age & employees are given accounts
- Cars to be parked are assigned an electronic ID (RFID or other)
- Parking data collection (scanners) units are set up in parking areas
Set Up Description 2 of 2

- Processing and statement-sending computers and software are established
- Data link between scanners and computer is established
- Full cost parking price rate (Charge per unit of time) is agreed upon

The Next 3 Charts show the calculations of student charges and earnings. Similar calculations would be done for employees.
Calculation of Student’s Time-in-School for Month

- For each student, the monthly hours at the school are accumulated, \( \Delta T_{\text{Student}} \)
  - Class time & extra curricular time
  - Adjusted upward if car is in the parking lot longer
  - Un-parked student’s extra time entered by staff
  - Absentee time deducted
- Total hours for all students is also computed for the month, \( \Delta T_{\text{AllStudents}} \)

Student Charge and Total Earnings are Computed

- For each student, the monthly charge for parking is accumulated
- The total amount charged, for all students, is also computed
- The administration fee is subtracted to yield total student-parking earnings, \( E_{\text{AllStudents}} \)
Student-Earnings Calculation

**Definitions to Compute A Student’s Monthly Earnings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta T_{Student}$</td>
<td>The Student’s Monthly Time at the School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta T_{AllStudents}$</td>
<td>Total Monthly Time at School, All Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{AllStudents}$</td>
<td>Total Monthly Earnings from the Student Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$E_{Student} = E_{AllStudents} \times \left( \frac{\Delta T_{Student}}{\Delta T_{AllStudents}} \right)$$

---

**Monthly Statements**

- Monthly charge & earnings
- If charge is larger than earning, the student pays the difference
- If the earnings are larger than the charge, either
  - Check enclosed or, if Board prefers
  - Contribution to Student’s “401K”
    - The total “401K” is awarded to support college
    - If no college, then the student can withdraw the money when they are 21 years of age

*Students accumulating money for college are more likely to go to college.*
Can This Really Be Done?

- Vendor: read proposal; ready to go!

David R. Carta, Ph.D., CEO
TELAERIS Inc.
Innovative Solutions and Rapid Development
9123 Chesapeake Dr., San Diego, CA 92123
+1.858.627.9708 : Office
+1.858.627.9702 : Fax
+1.858.449.3454 : Mobile
email: David.Carta@Telaeris.com
skype: davidcarta

I reviewed your Intelligent Parking proposal and presentation in their entirety. The identification of vehicles which you suggest for student parking using commercially available RFID technologies is a fairly straightforward process. There are numerous, inexpensive passive (no battery required) RFID tags which have been specifically designed for use on cars and trucks. These tags are installed directly on license plates or windshields, can be read from up to 30 meters away, and can be read as cars drive up to 60 mph. Additionally, automatic license recognition systems, used in conjunction with RFID, can provide a high level of enforcement making it difficult to cheat the system, similar to the Fast Track system which allows tolls to be automatically collected.

This is not too tough - we probably would integrate with a service that already sends physical mail from an electronic submission instead of re-inventing this wheel.

Drop-Off & Pick-Up Policy

- Drop-Off and Pick-Up Area defined as the “DOPU” Area
- DOPU Area is monitored, the same as the parking lot
  » Other areas are “no parking”
  » Drop off or pick up in “no parking” areas will be ticketed as a parking violation
- Car in the DOPU area must be authorized, the same as for parking
  » Car must be associated with a student
  » Student must have an account
  » Otherwise, the car driver is trespassing
- No parking lot earnings for any student on their “chauffeured” day
  » Pick up or drop off disqualifies student from earnings, but just on that day
  » Student may have multiple family cars registered to park or enter DOPU area
- Parking lot is also a DOPU area

Neither rewards nor discourages drop-off/pick-up with respect to driving & parking
Parking lot is NOT for students with a Chauffeur
This Protects Student’s Parking Lot Benefit
Back up charts

Mike Bullock, 1 of 3

- Personal
  - 64 years old, married, two daughters, & two grand daughters
    - Daughter Laura Bullock (lives in Walnut Creek)
    - Heidi Franczyk (Parks/Rec Commission & OCNA founding board member)
  - Moved from Cupertino to Oceanside in April 2007
  - Oceanside home (1800 Bayberry Dr) and 4-plex (506 N. Ditmar)
  - Swims with and competes for Oceanside Swim Masters
- Education
  - BSEE, Lamar University
  - MSE, University of Texas at El Paso
- Professional
  - Lockheed Martin Systems Engineer, 1971 to 2007
    - Last 2 years, Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS, satellite to detect and track missiles)
    - 10 Years previous: Milstar (communication satellite)
      - Verification of antenna pointing accuracy
      - Antenna pointing calibration
Transportation Interest: Economics, especially car parking
- Surface parking: 120 cars/acre
- Freeway lane capacity: 1800 cars/hour (@ 35 mph)
- 4-lane freeway cost:
  - 26 acres/mile (?);
  - $55M/mile construction cost ($875M for 16 miles, proposed 241 extension Toll Road, from TCA)
- Transit capacity = (car or train capacity) / Headway

President, newsletter editor of Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (1970s and 80s)
- Authored position paper “Bicycle Parking”: amend off-street car parking ordinances to include requirement for bike parking

Board Director of San Jose’s Modern Transit Society (AGT, PRT) (1970s to current)
- In early 1980’s, wrote position paper “How to Extend the Parking Lot Benefit to All Employees”, which may have been used in the formulation of “Cashout”

Activities
- Obtained Cupertino Council support for cashout (expression of support by 3 of 5 Council members)
- Written comments to SANDAG’s Draft and Final EIR for their RTP 2030, complete in late 2007.
  - Resulted in discussions with California’s Deputy AG Sandy Goldberg & SOFAR’s law office
- Gave 90 minute parking presentation at SANDAG
- Transportation Committee Chair for the San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club
Environmental Mitigation Program

Five-Year Strategy, FY 2011 Funding and Grant Criteria

January 7, 2011

Large Scale Acquisition, Management, and Monitoring

Reduced Cost Accelerated Delivery Implement Habitat Plans Listing of Species
Environmental Mitigation Program Costs

- Transportation Project Mitigation Fund $650m
- Major Highway & Transit Project Mitigation $450
- Local Transportation Project Mitigation $200
- Regional Habitat Conservation Fund $200

Total Program $850 Million

(Millions, in 2002 $)

Habitat Conservation Fund

Regional Monitoring and Land Management
Habitat Conservation Fund

**Implementation Process**

1. $4 million annually for 10 years
2. Five-Year Funding Strategy
3. Annual Funding Approved by SANDAG Board
4. Land Management Grants

Five–Year Strategy & FY 2011 Allocation

- Chart a course for EMP funding
- FY 2011 allocation total $4 million
- Proposed Update to Five-Year Strategy
Land Management Grants FY 11

- Proposed 5th Grant Cycle
- FY 2011 proposed $1.95 million

Eligible Activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Control and Habitat Restoration</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species-Specific Management</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Maintenance, Access Control, &amp; Volunteer Coordination</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

1) ITOC — January 12, 2011
2) SANDAG Board of Directors — January 28, 2011
3) Land Management Grants RFP — February 2011
Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to:

(1) Provide input on the proposed project selection criteria for the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program; and

(2) Recommend that the Board of Directors approve the updated Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategic Plan, the proposed management and monitoring activities and budget for FY 2011 totaling $4 million, and, subject to Board Policy No. 017, authorize staff to solicit proposals and enter into contracts or amend existing contracts accordingly.
### Summary of Recommended FY 2011 Funding Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proposed Funding FY 2011</th>
<th>Recommended Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Developer/Administrator</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>RFP once existing contract expires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Specialist</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Continue to fund SANDAG staff and USFWS staff working on these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Support</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Coordination</strong></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserved Lands Database</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Continue to fund SANDAG staff working on these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Management Implementation</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>Competitive grant process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Land Management Fund ¹</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Contract to qualifying land manager ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Animal Species Removal ¹</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Vegetation Mapping</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Management</strong></td>
<td>$2,575,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Fire Monitoring</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing MOA with USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Monitoring</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing contract with SDSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare Butterfly Monitoring</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Corridor Monitoring</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Wildlife Monitoring</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some activities will require implementation over multiple years.

¹ Proposed new task added to the Five-Year Funding Strategy

² See Attachment 3 for details on use of the fund
Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Status Update

January 7, 2011

Introduction

- SANDAG Board action
- Environmental and engineering work
- FTA Preliminary Engineering Application
- Public Involvement
- Next Steps
Board Action

- SANDAG Board of Directors actions – July 23, 2010
  - Reconfirmed LPA
  - Approved LPA and No-Build Alternative for evaluation in Draft SEIS/SEIR
  - Included evaluation of station at VA Medical Center
  - Approved final Public Involvement Plan
Environmental/Engineering Work

- Environmental studies:
  - Traffic
  - Biological resources
  - Historic structures

- Advanced conceptual engineering:
  - Survey work
  - Hydrology and hydraulic studies
  - Utility mapping
  - Refine alignment

During development of Draft SEIS/SEIR working with key stakeholders:
- Caltrans
- City of San Diego
- MTS
- UCSD
FTA New Starts Process

- Mid-Coast developed in accordance with FTA New Starts project development process
- FTA approval required to proceed with
  - Preliminary Engineering (PE)
  - Final Design
  - Construction

FTA PE Application

- Once LPA is selected
  - PE Application can be developed and submitted to FTA
  - FTA assigned Project Management Oversight Consultant (PMOČ)
    - Private consulting firm
    - Detailed review of PE Application
    - Assess technical capacity
FTA assigned Shaw Group as PMOC

Kick-Off Meeting
- FTA
- MTS
- PMOC
- SANDAG

PMOC meetings in San Diego
- Review scope, schedule, and budget

PE Application Materials:
- Various plans
- Methodology reports
- Project information templates
- Project schedule
- Capital cost estimate
- Operating cost estimate
- Engineering plans
FTA Risk Assessment

- FTA classifies projects with capital cost exceeding $1 billion as “mega projects”

- FTA Risk Assessment required on mega projects prior to approval to enter PE

FTA Risk Assessment

- Risk Assessment
  - 90 days
  - Detailed review of:
    - Capital cost estimate
    - Schedule
  - FTA identifies risks to project capital cost and schedule
FTA Risk Assessment

- FTA Risk Assessment
  - Kick-Off meeting – November 2, 3
  - Workshop 1 – December 14, 15
  - Workshop 2 – January 11, 12
- Participants:
  - FTA
  - PMOC
  - MTS
  - SANDAG

FTA Risk Assessment

- FTA Final Risk Assessment Report
  - Recommend revisions to:
    • Capital cost estimate
    • Schedule
- PE Application to be considered following Final Risk Assessment Report
Capital Cost Estimate and Schedule

- Submitted to FTA – August 2010
- Based on FTA/PMOC preliminary comments
  - Revisions to capital cost estimate and schedule
- Review continued through Risk Assessment

Public Involvement

- Project Working Group – October 6
- Presentations:
  - La Jolla Village Community Council
  - University Community Planning Group
  - American Society of Civil Engineers
- Newsletters to stakeholder list
Next Steps

- Continued development of:
  - Draft SEIS/SEIR
  - Advanced conceptual engineering

- Continue to work with FTA/PMOC
  - Complete PE application documentation
  - Risk Assessment

Next Steps

- FTA Final Risk Assessment Report complete – Spring 2011
  - Report on FTA recommended revisions to:
    • Capital cost estimate
    • Schedule