BOARD OF DIRECTORS
AGENDA

Friday, April 22, 2011
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• DRAFT 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
• REGIONAL BICYCLE PLAN: PROPOSED INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION
• FINANCIAL MARKET STATUS

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS 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 Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board 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 the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Board 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 Board of Directors 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 the SANDAG 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 12 noon, two working days prior to the Board of Directors meeting. **Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Board of Directors 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.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES | APPROVE
   +A. MARCH 11, 2011, BOARD POLICY MEETING MINUTES
   +B. MARCH 25, 2011, BOARD BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES | APPROVE

This item summarizes the actions taken by the Borders Committee on March 25, by the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees on April 1, the Executive Committee on April 8, and the Transportation Committee on April 15, 2011.

CONSENT (4 through 6)

4. FY 2011 BUDGET AMENDMENT: PORT OF SAN DIEGO FIBER OPTIC PROJECT (Chip Finch)* | APPROVE

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors: (1) authorize the Executive Director to enter into Amendment No. 1 to the original Memorandum of Understanding with the San Diego Unified Port District, in substantially the same form as attached to the report, for an increase of $671,320 with a total amount not to exceed $970,000, for the actual cost of services and construction for fiber optic cable installation; and (2) approve a budget increase to CIP No. 1210020 from $42,300,000 to $42,971,320.

5. REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (Lauren Warrem)* | INFORMATION

In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy Nos. 003 (Investment Policy), 017 (Delegation of Authority), and 024 (Procurement and Contracting-Construction), this report summarizes certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board of Directors meeting.
-6. REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG (Kim Kawada)

Board members will provide brief reports orally or in writing on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board of Directors meeting.

**REPORTS (7 through 9)**

-7. DRAFT 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (First Vice Chair Jack Dale, Transportation Committee Chair; Heather Adamson)*

The Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP) is the blueprint for keeping pace with the mobility and sustainability challenges in a growing region. The Plan is built on an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the transportation system so it meets the diverse needs of our changing region through 2050. The Board of Directors is asked to: (1) accept the Draft 2050 RTP for distribution; (2) authorize staff to distribute the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under development for the 2050 RTP as soon as it is available; and (3) schedule various public hearings and workshops on the Draft 2050 RTP, including its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and Draft EIR in June, and set the closing date of June 30, 2011, for public comments on the Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS.

-8. REGIONAL BICYCLE PLAN: PROPOSED INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION (First Vice Chair Jack Dale; Transportation Committee Chair; Chris Kluth)*

In May 2010, the Board of Directors approved Riding to 2050: San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Bike Plan). The Bike Plan includes recommendations for bicycle infrastructure improvements, bicycle-related programs, implementation strategies, and policy and design guidelines. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors: (1) approve funding for initial implementation of regional bicycle projects as shown in Table 1 of the report; and (2) approve funding for initial implementation of regional programs as shown in Table 2 of the report.

-9. FINANCIAL MARKET STATUS (Marney Cox and Lauren Warrem)*

This quarterly briefing is intended to keep the Board of Directors informed about the latest developments in the financial markets, the economy, and revenues, and the strategies we are exploring and implementing to minimize possible impacts to SANDAG.

10. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

If the five speaker limit for public comments was exceeded at the beginning of this agenda, other public comments will be taken at this time. Subjects of previous agenda items may not again be addressed under public comment.
CLOSED SESSION - PENDING LITIGATION AND POTENTIAL PROPERTY PURCHASE - PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 54956.9(b) AND 54956.8

One Potential Case - In re South Bay Expressway, L.P. and California Transportation Ventures, Inc., Case No. 10-04516 (Claims by debtor in bankruptcy) (Julie Wiley)

Property: State Route 125 Toll Road
SANDAG Negotiators: Gary L. Gallegos, Julie Wiley, Marney Cox
Property Owner Negotiators: South Bay Expressway, LP
Under Negotiation: Price and terms of payment for subject property

UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 13, 2011, at 10 a.m. The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 27, 2011, at 9 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
* next to an agenda item indicates a San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission item
BOARD OF DIRECTORS DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

MARCH 11, 2011

Chair Jerome Stocks (Encinitas) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:59 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Catherine Hill, League of California Cities, expressed the League’s opposition to the attempt by the Governor and State Legislature to balance the state budget by eliminating redevelopment agencies. She noted that the League has set up a website, “myvotecounts.org,” and she encouraged Board members to visit the site and to attend a League press conference before the League’s San Diego Division meeting on March 14 at the Four Points Sheraton in Kearny Mesa.

REPORTS (2 through 3)

Chair Stocks noted that Item 3 would be taken out of order.

3. PROPOSED SourcePoint CONTRACT WITH CITY OF SANTEE (APPROVE)

First Vice Chair Jim Janney (Imperial Beach) introduced this item.

Renée Wasmund, Chief Deputy Executive Director, provided the staff report.

The City of Santee has requested that SourcePoint enter into a contract to provide the City with access to SANDAG on-call engineering contracts and to have SANDAG carry out the competitive procurements and serve as the contract administrator on contracts for the construction of certain transportation projects in the City. The value of the project(s) is estimated at approximately $28.5 million, which exceeds the contracting authority of the Executive Committee acting as the SourcePoint Board of Directors. The Executive Committee reviewed this item at its March 11, 2011, meeting and recommended that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to execute a contract with the City of Santee and make the necessary budget modifications to accept the funds from the City.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Carrie Downey (Coronado) and second by Mayor Jim Desmond (San Marcos), the Board of Directors authorized the Executive Director to execute a contract with the City of Santee in substantially the same form as attached to the staff report, and make the necessary budget modifications to accept the funds from the City. Yes - 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No - 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain - 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent - Poway.
2. TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE MODELING: CURRENT PRACTICE AND FUTURE TRENDS (INFORMATION)

First Vice Chair Jack Dale (Santee) introduced this item.

Clint Daniels, Principal Research Analyst, provided a presentation on the current state of transportation and land use modeling at SANDAG. The presentation also included an update on the development of the next generation transportation and land use models.

Chair Stocks noted there were several requests to speak on this item.

Duncan McFetridge, Save Our Forests and Ranchlands (SOFAR) and the Cleveland Natural Forest Foundation (CNFF), suggested that perhaps there is something wrong with the model as it suggests the expansion of freeways. A letter was submitted to SANDAG questioning the model assumptions. What they discovered are two critically important assumptions in the SANDAG model: transit ridership was based on income and not quality of service; and the model indicated that it didn’t matter if we used transit or freeways for land use decisions in the future. He said that surveys show people want more mass transit service and thought the model should reflect that demand.

Cheryl Ede, a member of the public, said she was a fan of mass transit, high-speed rail, safe bikeways, and public open spaces. She hoped the future in San Diego County would allow us to get around by using transit. She expressed opposition to the expansion of Interstate 5 and hoped we would reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Board discussion ensued.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

3. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no additional public comments.

4. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 25, 2011, at 9 a.m. The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 8, 2011, at 10 a.m.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

DGunn/M/DGU
### ATTENDANCE
**SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**  
**MARCH 11, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cheryl Cox (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Carrie Downey (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Carl Hilliard (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Mark Lewis (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Jerome Stocks, Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, 2nd Vice Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller (1st. Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Don Higginson (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego – A</td>
<td>Lorie Zapf (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Tony Young (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jim Desmond (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale (1st Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Bill Horn (Primary, Seat A)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Ron Roberts (Primary, Seat B)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Bill Figge (2nd. Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Dave Roberts (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Sup. Louis Fuentes (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>CAPT Keith Hamilton (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Unified Port District</td>
<td>Dan Malcolm (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD County Water Authority</td>
<td>Mark Muir (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California/Mexico</td>
<td>Remedios Gómez-Arnau (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Allen Lawson (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin Romero (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
AGENDA ITEM NO. 11-04-1B
APRIL 22, 2011
ACTION REQUESTED – APPROVE

BOARD OF DIRECTORS DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MARCH 25, 2011

Chair Jerome Stocks (Encinitas) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:02 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Cheryl Cox (Chula Vista), and a second by Mayor Mark Lewis (El Cajon), the Board of Directors approved the minutes from the February 11, 2011, Board Policy and February 25, 2011, Board Business meetings. Abstain – Lemon Grove.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Caltrans District 11 Director Laurie Berman stated that the State 52 (SR 52) extension from SR 125 to SR 67 is scheduled to be open to traffic next week.

3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (APPROVE)

This item summarized the actions taken by the Borders Committee on February 25, by the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees on March 4, the Executive Committee on March 11, and the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on March 18, 2011.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Carrie Downey (Coronado) and second by Mayor Art Madrid (La Mesa), the Board of Directors approved the actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committees at the meetings noted above. Yes – 17 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – None (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – National City, and City of San Diego.

CONSENT ITEMS (4 through 8)

4. FY 2012 TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (APPROVE)

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) have developed their capital Improvement programs (CIPs) for FY 2012, which are the basis for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 Urbanized Area formula fund grant, the Section 5309 Rail Modernization formula fund grant, and the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) amendment for transportation projects. SANDAG is responsible for programming these funds and approving these grants. The Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the FY 2012 CIPs for the
San Diego region (MTS and NCTD); (2) approve the submittal of FTA Sections 5307 and 5309 applications for the San Diego region (SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD); and (3) adopt Resolution No. 2011-14, in substantially the same form as attached to the report, approving Amendment No. 6 to the 2010 RTIP.

5. NATIONAL BIKE MONTH 2011 (APPROVE)

This May, SANDAG will sponsor National Bike Month 2011 with help in part from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the County of San Diego. This nationally recognized event occurs annually and includes our premiere bicycle commuting event, Bike to Work Day, on Friday, May 20, 2011. The Board of Directors was asked to approve Resolution No. 2011-15 in support of May 2011 as National Bike Month, and to encourage member agencies to approve similar proclamations.

6. FY 2010 REQUESTS FOR EXCEPTIONS TO TransNet EXTENSION ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS (APPROVE)

MTS and the City of Oceanside did not meet certain eligibility requirements as noted in their draft FY 2010 TransNet annual compliance audits. Both agencies are requesting approval of certain exceptions, as permitted by the TransNet Extension Ordinance. The Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors, acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, approve: (1) the MTS request to exclude from the total FY 2010 operating cost per revenue vehicle hour for bus services calculation certain cost increases that were due to external events entirely beyond the control of MTS, as permitted under Section 4(C)5 of the TransNet Extension Ordinance; and (2) the City of Oceanside’s request for special circumstances to allow three additional years in which to meet its FY 2010 Maintenance of Effort requirement as permitted under Section 8 of the Extension Ordinance.

7. REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (INFORMATION)

In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy Nos. 003 (Investment Policy), 017 (Delegation of Authority), and 024 (Procurement and Contracting-Construction), this report summarized certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board of Directors meeting.

8. REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG (INFORMATION)

Board members provided brief reports orally or in writing on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board of Directors meeting.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Jim Wood (Oceanside), and a second by Mayor Don Higginson (Poway), the Board of Directors approved Consent Items Nos. 4 through 8, including Resolution Nos. 2011-14 and 2011-15. Yes - 17. No - 0. Abstain - 0. Absent – National City, and City of San Diego.
9. SUMMARY OF ANNUAL SANDAG BOARD SUMMIT (INFORMATION)

Chair Stocks provided a summary of the discussion at the annual SANDAG Board of Directors Summit held February 2-4, 2011.

10. DRAFT FY 2012 PROGRAM BUDGET (INCLUDING THE OVERALL WORK PROGRAM (APPROVE)

Second Vice Chair Jim Janney (Imperial Beach) introduced this item.

Lauren Warren, Director of Finance, reported that staff has developed the Draft FY 2012 Program Budget, including the Overall Work Program (OWP), based on direction from the Executive Committee. SANDAG Bylaws require the Board of Directors to approve a preliminary budget by April 1 of each year. The Executive Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the Draft FY 2012 Program Budget (including the OWP) for distribution to member agencies and other interested parties for review.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Lesa Heebner (Solana Beach) and second by Mayor Ron Morrison (National City), the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the Draft FY 2012 Program Budget (including the OWP) for distribution to member agencies and other interested parties for review. Yes – 19 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent - None.

11. PROPOSED 2010 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT (APPROVE)

Mayor Matt Hall (Carlsbad), Transportation Committee Vice Chair, introduced this item.

José A. Nuncio, Manager of Financial Programming and Project Control, stated that the 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for SANDAG was adopted by the Board of Directors in early 2010. Amendments to two currently programmed projects, the Mid-Coast Trolley and the Planning and Program Monitoring (PPM) project, are proposed to reflect updates to schedule and budget. In addition, STIP Transportation Enhancement funds are proposed to be programmed for Regional Bike Program implementation. The Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the proposed 2010 STIP Amendment in substantially the same form as shown in the report.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Heebner and second by Mayor Morrison, the Board of Directors approved the proposed 2010 STIP Amendment, in substantially the same form as shown in the report. Yes – 19 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent - None.
12. HEALTHY WORKS GRANT PROGRAMS: RECOMMENDED GRANT AWARDS (APPROVE)

Second Vice Chair Janney, Regional Planning Committee Chair, introduced this item.

Stephan Vance, Senior Planner, Vikrant Sood, Senior Planner, and Bridge Enderle, Associate Planner, each provided components of the staff report. Under the SANDAG contract with the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency for the Healthy Works program, SANDAG will award grants to local jurisdictions, tribal governments, schools, and nonprofit organizations to support projects that incorporate health considerations into local planning efforts and safe routes to school plans and programs. Based on criteria and a process approved by the Board of Directors in December 2010, the Board of Directors was asked to approve: (1) the projects listed in the report for funding through the Healthy Works program, and (2) the allocation of surplus funds from the Healthy Community Planning Grants to the projects listed in the report, as recommended by the San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency staff.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) and second by Mayor Madrid, the Board of Directors approved: (1) the projects listed in the report for funding through the Healthy Works program, and (2) the allocation of surplus funds from the Healthy Community Planning Grants to the projects listed in the report, as recommended by the San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency staff. Yes – 19 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent - None.

13. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no additional public comments.

14. CLOSED SESSION - PENDING LITIGATION - PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 54956.9(b) AND 54956.8

Chair Stocks convened the meeting into a closed session at 10:03 a.m. to discuss the following project.

One Potential Case - In regard to South Bay Expressway, L.P. and California Transportation Ventures, Inc., Case No. 10-04516 (Claims by debtor in bankruptcy) (Julie Wiley)
Property: State Route 125 Toll Road
SANDAG Negotiators: Gary L. Gallegos, Julie Wiley, Marney Cox
Property Owner Negotiators: South Bay Expressway, LP
Under Negotiation: Price and terms of payment for subject property

Chair Stocks reconvened the meeting into open session at 11:41 a.m.

Julie Wiley, General Counsel, reported the following out of closed session: Staff was given direction to notify the parties to the bankruptcy and the court that SANDAG plans to make a purchase offer on State Route 125 with the price and terms to be determined.
15. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

   The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 8, 2011, at 10 a.m. The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 22, 2011, at 9 a.m.

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

   The meeting was adjourned at 11:42 a.m.

DGunn/M/DGU
### ATTENDANCE
#### SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
#### MARCH 25, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cheryl Cox (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Carrie Downey (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Carl Hilliard (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Mark Lewis (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Jerome Stocks, Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, 2nd Vice Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>James Wood (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Don Higginson (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Lorie Zapf (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Tony Young (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jim Desmond (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>John Minto (1st. Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Bill Horn (Primary, Seat A)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Ron Roberts (Primary, Seat B)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Laurie Berman (1st. Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Chris Orlando (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Sup. John Renison (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>CAPT Keith Hamilton (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Unified Port District</td>
<td>Scott Peters (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD County Water Authority</td>
<td>Mark Muir (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California/Mexico</td>
<td>Alberto Diaz (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Allen Lawson (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin Romero (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The following actions were taken by the Policy Advisory Committees since the last Board of Directors meeting.

JOINT MEETING OF THE BORDERS COMMITTEE, THE COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO), AND THE CITY OF Tijuana (March 25, 2011)

- No actions were taken at this meeting.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (April 1, 2011)

- No actions were taken at this meeting.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (April 1, 2011)

The Regional Planning Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Appointed Lemon Grove Councilmember Jerry Jones as the co-chair of the Regional Housing Working Group.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (April 8, 2011)

The Executive Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Approved an oppose position on Senate Bill 468 (Kehoe), which places additional requirements on Caltrans for capacity-increasing state highway projects in the coastal zone.

- Approved requesting that Assembly Bill 486 (Hueso) become a two-year bill to allow SANDAG time to conduct an evaluation of the graffiti tracking pilot program currently under way.

- Approved the agenda for the April 22, 2011, Board of Directors meeting.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (April 15, 2011)

The Transportation Committee is scheduled to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

- Recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) authorize the Executive Director to enter into Amendment No. 1 to the original Memorandum of Understanding with the San Diego Unified Port District for an increase of $671,320 with a total amount not to exceed $970,000, for the actual cost of services and construction for fiber optic cable installation; and (2) approve a budget increase to CIP No. 1210020 from $42,300,000 to $42,971,320.
Concur with the scores for the 55 eligible projects given by the Local Review Committee for the FFY 2010 and FFY 2011 Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 program funding, and find that: (1) the applications are in conformance with the Coordinated Plan for the San Diego region, and (2) the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 5310 have been met by all listed applicants.

Adopt Resolution No. 2011-16, approving Amendment No. 7 to the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

Recommend that the Board of Directors approve funding for (1) initial implementation of regional bicycle projects; and (2) initial implementation of regional programs as described in the agenda report.

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING (April 15, 2011)

This meeting was cancelled.

Staff will update the Board of Directors if the actual actions taken by the Transportation Committee on April 15, 2011, differ from those described in this report.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
FY 2011 BUDGET AMENDMENT: PORT OF SAN DIEGO FIBER OPTIC PROJECT

Introduction

SANDAG is implementing a light rail rehabilitation program concurrent with regional freight capacity improvements on the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) right-of-way. Part of this program calls for installation of underground and overhead fiber optic cable. The San Diego Unified Port District (Port) also is implementing a fiber optic cable program in the same area. SANDAG previously agreed to install a portion of the Port’s fiber optic cable as part of the SANDAG project. This action provides for additional funds from the Port to construct an extension of the fiber optic cable through an amendment to the previous agreement. MTS separately approved an agreement with the Port for the installation and maintenance of the Port fiber cable in MTS right-of-way.

Discussion

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

The Port, MTS, and SANDAG staff worked together and determined that all agencies would benefit from placing a portion of the Port fiber optic cable in MTS right-of-way on the Blue Line. Benefits include reduced construction cost, reduced construction disruption, and improved fiber communications redundancy and reliability. On September 13, 2010, SANDAG approved the original memorandum of understanding (MOU) to install fiber optic cable for the Port in an amount not to exceed $298,680. The Port has identified funds to further extend its fiber optic cable project, including additional cable in the MTS right-of-way. The Port is prepared to approve a second

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors: (1) authorize the Executive Director to enter into Amendment No. 1 to the original Memorandum of Understanding, in substantially the same form as attached, with the San Diego Unified Port District for an increase of $671,320 with a total amount not to exceed $970,000, for the actual cost of services and construction for fiber optic cable installation; and (2) approve a budget increase to CIP No. 1210020 from $42,300,000 to $42,971,320.
transfer of funds to SANDAG to pay for the actual cost of SANDAG implementing this additional cable as part of the SANDAG Blue Line Crossover and Signals Project. The estimated cost for the additional fiber optic cable is $671,320, including support costs and contingency. Approval of Amendment No. 1 to the original MOU would bring the total sum of the agreement to $970,000. This action would increase the approved budget for the Blue Line Crossover and Signals Project from $42,300,000 to $42,971,320. At its April 15, 2011, meeting, the Transportation Committee recommended approval of both these actions.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

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

Attachment: 1. Amendment 1 to MOU between SANDAG and the Port
This Amendment No. 1 to SANDAG Contract No. 5001512 and Port District Document No. 56844
concerns a memorandum of understanding (MOU) by and between the San Diego Association of
Governments (hereinafter referred to as “SANDAG”), 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, California,
and the San Diego Unified Port District (Port District)

A. Under the original MOU dated September 13, 2010, SANDAG agreed to contract for and
develop a fiber optic network, utilizing portions of the San Diego Metropolitan Transit
System (MTS) right of way and existing infrastructure in the rail transit corridor between the
12th and Imperial Transit Center in San Diego and 24th Street in National City (MOU Project).

B. The Port District has been awarded under the California Port and Maritime Security Grant
Program funds in the amount of $2,200,000 for use on its Port-Wide Fiber Optic Connectivity
Project and the parties believe that additional work can be added to the MOU Project using
these funds.

C. This Amendment No. 1 is to modify the scope and payment terms of the MOU. Nothing in this
Amendment 1 is intended to relieve the parties of their obligations to perform as required by
the MOU unless expressly stated herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is agreed as follows:

1. The first sentence of Section 3 of the MOU under the heading “SANDAG Agrees” shall be
amended to read as follows:

That based on the estimated cost of the work for the MOU Project of $671,320,
between 24th Street in National City and the Iris Avenue Trolley Station in San
Diego, SANDAG will complete the extension of the MOU Project construction
described in this amendment for an amount not to exceed $671,320. The not to exceed amount includes a construction contingency of 10 percent, construction support services and administrative costs of 15 percent, plus railroad flagging costs, bringing the maximum amount of the MOU to $970,000. In the event SANDAG believes this amount will be exceeded due to change orders, increased flagging costs, delays, litigation or other causes, it will notify the Port District, and the parties will meet to discuss whether an amendment to this MOU is appropriate. In the event that a balance remains of any Port District funds upon completion of the MOU Project, SANDAG will transfer that amount to the Port District.

2. Section 4 of the MOU under the heading “SANDAG Agrees” shall be deleted.
3. Section 7 of the MOU under the heading “Port Agrees” shall be amended to read as follows:

As an addition to the amount of $298,680 previously transferred to SANDAG for the MOU Project, to transfer an additional $671,320 to SANDAG within thirty days of execution of this MOU for design, construction management, construction, administration, railroad flagging, and construction support. The transfer amount represents the estimated MOU Project cost. SANDAG shall have no obligation to continue work on the MOU Project and no liability under this MOU or on the MOU Project if this MOU is terminated or if the Port District or a third party does not provide sufficient funding for the MOU Project.

4. Section 11 of the MOU under the heading “Parties Mutually Agree” shall be amended to read as follows:

That a construction contingency of 10 percent shall be established for change orders required to implement the MOU Project. Change orders will be administered by SANDAG. SANDAG shall notify and as requested furnish the Port District with pending change orders. The Port District shall review and comment to the SANDAG Engineer on pending change orders within five working days. Design and construction support costs are herewith set at 20 percent of the construction bid amount in Section 3 of the MOU and determined to be reasonable estimates for these costs for the MOU Project. Parties agree to the estimated maximum amount of $970,000 for construction, construction contingency, design, administration, railroad flagging, and construction support for the MOU Project.

5. All other provisions of said MOU not amended herein, shall remain in full force and effect.

6. This Amendment 1 may be executed and delivered by facsimile signature and a facsimile signature shall be treated as an original. This Amendment No. 1 may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same Amendment.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, these parties have executed this Amendment 1 effective this _____ day of April, 2011.

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

DEBORAH FINLEY
Acting Director

APPROVED AS TO SUFFICIENCY
OF FORM AND LEGALITY:

Office of the General Counsel

Deputy Port Attorney
REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

File Number 8000100

Introduction

Board Policy Nos. 003, 017, and 024 require the Executive Director to report certain actions to the Board of Directors on a monthly basis.

Discussion

Board Policy No. 003

Board Policy No. 003, “Investment Policy,” requires the submittal of a monthly report of investment transactions to the Board. Attachment 1 contains the reportable investment transactions for February 2011.

Board Policy No. 017

Board Policy No. 017, “Delegation of Authority,” requires the Executive Director to report to the Board certain actions taken at the next regular meeting.

Section 4.1 of the policy authorizes the Executive Director to enter into agreements not currently incorporated in the budget and make other modifications to the budget in an amount up to $100,000 per transaction, so long as the overall budget remains in balance. Attachment 2 contains the reportable actions since the report made at the last meeting.

Board Policy No. 024

Board Policy No. 024, “Procurement and Contracting-Construction,” requires the Executive Director to report to the Board the granting of (1) Relief from Maintenance and Responsibility over $25,000, and (2) Acceptance of Work for construction contracts over $25,000. There are no delegated action items to report.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Reportable Investment Transactions for February 2011
2. Budget Transfers and Amendments

Key Staff Contact: Lauren Warrem, (619) 699-6931, lwa@sandag.org
MONTHLY ACTIVITY FOR INVESTMENT SECURITIES TRANSACTIONS FOR FEBRUARY 1 THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction Date</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Original Cost</th>
<th>Yield to Maturity on Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUGHT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2011</td>
<td>2/26/2013</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN NOTES</td>
<td>$9,000,000.00</td>
<td>$8,998,200.00</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2011</td>
<td>2/3/2014</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP</td>
<td>3,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,994,300.00</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2011</td>
<td>2/4/2014</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP</td>
<td>3,000,000.00</td>
<td>3,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2011</td>
<td>3/31/2012</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>4,915,000.00</td>
<td>4,947,830.66</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/2011</td>
<td>12/31/2012</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>7,550,000.00</td>
<td>7,526,701.17</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/2011</td>
<td>2/26/2013</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN NOTES</td>
<td>4,450,000.00</td>
<td>4,430,687.00</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BOUGHT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$31,915,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,897,718.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.82%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATURED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2011</td>
<td>2/4/2011</td>
<td>FANNIE MAE GLOBAL NOTES (CALLABLE)</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
<td>$3,998,000.00</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MATURED:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,998,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.51%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2011</td>
<td>12/28/2011</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN BKS GLOBAL BONDS*</td>
<td>$5,000,000.00</td>
<td>$5,008,900.00</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2011</td>
<td>3/23/2012</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP GLOBAL NOTES*</td>
<td>4,835,000.00</td>
<td>4,950,411.45</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/2011</td>
<td>1/9/2012</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN GLOBAL NOTES*</td>
<td>4,450,000.00</td>
<td>4,472,695.00</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/2011</td>
<td>1/31/2012</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES*</td>
<td>7,500,000.00</td>
<td>7,551,855.47</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SOLD:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$21,785,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,983,861.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.81%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Securities with maturities less than one year were sold and then reinvested in securities with longer term maturities to enhance the overall performance of the portfolio through higher yields.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>CURRENT BUDGET</th>
<th>NEW BUDGET</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1128200</td>
<td>Taylor Street Grade Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>$763.8</td>
<td>$743.8</td>
<td>($20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1128600</td>
<td>Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Car Wash Replacement</td>
<td>$1,050.0</td>
<td>$1,070.0</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129600</td>
<td>Direct Fixation Track Repair - Fletcher Bridge</td>
<td>$200.0</td>
<td>$255.0</td>
<td>$55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129300</td>
<td>System Grade Crossing Replacement</td>
<td>$1,630.0</td>
<td>$1,575.0</td>
<td>($55.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143403</td>
<td>TLSP - I-15 Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>$2,262.0</td>
<td>$2,242.0</td>
<td>($20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350700</td>
<td>CJ - Title V DMC</td>
<td>$47.9</td>
<td>$128.6</td>
<td>$80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7300100</td>
<td>Public Involvement Program</td>
<td>$265.1</td>
<td>$310.1</td>
<td>$45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7500000</td>
<td>Service Bureau - Main Project FY 2011</td>
<td>$195.6</td>
<td>$180.9</td>
<td>($14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7509600</td>
<td>Economic Impact for Cleantech Industry</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$4.7</td>
<td>$4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7509700</td>
<td>Escondido General Plan Update</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG

Since the last Board of Directors meeting, Board members participated in the following meetings and events on behalf of SANDAG. Key topics of discussion also are summarized.

March 3, 2011: California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) Board of Directors Meeting
Los Angeles, CA

- Chair Jerome Stocks testified before the CHSRA Board of Directors highlighting how SANDAG is working to improve rail opportunities in San Diego County and cooperating with our nearby metropolitan planning organizations and regional transportation planning agencies.

March 16-17, 2011: Intercity Rail Legislative Visits
Washington, D.C.

- Solana Beach Deputy Mayor Joe Kellejian, the SANDAG representative and Chair of the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Agency, participated in visits with members of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate, including our San Diego delegation members, and various meetings/events with other federal governmental officials.

March 23-24, 2011: California Biodiversity Council Meeting: Marine Life Protection Act
Monterey, CA

- Solana Beach Councilmember David Roberts attended the March 2011 California Biodiversity Council Meeting on the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative: An Innovative Public-Private Partnership. The State of California is completing the process of identifying a network of marine life protection areas along the California coast. In December 2010, ten areas along the San Diego coastline were approved as part of the South Coast study region by the Fish and Game Commission. The network of protective areas contains several different categories of uses to promote conservation of marine species while maintaining varying degrees of public use. Unique to the MLPA is the application of a public-private partnership to fund the planning process and promote public engagement. The next steps will consist of a multi-stakeholder monitoring, enforcement, and education outreach effort.
March 30, 2011: LOSSAN Board of Directors Meeting
Los Angeles, CA

- Solana Beach Deputy Mayor Kellejian attended this meeting as the SANDAG representative and Chair of the LOSSAN Board of Directors. The LOSSAN Board: (1) approved the FY 2012 LOSSAN Work Program, including annual member assessments to help offset staffing costs; (2) discussed the strategic implementation plan and possible governance structures; and (3) agreed to develop a letter of support for the next round of Federal Railroad Administration grants, including six San Diego rail projects.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
DRAFT 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Introduction

The Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP or Plan) is the blueprint for a regional transportation system that further enhances our quality of life, promotes sustainability, and offers more mobility options for people and goods. The Plan is built on an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the transportation system so it meets the diverse needs of our changing region through 2050.

The 2050 RTP contains a robust transportation network, with a diversity of projects that will provide residents and visitors with a variety of travel choices. The regional transportation network, in conjunction with how local jurisdictions develop land, will provide additional opportunities for walking, biking, getting to work, going to school, shopping, and playing. This Plan, more than previous ones, improves our region’s network for public transit. It provides more transit choices for today’s and tomorrow’s riders, by improving the existing system and by introducing new access to other areas.

Passed in 2008, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) encourages planning practices that create sustainable communities. SB 375 also charged the California Air Resources Board (CARB) with setting regional targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 and by 2035. SANDAG also must prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The SCS must show how the region will meet its goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks. The 2050 RTP and its SCS show that our region will meet or exceed these targets by using land in ways that make developments more compact, conserving open space, and investing in a transportation network that gives residents alternatives to driving alone.

Discussion

The following sections present a brief overview of the Draft 2050 RTP. The 2050 RTP and SCS Adoption Process section describes the process to obtain public input on the Draft Plan and major milestones leading to the anticipated adoption of the 2050 RTP in fall 2011.
A Vision for Mid-Century

The vision for the 2050 RTP describes a transportation system that:

• Supports a prosperous economy, promotes a healthy and safe environment, including climate change protection, and provides a higher quality of life for all San Diego County residents.
• Better links jobs, homes, and major activity centers by enabling more people to use transit and to walk and bike; efficiently transports goods; and provides fast, convenient, and effective transportation choices for all people.

A Strategy for More Sustainable Communities

The 2050 RTP and its SCS seek to guide the San Diego region toward a more sustainable future by integrating how we use land, develop housing, and plan transportation. The goal is to create communities that are more sustainable, walkable, transit-oriented, and compact. The strategy for the San Diego region is to use existing and reasonably expected funding to achieve our region’s transportation and housing needs, while also respecting, and enhancing our natural resources.

The path toward living more sustainably is clear: focus housing and job growth in urbanized areas where there is existing transportation infrastructure, protect sensitive habitat and open space, invest in a transportation network that provides residents and workers with transportation options that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and implement the Plan through incentives and collaboration.

The building blocks of the SCS have formed the foundation of transportation planning in the San Diego region for many years. This planning effort is now focused more sharply on promoting sustainability as our region strives to meet new requirements mandated by SB 375.

The building blocks of the SCS include:

• A land use pattern that accommodates our region’s future employment and housing needs, and protects sensitive habitats and resource areas.
• A transportation network of public transit, managed lanes and highways, local streets, bikeways, and walkways built and maintained with available funds.
• Managing demands on the transportation system (also known as Transportation Demand Management, or TDM) in ways that reduce or eliminate traffic congestion during peak periods of demand.
• Managing the transportation system (also known as Transportation System Management, or TSM) through measures that maximize the efficiency of the transportation network.
• Innovative pricing policies and other measures designed to reduce vehicle miles traveled and traffic congestion during peak periods of demand.

Ensuring Social Equity on the Road to Sustainability

Roads, freeways, public transit, and other transportation infrastructure can significantly influence the quality of life for a region’s residents by shaping access to housing, jobs, services, and recreational opportunities. Achieving social equity in the development of a comprehensive
transportation system is a major regional goal. It requires making investments that provide all residents – regardless of age, race, color, national origin, income, or physical ability with opportunities to work, shop, study, be healthy, and play.

Promoting social equity and environmental justice in transportation planning requires involvement from a wide variety of communities and stakeholders. To continue improving transportation planning, SANDAG conducted a significantly more robust, regionwide environmental justice analysis for the 2050 RTP. From the beginning, it engaged affected communities in the planning process. SANDAG incorporated their issues and concerns into the design and decision-making process, as well as in the definition of affected communities and the development of indicators to measure the performance of the transportation system. These efforts ensured that low income and minority communities will share in the benefits of transportation investments without bearing a disproportionate burden from the system. The 2050 RTP includes metrics and performance measures to assess how well the Plan’s improvements are distributed in these communities.

Paying for the Vision

The Plan is based on current and reasonably available financial resources projected out to 2050. These resources are applied to the estimated capital, operating, maintenance, and rehabilitation costs of the region's transportation system through 2050.

Total revenues estimated for the 2050 RTP are about $196.2 billion (escalated to the year that dollars are expended). Local funds make up 60 percent of the total revenue, with state and federal funds providing 22 percent and 18 percent, respectively. Revenues are phased in by decade. Projects that are listed in the initial years of the 2050 RTP are the same as those that are either already programmed in the five-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) through FY 2015, or are anticipated to be included in future near-term updates of the RTIP.

Offering More Travel Choices

During the past several decades our region has made substantial investments in Trolley, COASTER, SPRINT, and local bus networks, in addition to investing in our regional highway system. As our region continues to grow, the 2050 RTP considers new developments such as the requirement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, our region’s aging population, increasing patterns of infill and redevelopment in the western third of the region, and the growing emphasis on walking, bicycling, and other forms of active transportation on public health.

The Plan envisions an ambitious and far-reaching transit network that significantly expands the role that transit plays in meeting our region’s needs for mobility. The goal is to create the kind of public transit infrastructure and services offered by “world-class” transit systems.

The Plan’s network for public transit is strengthened by reinforcing and upgrading existing transit services, and by pursuing new transit projects in the most urbanized areas of our region with a broad combination of transit modes.

In recent RTPs, the region’s vision for a flexible highway system has been refined. This system serves multiple purposes and accommodates different types of travel. It accommodates buses and other transit vehicles, automobiles, the movement of freight, and bicycles. Most of the highway improvements included in the 2050 RTP offer new express or managed lanes that support carpooling, vanpooling, and bus rapid transit services. The 2050 RTP also recognizes that the smooth flow of traffic on local streets and arterials is needed to improve mobility on highways and regional
arterial networks. This is especially true where public transit and other alternatives are not as feasible as they are in our region’s urban areas.

Freight also is moved on the regional transportation network, and it requires good access and connectivity to local logistics centers and terminals to ensure the efficient movement of goods onto and off the network. In addition to roadways, the movement of goods in the San Diego region relies on air cargo, maritime, pipeline and rail systems, intermodal centers, and international border crossings.

The Plan also includes a multimodal strategy to improve airport access for cars, shuttles, trucks, and other surface transportation. The goal is to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of existing and planned aviation facilities by using all of the transportation infrastructure available.

Making bicycling and walking viable options for everyday travel also can increase mobility, reduce greenhouse gases, and improve public health. Implementing the Regional Bicycle Plan and the bicycle and pedestrian master plans of local jurisdictions will help in this effort. The 2050 RTP also includes the Safe Routes to School Strategy, which supports communities and schools that promote walking and bicycling to school.

Planning in the San Diego region has traditionally been considered as bounded by San Diego County. Over the years, however, our perceived borders have expanded. San Diego County has increasingly close ties to its neighboring counties, and to the Republic of Mexico. This challenges us to think of our region as extending beyond our borders. We also are home to 17 tribal governments, each of which is a sovereign nation within our region. Our region’s distinct characteristics present a variety of opportunities and challenges for coordinating transportation planning along our interregional and binational borders.

**Making Better Use of What We Have**

Reducing traffic, travel times, and air pollution depend on effectively managing the region’s transportation system. Known as Transportation Systems Management, or TSM, the effort is a core component of the 2050 RTP and its SCS. Its goal is to smooth the flow of traffic on streets and highways, eliminate bottlenecks, and enhance public transit. TSM investments in the 2050 RTP are designed to enhance today’s transportation network and ensure that future improvements realize their full potential. Successful management of the transportation system depends on implementing several techniques and incorporating advanced technologies, such as signal coordination, pricing, and traveler information, that make both vehicles and transportation facilities perform more efficiently.

**Incentives for the Path Less Traveled**

In the past, steady population growth; the dispersion of homes, jobs, schools, and services; increased interregional commuting; and the expanded movement of goods all have led to mounting congestion on our roadways. These trends challenged our ability to keep pace with growing travel demands and to operate a reliable transportation system. Improvements to transportation infrastructure require many years and significant resources to complete. Managing the demand for various forms of transportation, also known as Transportation Demand Management, or TDM, can provide flexible and cost-effective solutions. Typical TDM programs include ridesharing initiatives such as carpooling, vanpooling, and buspooling; promoting alternative work schedules and teleworking; and promoting bicycling, walking, and the use of public transit.
A Public Plan, With Public Input

SANDAG implemented a comprehensive public outreach and involvement program to support the development of the 2050 RTP and its SCS. The 2050 RTP Public Involvement Program is based on the SANDAG Public Participation Plan, which was adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2009.

The 2050 RTP Public Involvement Plan outlined specific activities for communicating with the public throughout the development of the RTP and the SCS. SANDAG prepared the Public Involvement Plan with input from the general public, the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), the Policy Advisory Committees, and the Board of Directors. Parallel to this effort, a tribal consultation work plan was developed. To engage low income and minority communities early in the planning process, SANDAG established a mini-grant program to focus the SWG directly on its concerns in a timely and meaningful way, and to provide resources so community collaboratives could reach out to their constituents throughout the process. The public outreach process will continue through use of public hearings and requests for comments from the public on the Draft 2050 RTP as further described below.

2050 RTP and SCS Adoption Process

To obtain public input on the development of the 2050 RTP and SCS, a broad range of media and communication avenues are being utilized to provide information, solicit participation and input, and allow for ongoing feedback and updates. A major goal of this public involvement effort is to reach out to both nontraditional and traditional audiences, to include them in the transportation planning process. The closing date for public comments on the Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS is proposed to be June 30, 2011.

SANDAG will hold various subregional workshops and public hearings in June to allow for public comment on the RTP, SCS, and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The public hearings/workshops schedule and format will provide opportunities for questions and answers with technical staff, public comments to be submitted, and information to be shared. The public hearing/subregional workshop schedule will be coordinated to allow for Board and Policy Advisory Committee members to attend, SWG members to “co-host,” and at times and locations that will provide the best options for public participation.

Upon Board action, the Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS will be distributed to local jurisdictions, the Metropolitan Transit System, the North County Transit District, Caltrans, the SWG, and other interested parties, and will be available on the SANDAG Web site. The Draft EIR will be released as soon as it is available. Anticipated major milestones include:

- April 22, 2011: Release of the Draft 2050 RTP
- May 2011: Release of the Draft EIR
- June 2011: Public hearings and subregional workshops on Draft 2050 RTP/SCS/EIR
- June 30, 2011: Close of public comment period for Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS
- July 2011: Close of public comment period for Draft EIR (date to be determined based on release date of Draft EIR)
- September 2011: Transportation Committee review of RTP/EIR comments
- October 28, 2011: SANDAG Board certifies Final EIR, approves air quality conformity finding, and adopts Final 2050 RTP and its SCS
Note: Printed copies of the Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS have been mailed to Board Members, Board Alternates, and Advisory Board Members. The Draft 2050 RTP, including Appendices, Technical Appendices, and the Executive Summary in Spanish, may be obtained from the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/2050rtp. DVDs of the entire document will be available free of charge by contacting the SANDAG Public Information Office at (619) 699-1950. Copies of the Draft 2050 RTP in printed format may be purchased for the cost of reproduction.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Heather Adamson, (619) 699-6967, had@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3100500
Introduction

The Board of Directors approved the Riding to 2050: San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Bike Plan) on May 28, 2010. The full Plan can be accessed electronically at www.sandag.org/bicycle. The Bike Plan was developed to support implementation of both the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP). The RCP calls for more transportation options and a balanced regional transportation system that supports smart growth and a more sustainable region. The Draft 2050 RTP calls for a multimodal regional transportation system that includes a regional bicycle network.

The Bike Plan, which will be incorporated into the Draft 2050 RTP currently under development, outlines a range of recommendations to facilitate accomplishing the regional goals of increasing the number of people who bike and frequency of bicycle trips for all purposes, encouraging the development of Complete Streets\(^1\), improving safety for bicyclists, and increasing public awareness and support for bicycling in the San Diego region. Integrating the Bike Plan into the 2050 RTP also will allow it to become part of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) mandated by Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008). Implementation of the Bike Plan will help the region meet its goals in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving mobility. It also will provide benefits to public health by encouraging more people to adopt a physically active mode of transportation for at least some of their trips. The Bike Plan provides a vision for a diverse regional bicycle system of interconnected bicycle corridors, support facilities, and programs to make bicycling more practical and desirable to a broader range of people in our region.

On April 1, 2011, the Transportation Committee received a report reviewing the key elements of the Bike Plan, including the goals and objectives, the regional bicycle network, supporting programs, benefits of Bike Plan implementation, project prioritization criteria, and a prioritized list of projects. The following report provides a proposed list of projects and programs for initial implementation of the Bike Plan as well as a proposed funding strategy that utilizes Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds, in conjunction with TransNet Active Transportation funding. The TE funds are composed of funds that the Board of Directors set aside in a State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) amendment to be used for the regional bike projects and funds that were originally programmed

\(^{1}\) Complete streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and public transportation users of all ages and abilities are able to safely move along and across a complete street. – www.completedstreets.org
on other projects, which because of schedule delays are unable to be allocated this fiscal year. The Transportation Committee received a report on these TE funds prior to its recommendation to the Board of Directors on this item. This report also describes a proposal for SANDAG to assume responsibility as a lead agency in project and program implementation for regional bicycle projects.

**Discussion**

**Initial Project Implementation**

The Bike Plan acknowledges the importance of completing the regional network of Class I bike paths, which includes the Inland Rail Trail, Coastal Rail Trail, San Diego River Trail, and Bayshore Bikeway. Although many sections of the regional network have been completed, together they fall short of creating a continuous regional network. Completing these segments will make an important contribution in moving toward an interconnected Class I network and provide additional facilities that bicyclists and pedestrians can use now. Proposed initial implementation of the Bike Plan includes final design and construction for two portions of the Coastal Rail Trail in the cities of Oceanside and Encinitas as well as preliminary engineering and environmental work to advance portions of the Inland Rail Trail, Coastal Rail Trail, and San Diego River Trail in the cities of San Marcos, Vista, Encinitas, San Diego, Santee, and the County of San Diego (Attachment 1).

In addition to the established Class I network, the Bike Plan proposes a number of additional projects to provide a comprehensive bicycle network for the San Diego region. On April 1, 2011, the Transportation Committee was presented with the prioritized list of these additional projects resulting from applying the Transportation Committee-approved project prioritization criteria. A map illustrating the prioritized list of projects is provided in Attachment 2 and project details such as proposed locations and facility types are included in Attachment 3. Proposed initial implementation of the Bike Plan includes preliminary planning for the first seven projects from the prioritized list that would serve some of the highest density development in the region. One additional project proposed as a part of this initial implementation is the 14th project on the list, which is a link in making a continuous route between downtown San Diego and downtown La Mesa.

Three regional bicycle projects have been identified that can utilize approximately $2.4 million of the $3.8 million in FY 2011 TE funds. Consistent with the Board of Directors action on March 25, 2011, amending the 2010 STIP to program FY 2012 to FY 2015 TE funds for the Regional Bike Plan Implementation, approximately $1.8 million of unallocated FY 2012 TE funds are available for the final design and construction of the Coastal Rail Trail segment in Oceanside and environmental work for the Coastal Rail Trail in Encinitas.

Table 1 shows the proposed projects and associated funding sources that comprise the proposed initial Implementation of the Bike Plan.
### Table 1 - Proposed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inland Rail Trail</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>San Marcos, County of San Diego, Vista</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering and Environmental</td>
<td>$1,597,000</td>
<td>FY 2011 TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>San Diego/Chula Vista - Main to Palomar</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>380,950</td>
<td>FY 2011 TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>San Diego - SR 52 to Mission Bay</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>FY 2011 TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>Oceanside - Oceanside Blvd to Wisconsin Ave</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,702,000</td>
<td>FY 2012 TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>Encinitas - Chesterfield Dr to G St</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>FY 2012 TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>Encinitas - Santa Fe Dr</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego River</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>San Diego and Santee</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I, II, III and Bike Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Mission Valley/ Hillcrest/ Uptown/Downtown</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>576,221</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>2. Hillcrest/North Park/Kensington</td>
<td>Planning and Construction</td>
<td>328,865</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class III, Cycle Track</td>
<td>3. Old Town/Hillcrest</td>
<td>Planning and Construction</td>
<td>182,231</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>4. Hillcrest/North Park/City Heights</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>483,661</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>5. City Heights</td>
<td>Planning and Construction</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II, III, Bike Blvd</td>
<td>6. Hillcrest/North Park/City Heights</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>89,700</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>7. University Heights/North Park/ Balboa Park</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>114,075</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>14. City Heights/Rolando/La Mesa</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>94,250</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,558,153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Bicycle Plan Program Implementation

The Bike Plan identifies a range of programs to achieve the goals and policies, and directly support the capital investments for construction of the Regional Bicycle Network by maximizing usage and safety. These active transportation programs support investments in both regional transit and local smart growth development.

The programs are outlined in detail in Chapter 4 of the Bike Plan, and encompass four broad categories: evaluation and modeling, education, public awareness, and encouragement. Proposed initial program implementation includes the five programs summarized below:

#### Data Collection, Evaluation, and Modeling

Proper planning for active transportation requires up-to-date, robust data and model information on bicyclists, pedestrians, and the facilities they use. The Activity-Based Model (ABM) under development relies on more robust data to improve analyses of bicycle/pedestrian usage. SANDAG
proposes data collection efforts to count bicyclists and pedestrians, better understand bicycle/pedestrian travel behavior, and capture information about bicycle and pedestrian facilities and safety in the region. Funding for this program would allow SANDAG to collect pertinent data, establish evaluation criteria and a framework to monitor the impact of investments in active transportation, such as the TDA/TransNet Bicycle/Pedestrian, Neighborhood Safety and Traffic Calming Program and TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program grants. The results of this monitoring effort will be compiled into a report that will be produced every four years, to inform preparation of each Regional Transportation Plan and the transportation models used in the transportation planning process.

This program is proposed for the initial implementation efforts so that baseline data can be collected and a bicycle/pedestrian model can be developed in time for incorporation into the Activity-Based Model that will be used to develop the Regional Transportation Plan update in 2015.

Safe Routes to Transit and Transit Station Bicycle Parking

Safe and inviting streets and station areas that provide residents with the option of walking or bicycling to transit are key to increasing transit use and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. For bicyclists, secure and ample bicycle parking is required for bike-to-transit trips. Funding this program would allow SANDAG to analyze bicycle and pedestrian access around station areas along the COASTER, SPRINTSTER, San Diego Trolley, and bus rapid transit (BRT) lines, as well as demand for bicycle parking at each station with the goal of developing a prioritized needs list for infrastructure improvements and bicycle parking facilities.

This program is recommended for initial implementation to maximize SANDAG planning efforts currently underway for both new transit projects such as the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit project, I-15 BRT, and Destination Lindbergh Intermodal Transportation Center, as well as planned improvements at existing transit facilities such as the Santa Fe Depot in downtown San Diego.

Regional Wayfinding Signage Design Guidelines and Signing Plan

Bicycling is made more attractive as an option for everyday trips when the bicycle network is easy to navigate and destinations are easy to find. Funding for this program would allow SANDAG to prepare Regional Wayfinding Signage Design Guidelines that would provide a uniform, recognizable, and easy-to-use system of wayfinding and identification of locations on the regional bicycle network. These guidelines also could be a tool to local jurisdictions for implementation of their local bicycle networks.

This program is recommended for initial implementation to complement existing and proposed capital investments in the Regional Bicycle Network, and to build on way-finding efforts currently underway at SANDAG through its Healthy Works grant with the County of San Diego.

Cycling Skills and Safety Education

For bicycling to represent a viable travel mode for everyday trips, it must be safe for residents of all ages and abilities. Safety is partly dependent on bicyclists and pedestrians that know the rules of the road and how to share the road safely with other users. This program would provide bicycle safety training to children and adults through schools, places of employment, and community organizations. This training can be incorporated into existing iCommute employer programs and expanded to schools and community organizations throughout the region, and would be ongoing.
The cycling skills and education program is recommended for initial implementation because it can be implemented relatively quickly, due to its compatibility with existing iCommute efforts, and can build on an existing staff effort through the Healthy Works grant with the County of San Diego.

Share the Road Public Awareness Campaign

As more miles of bicycle facilities become available throughout the region, public awareness campaigns can help to increase safety for all travel modes on roadways and paths. A Share the Road public awareness campaign would allow SANDAG to use multiple media outlets to highlight the need to increase roadway safety through courteous and cooperative behavior by all users. Such a campaign would educate motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians about their legal rights and responsibilities on the road.

This program is recommended for initial implementation to complement and maximize implementation of the proposed cycling skills and safety education program. Staff can begin implementing the above programs in FY 2012, with implementation of the remaining programs to follow. Once these initial programs have been established, staff will evaluate them after one year to determine what adjustments are warranted to increase the programs’ success in meeting the goals outlined in the Bike Plan.

Table 2 shows a summary of the proposed programs and estimated costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection, Evaluation, and Modeling</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to Transit and Transit Station Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Way-finding Signage Design Guidelines and Signing Plan</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Skills and Safety Education</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the Road Public Awareness Campaign</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost for Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,750,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding

Table 3 provides a summary of available funding for initial implementation of regional projects and programs, including approximately $12.9 million in local TDA and TransNet and an additional $4.2 million in TE funding. This provides the region with approximately $17.1 million for Active Transportation. The proposed $8.3 million initial implementation of the Bike Plan includes $4.7 million for Class I bikeways, $1.9 million for high-priority projects, and $1.7 million for regional programs. As summarized in Table 4, this leaves approximately $8.8 million available for the FY 2012 Active Transportation Program local call for projects and would provide ample opportunity to fund local bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic calming projects throughout the region.
Table 3 - Revenue Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011 TransNet</td>
<td>$4,328,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012 TransNet</td>
<td>4,502,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Reserve</td>
<td>87,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011 TDA</td>
<td>1,877,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012 TDA</td>
<td>2,115,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$12,911,041

FY 2011 TE for regional projects $2,377,950
FY 2012 TE 1,843,000
Total TE $4,220,950

Total Funding $17,131,991

Table 4 - Overall Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Funding (Table 3)</td>
<td>$17,131,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Regional Projects (Table 1)</td>
<td>(6,558,153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Regional Programs (Table 2)</td>
<td>(1,750,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Funding Available for FY 2012 Local Call for Projects</td>
<td>$8,823,838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SANDAG as Potential Lead Agency for Project and Program Implementation**

Historically, the primary role of SANDAG in developing the regional bicycle network has been to identify and administer funding sources, encourage local agencies to take on regional projects, and provide guidance and oversight as projects are developed. This approach to developing regional bikeways was developed before the consolidation of regional transportation implementation responsibilities at SANDAG and is a reflection of the agency's role as the administrator of transportation funding in the region. Implementation of corridor projects that have a high priority at the regional level have had to compete against local priorities for resources. At times this has led to long project development timelines. Different priorities for regional projects between jurisdictions have resulted in the development of discontinuous segments for multi-jurisdictional bicycle facilities. In addition, educational and promotional programs that could have been deployed regionwide have been restricted to the single jurisdiction that is awarded funding for the project, reducing the program's impact.

To take advantage of the capacity of SANDAG to implement projects, it is proposed that SANDAG assume a lead role in the planning, design, and construction of regional bicycle projects similar to how regional transit projects are developed. SANDAG has demonstrated its ability to effectively oversee planning and construction of regional bicycle projects. For example, at the request of the County of San Diego, SANDAG has applied this strategy to the Bayshore Bikeway and found that consolidating planning, design, and construction with funding administration has improved the overall efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation. Even though these projects are part of the regional bicycle network, all projects still reside in and are part of local jurisdictions circulation elements. On a project-by-project basis SANDAG would partner with the local jurisdiction to establish roles and responsibilities to ensure the success of any regional project.
Section 2E of the TransNet Extension Ordinance provides that bicycle program funding is to be distributed on a regional competitive grant basis. In keeping with that requirement, the proposal is to allocate a portion of the TransNet bike funds toward a competitive process for regional projects to be administered by SANDAG using the project prioritization criteria approved by the Transportation Committee in June 2009 (and incorporated into the Bike Plan in May 2010), and to allocate the remainder of the funds for distribution to the cities and the County of San Diego using the call for projects process described above.

**Next Steps**

With the approval by the Board of Directors of the proposed projects and programs, the project funding will be integrated into the final FY 2012 Program Budget, including the Overall Work Program and Capital Improvement Program, scheduled for Board approval in May 2011. In addition, staff continues to work with stakeholders to develop recommendations on revising the local project evaluation criteria for the Active Transportation Program. The evaluation criteria for the call for local projects is anticipated to return to the Transportation Committee this summer.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan - Initial Implementation Projects
    2. Regional Bicycle Network Prioritization
    3. San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan - 30 Highest Priority Regional Corridor Segments

Key Staff Contact: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, ckl@sandag.org
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## San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan - 30 Highest Priority Regional Corridor Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Regional Corridor (High Priority Segment)</th>
<th>Seg #</th>
<th>High Priority Segment</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Feet</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project 1:</strong></td>
<td>Clairemont-Centre City Corridor (Mission Valley to Downtown San Diego)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unbuilt Bike Path</td>
<td>Friars Road/Ulric Street</td>
<td>Fashion Valley Bike Path</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unbuilt Bike Path</td>
<td>Camino de la Reina</td>
<td>Fashion Valley Bike Path</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fashion Valley Bike Path</td>
<td>Camino de la Reina</td>
<td>Hotel Circle South</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fashion Valley Bike Path</td>
<td>Camino de la Reina</td>
<td>Beckham Place</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hotel Circle South</td>
<td>Hotel Circle South</td>
<td>Arbor Drive</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beckham Place</td>
<td>Arbor Drive</td>
<td>Lewis Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lewis Street</td>
<td>Bachman Place</td>
<td>3rd Avenue</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lewis Street</td>
<td>Walnut Avenue</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>3,789</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3rd Avenue</td>
<td>3rd Avenue</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3rd Avenue</td>
<td>Walnut Avenue</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Upas Street</td>
<td>3rd Avenue</td>
<td>4th Avenue (SB)/5th Avenue (NB)</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4th Avenue (SB)</td>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>4,219</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4th Avenue (SB)</td>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Built</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4th Avenue (SB)</td>
<td>C Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4th Avenue (SB)</td>
<td>C Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>8,746</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project 2:</strong></td>
<td>Kensington-Balboa Park Corridor (Hillcrest to Kensington)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meade Avenue</td>
<td>Park Boulevard</td>
<td>Fairmount Avenue</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>13,975</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Taylor Street</td>
<td>Pacific Highway</td>
<td>Congress Street</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Congress Street</td>
<td>Taylor Street</td>
<td>San Diego Avenue</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Diego Avenue</td>
<td>Congress Street</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>4,459</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>San Diego Avenue</td>
<td>W. University Avenue</td>
<td>Cycle Track</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>W. University Avenue</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>Goldfinch Street</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project 3:</strong></td>
<td>City Heights-El Cajon Corridor (Old Town to Hillcrest)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Howard Avenue/Orange Avenue</td>
<td>Park Boulevard</td>
<td>Sharron Place</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>14,716</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wightman Street</td>
<td>Swift Avenue</td>
<td>Interstate 15</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>3,256</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project 5:</strong></td>
<td>City Heights-Old Town Corridor (City Heights)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Robinson Avenue</td>
<td>Park Boulevard</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>5,077</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Robinson Avenue</td>
<td>Park Boulevard</td>
<td>Alabama Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alabama Street</td>
<td>Robinson Avenue</td>
<td>Landis Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Landis Street</td>
<td>Alabama Street</td>
<td>Utah Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Landis Street</td>
<td>Utah Street</td>
<td>Boundary Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Landis Street</td>
<td>Boundary Street</td>
<td>Swift Avenue</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Swift Avenue</td>
<td>Landis Street</td>
<td>Wrightman Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project 7:</strong></td>
<td>Kensington-Balboa Park Corridor (Hillcrest to Balboa Park)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Park Boulevard</td>
<td>Meade Avenue</td>
<td>Village Place</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>8,995</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project 8:</strong></td>
<td>Park Boulevard Connector (East Village)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Park Boulevard</td>
<td>C Street</td>
<td>Island Avenue</td>
<td>Cycle Track</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- **Seg #**: Segment number.
- **High Priority Segment**: Name of the high priority segment.
- **From**: Starting point of the segment.
- **To**: Ending point of the segment.
- **Facility**: Type of facility along the segment.
- **Feet**: Distance of the segment in feet.
- **Miles**: Distance of the segment in miles.
- **Status**: Status of the segment (Built/Unbuilt).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Regional Corridor (High Priority Segment)</th>
<th>Seg #</th>
<th>High Priority Segment</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Feet</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Centre City- La Mesa Corridor (Downtown San Diego to Encanto)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Front Street</td>
<td>Harbor Drive</td>
<td>Island Avenue</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Island Avenue</td>
<td>Front Street</td>
<td>Park Boulevard</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>3,363</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Island Avenue</td>
<td>Park Boulevard</td>
<td>13th Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13th Street</td>
<td>Island Avenue</td>
<td>National Avenue</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>National Avenue</td>
<td>13th Street</td>
<td>Commercial Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Commercial Street</td>
<td>National Avenue</td>
<td>28th Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>5,469</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28th Street</td>
<td>Commercial Street</td>
<td>Ocean View Boulevard</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ocean View Boulevard</td>
<td>28th Street</td>
<td>67th Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>12,426</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Centre City- North Park Corridor (Downtown San Diego to Golden Hill)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C Street</td>
<td>Kettner Boulevard</td>
<td>Park Boulevard</td>
<td>Cycle Track</td>
<td>5,019</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C Street</td>
<td>Park Boulevard</td>
<td>19th Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mission Valley- Chula Vista Corridor (City Heights to Encanto)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4th Street</td>
<td>Federal Boulevard</td>
<td>Logan Avenue</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>8,974</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Logan Avenue</td>
<td>4th Street</td>
<td>Euclid Avenue</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mission Valley- Chula Vista Corridor (City Heights)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fairmount Avenue</td>
<td>Meade Avenue</td>
<td>Ridge View Drive</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>11,390</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Border Access (San Ysidro)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saturn Boulevard</td>
<td>Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Coronado Avenue</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beyer Boulevard</td>
<td>Dairy Mart Road</td>
<td>Otay Mesa Road/ E. Beyer Boulevard</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>7,655</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E. Beyer Boulevard</td>
<td>Beyer Boulevard</td>
<td>E. San Ysidro Boulevard/ Camino de la Plaza</td>
<td>Southern terminus at International Border</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>5,726</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E. San Ysidro Boulevard</td>
<td>E. Beyer Boulevard</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hillcrest-El Cajon Corridor (City Heights to Rolando)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orange Avenue</td>
<td>51st Street</td>
<td>Sharron Place</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sharron Place</td>
<td>Orange Avenue</td>
<td>Trojan Avenue</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trojan Avenue</td>
<td>Sharron Place</td>
<td>60th Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60th Street</td>
<td>Trojan Avenue</td>
<td>Adelaide Avenue</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adelaide Avenue</td>
<td>60th Street</td>
<td>Tarragona Drive</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tarragona Drive</td>
<td>Adelaide Avenue</td>
<td>Carling Way</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Carling Way</td>
<td>Tarragona Drive</td>
<td>Tarragona Drive</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tarragona Drive</td>
<td>Tarragona Drive</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cartagena Drive</td>
<td>Tarragona Drive</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Malcolm Drive</td>
<td>Cartagena Drive</td>
<td>Alamo Way</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alamo Way</td>
<td>Malcolm Drive</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Centre City- La Mesa Corridor (La Mesa)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring Street</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Spring Street</td>
<td>La Mesa Boulevard</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>3,749</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>La Mesa Boulevard</td>
<td>Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Porter Hill Road</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>La Mesa Boulevard</td>
<td>Porter Hill Road</td>
<td>Grossmont Boulevard</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grossmont Boulevard</td>
<td>La Mesa Boulevard</td>
<td>Bancroft Drive</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Centre City- La Mesa Corridor (Encanto)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Imperial Avenue</td>
<td>Chollard Street</td>
<td>San Jacinto Drive</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Imperial Avenue</td>
<td>San Jacinto Drive</td>
<td>62nd Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Imperial Avenue</td>
<td>62nd Street</td>
<td>69th Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hillcrest-El Cajon Corridor (Grossmont College)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grossmont College Drive</td>
<td>Fanita Drive</td>
<td>Bike Path</td>
<td>Fanita Drive</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I-15 Bikeway (Mission Valley to Normal Heights)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unbuilt Bike Path</td>
<td>San Diego River Bikeway</td>
<td>Wightman Street</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>12,869</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Regional Corridor (High Priority Segment)</td>
<td>Seg #</td>
<td>High Priority Segment</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Feet</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 19:</td>
<td>Central Coast Corridor (Pacific Beach to Mission Beach)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mission Boulevard</td>
<td>Law Street</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Drive</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>4,223</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mission Boulevard</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Drive</td>
<td>W. Mission Bay Drive</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>6,976</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 20:</td>
<td>Centre City-La Mesa Corridor (Lemon Grove)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Avenue</td>
<td>Kempsf Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 21:</td>
<td>Imperial Beach Connector (Imperial Beach)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Seacoast Drive</td>
<td>13th Street</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>8,026</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13th Street</td>
<td>Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Donax Avenue</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Donax Avenue</td>
<td>13th Street</td>
<td>Saturn Boulevard</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 22:</td>
<td>Kearny Mesa-Beaches Corridor (Clairemont)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clairemont Drive</td>
<td>E. Mission Bay Drive</td>
<td>Burgener Boulevard</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>5,225</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 23:</td>
<td>SR-125 Corridor (El Cajon to La Mesa)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Katherine Street</td>
<td>Medford Street</td>
<td>Garfield Avenue</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Garfield Avenue</td>
<td>Katherine Street</td>
<td>Louise Court</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Severin Drive</td>
<td>Louise Court</td>
<td>Amaya Drive</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>4,424</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 24:</td>
<td>Mission Valley to Chula Vista Corridor (Encanto to Chula Vista)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Euclid Avenue</td>
<td>Logan Avenue</td>
<td>E. 18th Street</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>8,728</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E. 18th Street</td>
<td>Euclid Avenue</td>
<td>Prospect Street</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prospect Street</td>
<td>E. 18th Street</td>
<td>Interstate 805</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grove Street</td>
<td>Interstate 805</td>
<td>Sweetwater Road</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sweetwater Road</td>
<td>Grove Street</td>
<td>2nd Avenue</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2nd Avenue</td>
<td>Sweetwater Road</td>
<td>State Route 54 (EB)</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2nd Avenue</td>
<td>State Route 54 (EB)</td>
<td>J Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>11,324</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 25:</td>
<td>Central Coast Corridor (Ocean Beach to Point Loma)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nimitz Boulevard</td>
<td>Ocean Beach Bike Path</td>
<td>Rosecrans Avenue</td>
<td>Cycle Track</td>
<td>10,843</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 26:</td>
<td>Central Coast Corridor (Mission Beach)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>W. Mission Bay Drive</td>
<td>Mission Boulevard</td>
<td>Dana Landing Road</td>
<td>Cycle Track</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 27:</td>
<td>SR-56 Bike Path (Carmel Valley)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SR-56 Bike Path</td>
<td>Sorrento Valley Road</td>
<td>Existing western terminus of SR-56 Bike Path</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 28:</td>
<td>Mira Mesa Corridor (Mira Mesa)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mira Mesa Boulevard</td>
<td>Reagan Road</td>
<td>Westmont Drive</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>6,268</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mira Mesa Boulevard</td>
<td>Westmont Drive</td>
<td>Marbury Avenue</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mira Mesa Boulevard</td>
<td>Marbury Avenue</td>
<td>Black Mountain Road</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 29:</td>
<td>East County Northern Loop (El Cajon)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>El Cajon Boulevard</td>
<td>Chase Avenue</td>
<td>Marshall Avenue</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 30:</td>
<td>Kearny Mesa-Beaches Corridor (Pacific Beach to East Mission Bay)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hornblend Street</td>
<td>Mission Boulevard</td>
<td>Haines Street</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>4,649</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Haines Street</td>
<td>Hornblend Street</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Drive</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Drive</td>
<td>Haines Street</td>
<td>Eastern terminus of Pacific Beach Drive</td>
<td>Bike Blvd</td>
<td>4,929</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unbuilt Bike Path</td>
<td>Eastern terminus of Pacific Beach Drive</td>
<td>Clairemont Drive</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>Unbuilt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Webmaster @sandag.

I’ve been trying to e-mail the comments for Directors April 22 meeting shown below unsuccessfully for about an hour.

I hope this FAX will get to the right place in time for meeting material.

Please include below in background material about RTP 2050 for Directors at the April 22 meeting.

Thank you,

A suggestion for a more informed and useful set of public comments for RTP 2050.

Two areas should be improved in the main document before it is released for review and comment:

1), While Chapter 2 summarizes travel mode contributions to performance, there is no context to compare other options considered for distribution of mode funding. Thus there is no directly comparable rationale for distributions that are significantly different from previous Plans.

2), While performance contributions by modes are given as noted, similar information is not presented for GHG emissions, and associated energy use. And again for other options considered.

More complete information would help establish the preferred option to meet the fundamentals in AB-32, and SB-375 identified as critical elements in transportation decisions.

I also suggest because of these identified omissions, RTP 2050 in its present form does not meet requirement of the SANDAG
Public Participation Plan approved December 18, 2009; In particular Paragraph 8 under Project Development & Participation:

"The PPP will be developed so that critical community concerns and technical issues are identified and potential options to address those concerns are provided. These issues include but are not limited to engineering, environmental, economic, social, and financial analyses that respond effectively to community needs and preferences and satisfy local, state, and federal environmental clearance requirements."

I suggest public understand and response will be much more useful if these changes are made before release for comment.

Walt Brewer
Concerned Citizen.
Catcar38@verizon.net
April 20, 2011

SANDAG Board of Directors

Via E-mail: pjo@sandag.org (Phillip Johnston)

Re: California Air Resources Board (CARB) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Targets, Issued to SANDAG, in Accordance with SB 375, for the Year 2035

SANDAG Board Chair Jerome Stocks and Members of the Board:

I appreciate the opportunity to communicate with you concerning this important topic.

The subject targets were issued on September 30th of 2010. On September 20th, I sent a letter to CARB\(^1\) asking them to issue targets that would uphold the Executive Order S-3-05\(^2\) GHG reduction trajectory, for cars and light-duty trucks. CARB’s Scoping Plan gives no reason to not apply the straight-line trajectory, implied by the S-3-05 reductions, to the GHG emissions from cars and light-duty trucks. S-3-05 names CARB as one of the agencies that must create plans and progress reports to ensure that the reductions in S-3-05 are achieved.

Unfortunately, CARB gave you (SANDAG) the Year 2035 reduction that you (SANDAG) requested, which is only a 13% reduction, for year 2035.

“GHG” is really “VMT” and Other Important Details on the Reductions

These reductions are per capita, with respect to driving in 2005. This can be understood by carefully considering the following two items:

1.) Page 8, of [http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/staffreport_sb375080910.pdf](http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/staffreport_sb375080910.pdf), which says, “The RTAC recommended that targets be expressed as a percent reduction in per-capita greenhouse gas emissions from a 2005 base year”; and

2.) The first footnote in the table of CARB calculations, [http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo.co2.reduction.calc.pdf](http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo.co2.reduction.calc.pdf), which says: “The CO2 emissions presented in this table do not include reductions from Pavley and LCFS regulations.”

“Greenhouse gas (GHG)” emissions are used as equivalent to the more accurate “C02 emissions.” In the second item, “Pavley” (named after Senator Fran Pavley) refers to a lowered average CO2 per mile driven. Also in the second item, “LCFS” refers to the “Low Carbon Fuel Standard”. Both “Pavley” and the “LCFS” reduce the emissions per mile driven. Since these reductions are not being counted, the reductions shown come only from per capita, percent reductions in driving, or “vehicle miles travelled”, VMT. Therefore the so-called GHG reductions are really VMT reductions.

---

\(^1\) The letter is Reference 1, listed at the bottom of this letter and attached in the email with this letter.

\(^2\) S-30-05 is shown in Reference 2, listed at the bottom and attached in the email with this letter.
More Background Information

In 2007, you (SANDAG) adopted your current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). It includes a 38% increase in the total number of freeway-lane miles, in San Diego County. My job as Transportation Chair for the Sierra Club is to stop all freeway expansions, as specified in our National Policy. Our Chapter has commented extensively on the I-5 expansion Draft Environmental Impact Report. As you know, it would add either 4 or 6 lanes, to an eight-lane freeway, over a length of 27 miles.

You (SANDAG) are now in the process of approving a new RTP, with even more freeway expansions. However, your staff now claims that by Year 2035, they will reduce GHG (really VMT, as explained above) from cars and light-duty trucks by 19%. You (the SANDAG Board) and staff can therefore claim, correctly, that you are going to exceed your CARB target, for Year 2035.

However, the GHG reductions of S-3-05 must be achieved by mankind, if we are to have any reasonable chance of stabilizing our climate. A destabilization will likely have disastrous environmental and human consequences.

The purpose of this letter is to show you that the GHG (really VMT) reduction achieved must be at least 35%, not the 13% given by CARB and not the 19% that your staff now claims they can achieve by 2035.

Overview of Relationships and Derivation of Key Formula

The S-3-05 net reduction in GHG emissions, from cars and light-duty trucks, expressed as a fraction of 2005 emissions, is obtain by multiplying four factors together. The definitions of Table 1 apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Factor Definitions, with Respect to Year 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>net factor of the emissions of Greenhouse Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f_Pavley</td>
<td>factor of the average statewide mileage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f_Fuel</td>
<td>factor of the reduction of GHG due to fuels that burn less carbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f_Population</td>
<td>factor of the population in the region of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f_PerCapitaVMT</td>
<td>factor of per capita driving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All are for the year of interest, with respect to year 2005 values. Except for Population, all are for cars and light-duty trucks.

The following equations apply.

\[ f = F_{Pavley} \times f_{Fuel} \times f_{Population} \times f_{PerCapitaVMT} \] (Eq. 1)

Eq. 2 is derived from Eq. 1.

\[ f_{PerCapitaVMT} = f / (F_{Pavley} \times f_{Fuel} \times f_{Population}) \] (Eq. 2)
Figure 1 is from http://www.nrdc.org/globalWarming/sb375/files/sb375.pdf, a widely-respected report on SB-375. Note that all of its values are in the units of factors (same as fraction) of their values in year 2005. Figure 1 will supply all of the needed values, except for the factor of population. (Neither the red line nor the blue line are used.) Its gold line is the S-3-05 trajectory that CARB ignored when it issued the driving reduction values for year 2035.

**Figure 1**  GHG Reductions from Pavley (AB 1493, in Green); the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (in Purple); the Predicted Driving (VMT, in Red); the Net Result of GHG (C02, in Blue); and the S-3-05 Trajectory (in Gold)

Getting the Net Factor of the Emissions of Greenhouse Gas in 2035, with Respect to 2005 Values

To get the net factor of the emissions of GHG, for year 2035, and with respect to year 2005, it is necessary to extrapolate the Governor’s Executive Order target values (the gold line of Figure 1), out to year 2035. The gold line shows that this factor is 0.87 in 2020 and is 0.64 in 2030. Therefore, in year 2035, the factor will be

$$0.64 + [(0.64 - 0.87) / (2030-2020)] * (2035-2030) = 0.525$$

Getting the Factor of the Average Statewide Mileage in 2035, with Respect to the 2005 Value

To get the Pavley reduction factor, for Year 2035, it is necessary to extrapolate the average statewide mileage factor data, which is Figure 1’s green line, out to Year 2035. It is 0.82 in 2020 and it is 0.73 in 2030. Therefore, in year 2035 the statewide mileage factor data will be

$$0.73 + [(0.73 - 0.82) / (2030-2020)] * (2035-2030) = 0.685$$

Pavley 1 ends in Year 2017. It is widely assumed that it will be replaced by what is often called “Pavley 2”. The extrapolation computed here is based on the assumption made by the author of
Figure 1, as shown in the slope of the green line from year 2020 to 2030. Based on the authoritative credentials of the authors of Figure 1, this is the best assumption that can be made. Assuming that the California fleet will continually get more efficient, in terms of C02 per mile driven, relies on an assumption that a significant fraction of our car owners will be able to purchase newer-model cars.

**Getting the Factor of the Reduction of GHG Due to Fuels that Burn Less Carbon**

Looking at the purple line of Figure 1, it is clear that this factor will be 0.9 in 2035.

**Getting the Factor of the Increase in Population**

The factor for population in San Diego County is computed using the populations estimated in CARB’s http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo.co2.reduction.calc.pdf, namely 3,034,388 people in 2005 and 3,984,753 people in 2035. So the factor, from 2005 to 2035 is $\frac{3,984,753}{3,034,388} = 1.313$.

**Computing the Required Driving Reduction, for 2035**

The 4 values computed above are used in Eq. 2 to compute the required factor.

\[
\text{Eq. 2 \hspace{1cm} } f_{\text{PerCapitaVMT}} = \frac{.525}{(.685 \times 0.9 \times 1.313)}
\]

Therefore, $f_{\text{PerCapitaVMT}} = .649$. This corresponds to a 35.1% reduction in per-capita driving, in year 2035.

**In Conclusion**

You must not conspire with CARB to violate S-3-05. Your RTP must achieve a 35% reduction. Reference 1 shows how this can be done. You have a responsibility to get CARB and SANDAG back on a path of moral and responsible leadership. The current 2035 targets undermine S-3-05.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Bullock, 760-754-8025
Chair of the Sierra Club San Diego Transportation Committee

**References Attached with Email**

**Reference 1:** PROPOSED REGIONAL GHG EMISSION REDUCTION TARGETS FOR AUTOMOBILES AND LIGHT TRUCKS PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 375 (Released: August 9, 2010, for a September 23, 2010 Consideration) and the Failure of Its Proposed SANDAG GHG Reductions to Protect Health, Support S-3-05, and be Just and Reasonable

**Reference 2:** S-3-05, with additional comments

Copies: C. Chase, P. Epstein, Richard Miller

The San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club is San Diego’s oldest and largest grassroots environmental organization, founded in 1948. Encompassing San Diego and Imperial Counties, the San Diego Chapter seeks to preserve the special nature of the San Diego and Imperial Valley area through education, activism, and advocacy. The Chapter has over 14,000 members. The National Sierra Club has over 700,000 members in 65 Chapters in all 50 states, and Puerto Rico.
SUBJECT: The PROPOSED REGIONAL GHG EMISSION REDUCTION TARGETS FOR AUTOMOBILES AND LIGHT TRUCKS PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 375 (Released: August 9, 2010, for a September 23, 2010 Consideration) and the Failure of Its Proposed SANDAG GHG Reductions to Protect Health, Support S-3-05, and be Just and Reasonable

Dear Air Resources Board Chair Mary Nichols and Members of the Board:

1.0 Introductory Comments

The time for debate has long since passed. The climate science is clear; we need to achieve significant GHG reductions today if we are to avert climate disaster in the future.

1.1 AB 32, SB 375, What Science Has Determined, and Current GHG Levels

AB 32 requires California emissions, from all sources, to be at 1990 levels by 2020. The years after 2020 are covered by Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05. It calls for emissions to be 80% below 1990 levels, by 2050. These reductions, world wide, would limit GHG levels to 450 PPM.

When AB 32 and the executive order were formulated, it was thought that limiting GHG levels to 450 PPM would provide humanity adequate safety from catastrophic climate destabilization. However, climate science now tells us that any level above 350 PPM is dangerous. Unfortunately, the current level is 390 PPM and this is higher than it has been in over a million years.

SB 375 was written to give CARB authority over cars and light-duty trucks, sometimes referred to as personal driving. This personal driving is quantified as vehicle miles traveled, or VMTs. Personal driving is responsible for 32% of GHG in California. In San Diego County, it is responsible for 41%. SB375 calls for CARB to give each regional government in the state (Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO) GHG reduction targets, for personal driving, for the years 2020 and 2035. SB375 requires that CARB give each MPO their targets by September 30th of this year.

1.2 Scoping Plan Observations

1.2.1 AB 32

AB 32 gives CARB the responsibility of allocating reductions to the various sectors. In the “Scoping Plan”, adopted in December 2008, on page 17, CARB specified only 5 million tons per year as the reduction from “Regional Transportation-Related GHG Targets” by 2020.

The Plan added in a footnote, “This number represents an estimate of what may be achieved from local land use changes. It is not the SB 375 regional target. ARB will establish regional targets for each MPO region following the input of the Regional Targets Advisory Committee and a public consultation process with MPOs and other stakeholders per SB 375.”

The 5 million tons identified in the Scoping Plan’s Table 2 is in addition to 31.7 million tons for Light-Duty Vehicle GHG Standards, including Pavley 1 and the anticipated Pavley 2 standards, and15 million tons for the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. These values are also from the Scoping
Plan’s Table 2.

1.2.2 Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05

On page 117 of the scoping plan, the overall reductions to achieve the Governor’s Executive Order are given. However, the scoping plan does no allocation of this reduction to the various sectors. Since CARB has no published allocation for reductions in the year 2035, it therefore follows that, as a baseline starting point, each sector must reduce emissions in line with the Governor’s Executive Order. Furthermore, since S-3-05 provides no guidance as to the shape of the trajectory of the reductions as a function of year, since climate science urges reductions to come sooner rather than later, and since climate science tells us that the S-3-05 reductions are too small, it therefore follows that the 2035 target reduction for each MPO must support at least a straight-line trajectory of S-3-05.

1.3 Danger in “Bottom Up” Process of Identifying Draft Targets

In modeling “achievable” reductions, MPOs are free to ignore the AB 32 and S-3-05 legal requirements for reductions and the additional reductions needed for public health and safety, in light of our need to get GHG levels down to 350 PPM, as soon as possible. MPO Boards may push for “path-of-least-resistance” strategies, hoping to sell these strategies to CARB as “aggressive but achievable”. Since government’s primary responsibility, at all levels, is public health and safety, and since this responsibility extends from the three branches of state government down to all boards and agencies, it follows that the final GHG reductions must be based on what the climate scientists have determined is safe. Such reductions will significantly exceed those required by AB 32 and S-3-05. It is certainly CARB’s responsibility to address this issue, even if it is in some other proceeding. Ignoring this issue is negligent, since it may lead to catastrophic climate destabilization, resulting in a significant die off of the human population.

1.4 Reducing GHG from Cars and Light-Duty Trucks

There are three things that will reduce GHG from driving. They are “clean cars”, “clean fuels” and less driving. “Clean cars” includes the benefits of more efficient gasoline and diesel powered cars, hybrids, and battery electric vehicles (BEVs). Since some of our cars will be BEVs, when CARB computes the overall average GHG per mile of our state’s fleet of cars, it must account for how much of our electricity is generated from fossil fuels. Most of our electricity will come from fossil fuels for many years, perhaps several decades. “Clean fuel” refers to fossil fuel formulated to have more hydrogen and less carbon, to result in less GHG emissions. “Clean fuel”, referred to as Low Carbon Fuel Standards (LCFS) fuel, is expected to provide a 10% emission reduction by 2020, but no more after that. This paper uses the LCFS factor of nine-tenths for both 2020 and 2035, even though this may be overestimating reductions in 2035 because the factor is inappropriate for BEVs and the number of BEVs could become significant by 2035.

For at least the next decade and perhaps much longer, less driving will be needed to provide a large reduction in GHG, relative to current 2010 levels.

These factors can be observed in Figure 1 of an analysis by S. Winkleman, based on CalTrans VMT forecast (red line), AB 1493 (“Pavley”, green line), and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS, purple line), compared with the AB 32 target of 1990 levels (light blue line). This Figure has been placed into this document for convenience. Note that the dark blue line, which combines all three factors, shows how the projected increase in VMT overwhelms GHG savings from cleaner fuels and vehicles. Decreasing VMT is the objective of SB 375.

2.0 Comments on the Introduction and Sections I and II of the Staff Report of August 9, 2010

2.1 Introduction (Page 1)

Some of the discussion contained in this section shows significant oversights.

For example, it says, “Planning strategies that promote social equity, such as affordable housing, accessible transit, and jobs-housing fit, are recognized as effective means of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. MPOs should promote equitable land use and transportation practices that result in inclusion, accessibility, efficient use of land, and decreased emissions.”

If CARB wants to mention equity, it should also discuss the most prevalent and significant forms of transportation-related practices which are unfair. The state of California funds roads with sources of revenue (sales taxes, property taxes, income taxes, and so-called “development fees”) that are unrelated to the decision to drive. This is unfair to those that drive less than average and it greatly increases driving. Similarly, the high cost of parking is generally hidden and forced upon everyone that pays rent, receives a wage, buys food, rides on a train with so called “free parking” at the station, and so on. This is unfair and should be fixed through good legislation. If government funding is involved, such as community colleges or housing with government subsidies, bundled parking cost violates equal protection of the law, and is therefore unconstitutional. As an example of the inequity, at an apartment where the cost of parking is bundled into the cost of the rent, families with no car could be paying rent that is $50 or even $100 dollars a month more than what it would be if the parking rent was separated out. This could be forcing families living on a monthly paycheck to go without adequate food at the end of the month, in order to pay the higher rent. Their neighbor could own many cars and be paying the exact same rent. CARB seems to be blind to these inequities that help families drive and park cars,
at the expense of families that happen to own fewer than the average number of cars or drive less than an average amount.

The introduction should also include the fact that CARB has a legal responsibility to set the MPO reductions so that the overall reductions needed by AB32 and the Governor’s Executive Order straight-line trajectory are met. This is discussed in Section 1 of this letter.

### 2.2 Section I, California’s Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (Page 4)

The following words tend to obscure the fact that state government has a responsibility to correct significant unfairness if local governments fail to do so:

While SB 375 requires regions to consider a variety of greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies, it reaffirms local government authority over land use decisions, and recognizes the critical role local governments play in implementing these kinds of strategies.

SB 375 does not reaffirm local control. SB 375 simply goes along with the common convention that state law usually does not interfere with local government authority over land-use decisions and car-parking policies. Unbundling the cost of parking happens to be a key strategy that could reduce driving. In addition, allowing the cost of parking to be hidden and forced upon even those that do not use the parking is so unfair that it calls for state intervention to protect those harmed. Where government support is involved, such as at schools and subsidized housing, the equal protection of the law, which is guaranteed by our constitution, is being denied those that do not park a car. The opinioned comment about “reaffirming local control” tends to obscure this profound and relevant fact. Since convenient and transparent car-parking reform will require both new hardware and software design and implementation, it is both logical and efficient for the state to play a major role.

Under the heading “AIR RESOURCES BOARD ROLE” on Page 6, comes the following true but insufficient statement:

ARB’s primary responsibility is to set greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets for passenger vehicles for each of California’s 18 federally designated MPOs by September 30, 2010. Targets are to be set for 2020 and 2035. In establishing the targets, ARB must take into account greenhouse gas reductions that will come from improved vehicle emission standards, changes in fuel composition, and other measures that it has adopted.

What this covers up is CARB’s responsibility to set these targets to at least meet the overall reduction requirements of AB 32 and the Governor’s Executive Order. However, this is not enough. CARB also has a responsibility to select targets that set an example, such that if the world followed California’s lead, humanity would avoid the devastation of a destabilized climate. The last sentence about what ARB must take into account is a technical detail. The profound truth that is fundamental to ARB’s mission is overlooked.

### 2.3 Section II, Target Setting Process (Page 8)

On page 16, under “Challenge of 2035 Targets” comes an admission which shows what a poor job CARB and the MPOs have done so far. It says:

There are several forecasting assumptions that may have a significant impact on greenhouse gas emission reductions in 2035. The cost of travel is one. It can affect travel behavior by influencing mode choice, as well as the frequency and length of trips. Uncertainties in predicting the cost of travel – which may include the purchase, maintenance, and fuel for a vehicle; transit fares; or travel fees in the form of tolls, parking pricing, or other costs – add to the challenge of setting 2035 targets. In addition, although the current models used by MPOs
have embedded travel costs, most do not yet account for the impacts of changes in travel cost on travel.

Rezoning for smart growth will not reduce VMT until projects get built. Getting projects built takes time. The amount of time required and the likelihood that a project will ever get built is dependant on the economy. Similarly, since good transit is expensive to build, it also depends on our economy. Finally, the extent to which California citizens decide to trade in their car for a more efficient model also depends on the economy. This shows that the strategies involving smart growth, transit, and Pavley are highly dependent on our economy, over which neither CARB nor the MPOs have much control. However, correcting the fundamental unfairness of how we pay for parking and driving is not dependent on the economy because it costs less than nothing. It costs less than nothing because if we properly price driving and parking, we will save money on road use, on not needing to build more roads, and on not needing as much car parking. Such strategies would yield immediate and significant VMT reductions. The above paragraph, from page 16 of the subject document shows how little thinking CARB and the MPOs been done on these two crucial strategies.

Nowhere in the target-setting process section does it show how targets are set to support AB32 and S-3-05.

3.0 Evaluation of the Proposed SANDAG Targets (Page 8)

On page 26, the values shown in Table 1 are given.

It is important to note the implications of the asterisked footnote and the fact that this target is per capita. It means that the calculation of the net GHG reduction estimates from these numbers require the use of factors to account for population growth, the Pavley reductions (“Pavley”), and the LCFS reductions, which can be taken from Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita GHG Reduction</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent reduction numbers do not include emission reductions expected from Pavley Greenhouse Gas Vehicle Standards and Low Carbon Fuel Standard measures.

3.1 Adequacy, 2020 Targets, Compared to AB 32 Reductions

In order to estimate the net 2020 outcome of the Table 1 reduction of 7%, the per capita reduction target, the increase in population, the Pavley reduction, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard factors must be multiplied together. For the calculation, the following factors apply:

1. 0.93, for the per capita reduction in driving of 7%, from Table 1;
2. The factor for population is computed using the populations estimated in CARB’s http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo.co2.reduction.calc.pdf, namely 3,034,388 for 2005, and 3,635,855 for 2020. So the factor from 2005 to 2020 is
   \[
   \frac{3,635,855}{3,034,388} = 1.198
   \]
3. 0.825, for the 82.5%, shown for 2020, on the green “Pavley” line of Figure 1;
4. 0.90, for the reduction in low-carbon fuel standard (LCFS), as shown on the purple line of Figure 1.
Multiplying these four factors together results in a factor of \((0.93) \times (1.198) \times (0.825) \times (0.90) = 0.827\). This is a 17% reduction and so it passes the reduction that would be in line with AB 32, which is around 13%, as shown in the 1990 light-blue line on Figure 1, which is also the first yellow “X” on Figure 1.

### 3.1.1 Need for “Pavley” and LCFS to Meet AB 32 Reductions

What is needed is a complete picture of what the various factors are providing. For example, it would be useful to know if both “Pavley” and the LCFS are needed to get the reductions within the AB 32 level. Therefore Tables 2 through 4 have been computed and appear here.

**Table 2** Factors Used to Estimate 2020 GHG Reduction from 2005, With a 7% Driving Reduction, from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Reduction Factors, 2005 to 2020</th>
<th>VMT Per Capita Reduction of 7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT Only</td>
<td>CARB Predict, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.930</td>
<td>1.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavley</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCFS</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB32 Target</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3** Results of Combining Factors to Estimate 2020 GHG Reductions, With a 7% Driving Reduction from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Reductions, Combining Factors, 2005 to 2020, VMT Per Capita Reduction of 7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT &amp; Population &amp; Pavley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT &amp; Population &amp; Pavley &amp; LCFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination Within AB32? Less Than .87?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4** Percent Reductions from Combining Factors to Estimate 2020 GHG Reductions, With a 7% Driving Reduction from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combining 2005 to 2020 GHG % Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting from a VMT Per Capita Reduction of 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT &amp; Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT &amp; Population &amp; Pavley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT &amp; Population &amp; Pavley &amp; LCFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets AB32? (Below -13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is therefore shown that for the proposed 7% reduction, both “Pavley” and the LCFS are needed to meet the AB 32 standards by 2020. There is always danger in relying on such events.
example, if the economy remains poor, fewer people will want to spend the money to trade their car in for a more efficient model.

3.1.2 Conclusions Regarding 2020 Reductions, AB 32, & Reductions for Safety

For the 7% reduction, the following conclusions can be drawn. Both “Pavley” and the LCFS are needed to meet the AB 32 reduction. Since AB 32 is inadequate for the industrialized countries, when compared to the world-wide reductions needed to protect humanity from a catastrophic climate destabilization, the proposed reduction of 7% should be increased. This is especially true since the strategies described in Section 5 of this letter would reduce driving well below 7%. These strategies are good public policy for many reasons. They will show the world that we can adopt policies that will result in the GHG emission reductions needed to protect our climate.

3.2 Evaluation of CARB Draft SANDAG Targets for 2035

The -13% value shown in Table 1 will be evaluated.

3.2.1 Required Extrapolations

CARB’s South Coast AQMD Planning Liaison, Earl Withycombe, PE, told me (verbally, in a phone conversation) that CARB is free to ignore S-3-05 when they set the 2035 targets. He also told me that he was instructed by his management to NOT put that into an email. Ignoring S-3-05 is illegal. S-3-05 covers the years from 2020 to 2050 so this would include 2035. If CARB is able to ignore S-3-05, then the order has no effect in any agency. Refusing to put the assertion that they are free to ignore S-3-05 in writing shows a disappointing lack of transparency. It appears that CARB wants to be able to deny that it ever said that it could ignore S-3-05. On page 117 of CARB’s Climate Change Scoping Plan, the text refers to a linear trajectory of GHG reductions from AB32 levels down to the S-3-05 level. What is reasonable, legal, and in writing will be used in this evaluation.

Therefore, for 2035, it is necessary to extrapolate the Governor’s Executive Order target, which is Figure 1’s gold line, out to year 2035. It is 0.87 in 2020 and it is 0.64 in 2030. Therefore, in year 2035, it will be

\[ 0.64 + \left[ \frac{0.64 - 0.87}{2030-2020} \right] \times (2035-2030) = 0.525 \]

Likewise, for 2035 it is necessary to extrapolate “Pavley”, Figure 1’s green line, out to year 2035. It is 0.82 in 2020 and it is 0.73 in 2030. Therefore, in year 2035 it will be

\[ 0.73 + \left[ \frac{0.73 - 0.82}{2030-2020} \right] \times (2035-2030) = 0.685 \]

Note that Pavley 1 ends in 2017. It is widely assumed that it will be replaced by what is often called “Pavley 2”. If so, the extrapolation computed here is equivalent to assuming that California’s fleet of cars and light trucks will continue the trajectory forward from 2017, all the way to 2035. In other words, it is assumed that the slope of Pavley 2 will be equal to the slope of Pavley 1. At this time, this is the best assumption that can be made. Assuming that the California fleet will continually get more efficient, in terms of CO2 per mile driven, relies on an assumption that a significant fraction of our car owners will be able to purchase newer model cars.

3.2.2 Calculation and Discussion

For the calculation, the following factors apply:

1. 0.87, for the per capita reduction in driving, using the 13% reduction from Table 1;
2. The factor for population is computed using the populations estimated in CARB’s http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo.co2.reduction.calc.pdf, namely 3,034,388 for 2005 and 3,984,753 for 2035. So the factor from 2005 to 2035 is
Therefore, use 1.313, from the calculation shown;

3. 0.685, from the above-computed extrapolation of the green “Pavley” line of Figure 1;
4. 0.90, for the reduction in low-carbon fuel standard (LCFS), as shown on the purple line of Figure 1.

Multiplying these four factors together results in a factor of \((0.87)(1.313)(0.685)(0.90) = 0.704\).

This is a 30.0% reduction, which is not even close to the required S-3-05 reduction value of 47.5%, from the above-computed extrapolation of the Governor’s Executive Order target fraction of 0.525.

This is a significant failure and indicates that neither the MPOs nor CARB are taking their climate crisis responsibilities seriously.

### 3.2.3 Calculation to Show Contributing Factors

Tables 5, 6, and 7 provide a complete picture of what the various factors are and how they fail to achieve the S-3-05 reductions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Reduction Factors, 2005 to 2035</th>
<th>VMT Per Capita Reduction of 13%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VMT Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Reductions, Combining Factors, 2005 to 2035, VMT Per Capita Reduction of 13%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2.4 Calculation of Reduction to Meet the Governor’s Executive Order Reduction
The “VMT-Only” value that will support the S-3-05 value of .525 can be computed.

\[
VMT = \frac{.525}{(\text{Population Factor} \times \text{Pavley Factor} \times \text{LCFS Factor})}
\]

\[
VMT = \frac{.525}{(1.313 \times .685 \times .90)} = .64848
\]

This factor corresponds to percent reduction of \((1 - .64848) \times 100\% = 35.15\%\).

### 3.2.5 Calculation Using the Reduction to Meet S-3-05, Showing the Impacts of the Factors
The effects of the various factors are shown in Tables 8, 9, and 10.

#### Table 7

| Combining 2005 to 2035 GHG % Reductions Starting from a VMT Per Capita Reduction of 13% |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| -13.0%                          | 14.2%            | -21.7%            | -29.6%           | No              |

#### Table 8

| Factors Used to Estimate 2035 GHG Reduction from 2005, With a 35.15% Driving Reduction, from 2005 |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| GHG Reduction Factors, 2005 to 2035           | VMT Per Capita Reduction of 35.15% |
| VMT Only                                      | Population ARB for SD | Pavley | LCFS | GovExecOrder S-3-05 |
| .648                                          | 1.313            | .685          | .900        | .525            |

#### Table 9

| Results of Combining Factors to Estimate 2035 GHG Reductions, With a 35.15% Driving Reduction from 2005 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| GHG Reductions, Combining Factors, 2005 to 2035, VMT Per Capita Reduction of 35.15% |
| .648                                          | .852            | .583            | .525           | Yes             |
Table 10  Percent Reductions from Combining Factors to Estimate 2035 GHG Reducions, With a 35.12% Driving Reduction from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-35.2%</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td>-41.7%</td>
<td>-47.5%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0  A Correct and Reasonable, Science-Driven 2035 Reduction

The Section 3 result of a 35.15% per-capita VMT reduction, required to meet the S-3-05 target for year 2035, is a reasonable starting point. Given the uncertainty of the Pavley reduction by 2035 and the fact that climate scientists have shown that we need large reductions soon and need to be essentially off fossil fuels by 2050, a more reasonable reduction value for 2035 is a 45% reduction.

Results from this assertion are shown in Tables 11, 12, and 13.

Table 11  Factors Used to Estimate 2035 GHG Reduction from 2005, With a 45% Driving Reduction, from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Reduction Factors, 2005 to 2035</th>
<th>VMT Per Capita Reduction of 45%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT Only</td>
<td>Population for SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.550</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavley</td>
<td>LCFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12  Results of Combining Factors to Estimate 2035 GHG Reductions, With a 45% Driving Reduction from 2005

| GHG Reductions, Combining Factors, 2005 to 2035, VMT Per Capita Reduction of 45% |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| VMT Only                            | VMT & Population                |
| .550                                | .722                            |
| .495                                | .445                            |
| Net Within S-3-05? Less than .525? | Yes                             |
Table 13 Percent Reductions from Combining Factors to Estimate 2035 GHG Reductions, With a 45% Driving Reduction from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combining 2005 to 2035 GHG% Reductions</th>
<th>With a VMT Per Capita Reduction of 45%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-45.0%</td>
<td>-27.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 13, the percent margin below the S-3-05 target is 8% (55.5-47.5). It can be shown that this corresponds to being nearly off carbon fuels by 2050, which is needed.

5.0 Fiscally Sound and Effective SCS Strategies

5.1 Introduction

This section will debunk SANDAG’s claim that its strategy set is “aggressive”. Nothing could be further from the truth. Significant reductions in driving can be achieved, as this section will show.

One strategy that the MPOs are trying to implement is enacting zoning changes to reduce sprawl. These changes typically increase densities and allow mixed use, especially around transit stations. These changes are said to support “smart growth”. SANDAG Directors have repeatedly been asked to define “smart growth” to be “VMT-reducing” growth, so that smart growth strategies and estimated outcomes could be quantified. These requests have been ignored. Therefore, SANDAG has done a poor job of creating their “Smart Growth Incentive Plan” and their “Smart Growth Design Guideline”. These documents had great potential. However, SANDAG preferred to keep the definition of “smart growth” vague, using such phrases as “pedestrian and bicycle friendly” so that decisions on spending money could remain arbitrary. Even so, the concept of improving zoning to reduce driving is sound. Over time and to the extent the economy supports growth, this will yield driving reductions. However, building smart growth requires a significant investment. Unless the economy improves dramatically, this strategy will produce VMT reductions that are too little and too late.

The MPOs need to identify all of the significant root causes of the car-oriented California lifestyle, besides just the urban sprawl that can only be partially mitigated by zoning specific and unique areas for smarter development. Several of these root causes are a direct result of government policies that create fundamental unfairness to those that drive less than average. MPOs need to fully develop strategies that eliminate these causes. These strategies would best be accomplished with both CARB and state legislative help.

The primary root causes are the poor methods used to get the public to pay for roads and parking. Fundamental changes in parking policy and road-use pricing, which are both related to the issue of congestion and freeway expansion, are never discussed in any depth at SANDAG. This oversight is reducing the chances of getting strategies that will bring down rates of driving on the scale that is needed. Such strategies would allow California to live up to its global warming responsibility and to do this in a way that is equitable to all.

5.2 Road Use Fee Pricing Systems

A San Diego County newspaper, the North County Times (NCT), in a February 9, 2009 article, reported that the Chair of the California Transportation Commission (CTC) wrote that the gas tax...
currently contributes nothing to road construction and only provides half of the money needed annually for repairs:

A Canadian company, Skymeter, is designing and installing a variable and comprehensive road-use fee pricing system, in the Netherlands by 2014 and in Denmark by 2016. The charge per mile will vary by such things as model of car, road, time of day, and congestion level. In 2005, the gas tax in the Netherlands was equivalent to $3.50 per gallon. However, with the advent of the new system, the Netherlands will eliminate the gas tax. The Netherlands estimates that the GHG from driving will drop by 10%, with the new system. Note that such a system could easily charge a price of zero cents per mile for a low-income driver. Our current system of a gas tax has no such capability. Skymeter will program the navigational-unit-like GPS boxes so that no travel information is stored, to protect driver privacy.

On July 11th 2009, the California Nevada Regional Conservation Committee (CNRCC) of the Sierra Club California passed a resolution supporting a “Comprehensive Road Use Fee Pricing System”.

The CNRCC resolution is supported by a 10-Page “Reference Document” that describes the defining characteristics of a road-use fee pricing system that would conform to Sierra Club principles. It has an example of a road-use fee structure that has these characteristics. Useful background information is also provided. This paper can be provided upon request.

On November 14th, the Environmental Caucus of the California Democratic Party (CDP) passed a 1-page resolution in support of a “Comprehensive Road-Use Fee Pricing System”. This one-page resolution contains the following words.

THerefore, be it resolved, that the California Democratic Party* supports a state-funded study of a design of a road-use fee pricing system that (1) would pay for all road-use costs including the environmental and health costs caused by driving, (2) could still include a fuel tax or fee, (3) would mitigate impacts on low-income users and protect privacy, (4) would include congestion pricing when that technology becomes feasible, (5) would keep the per-mile price incentive to drive energy-efficient cars at least as large as it is with today’s fuel excise tax, and (6) could be accompanied by tax reductions sized to achieve either net-revenue neutrality or near-net-revenue neutrality.

*Not true because the resolution failed in the CDP Resolution Committee

The Nevada Department of Transportation is taking comments on a proposal for a VMT fee to replace their gas tax, as shown at http://www.vmtfeenv.com/. Oregon has done a proof of concept of a decentralized VMT system.

The 2010 Platform of the California Democratic Party (at http://www.cadem.org/atf/cf/%7BBF9D7366-E5A7-41C3-8E3F-E06FB835FCCE%7D/Platform2010CDP_FINAL_June.pdf) has words that were in part inspired by the 1-page resolution identified above. These words are the following bullet:

• Work for equitable and environmentally-sound road and parking use

Using sales taxes, property taxes, income taxes, and other general taxes to pay for road expansion and operation makes it artificially cheap to drive. This is unjust to citizens that drive less than average. It also encourages driving. There is no reason why government should adopt policies that increase driving and economically discriminate against those that telecommute, walk, bike, car pool, or use transit. The unconstitutionality of the current system is plain to see since roads are built and maintained by the government. The government must be fair to citizens unless there is a
significant reason to be unfair. Forcing people with no children to pay for education is justifiable because we will all suffer if we have a poor public education system. However, driving a car is not behavior that justifies government subsidy. Getting an education deserves subsidy; driving does not.

Considering all of this information, CARB has a responsibility to notify the Governor and our legislative leaders that our state has good reasons to implement a comprehensive and variable road-use fee pricing system. There is probably no reason to “reinvent the wheel”. The Skymeter system would work fine here in California. The Sierra Club California analysis can be considered to ensure an implementation that is both equitable to all and environmentally sound.

This strategy, by itself, would probably decrease driving throughout California by between 20% and 25%.

5.3 Unbundling the Cost of Car Parking

For the vast majority of destinations in California, the cost of car parking is hidden within other costs. This has serious consequences. For example, at most places of employment, parking costs reduce the wages that can be paid to all the employees, even those that never use the parking. Similarly, at most apartment complexes, bundled parking costs increase the rent and this is true, even for families that do not own a car. Bundled parking costs routinely increase the costs of goods, such as groceries, for all customers. Again, this is even true for those that do not drive. Since governments require businesses to provide minimum levels of parking, they are involved in this economic discrimination towards those that drive less.

Driving less is, to some degree, a lifestyle choice. Since government has no valid reason to encourage driving, the lifestyle choice of less driving deserves constitutional, or at least legal, protection from any practices that discriminate against it, economically. So far, this agency (CARB) has not taken an active role in educating the MPOs on how parking policy effects economic fairness or how parking policies that were more fair could reduce driving.

On June 22nd 2010, I presented a paper that I coauthored, on how parking could be operated to unbundle parking costs in a way that supports the sharing of parking. This was at the 101st Conference and Exhibit of the Air and Waste Management Association, in Calgary, Canada. The session, Sustainable Land Use and Transportation, included my paper, A Plan to Efficiently and Conveniently Unbundle Car Parking Costs. The paper was extremely well received.

My paper is therefore both peer reviewed and published. I would be pleased to present this paper to the staff of CARB, in the hopes that CARB could help to bring about equitable and environmentally-sound parking policies to California.

The following points, taken from the paper, apply.

- Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) are a major cause of global warming and pollution.
- California’s Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) will need to adopt strategies that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), in order to meet SB 375 GHG reduction targets, to be issued by the California Air Resources Board in late 2010, for years 2020 and 2035.
- The appropriate pricing of parking is one of the least costly tools documented to reduce VMT.
- New technologies, such as sensors feeding computer-generated billing, offer the potential to efficiently bill drivers for parking and alert law enforcement of trespassers.
- Reformed parking policies can increase fairness, so that, for example, people who use transit or walk do not have to pay higher prices or suffer reduced wages, due to parking.
• Methods to unbundle parking cost are inefficient unless they support the spontaneous sharing of parking spaces. Shared parking with unbounded cost would ultimately allow cities to require significantly less parking.

• Typical systems of timed parking and metered parking are far from ideal. Such parking has no automated record keeping, so it is difficult to know where there is too much or too little.

• Good policies will eventually let cities turn parking minimums into parking maximums.

Less land and resources devoted to parking will support mixed use and make “smart growth” more economically viable. It should therefore be a key ingredient supporting the MPO’s stated desire to foster “smart” growth, where “smart” should be defined as “less VMT”.

Here is a copy of the abstract of the paper.

The Introduction shows documented driving reductions due to the pricing of parking. It notes that although the benefits of priced and shared parking are known, such parking has not been widely implemented, due to various concerns. It states that a solution, called “Intelligent Parking,” will overcome some of these concerns, because it is easy to use and naturally transparent. It asserts that this description will support a “Request for Proposal” (RFP) process. Eight background information items are provided, including how priced parking would help California achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets. A story demonstrates some of the key features of Intelligent Parking. Arguments for less parking, shared parking, and priced parking are made. Barriers to progress are identified. The fair pricing of parking is described. New ways to characterize transportation demand management are presented. Seven goals of Intelligent Parking are listed. Eleven definitions and concepts, that together define Intelligent Parking, are described. This includes a method to compute a baseline price of parking and how to adjust that price instantaneously to keep the vacancy above 15% (“Congestion Pricing”). An implementation strategy is described.

This abstract aroused enough interest among those responsible for A&WMA’s Sustainable Land Use and Parking session that they requested that I submit a manuscript, which was ultimately selected to become part of the written Conference Proceedings and for presentation. I hope that it will similarly arouse the interest in the CARB Board and staff. CARB needs to consider working to execute the implementation strategy described in A Plan to Efficiently and Conveniently Unbundle Car Parking Costs. I would be honored to help in any way possible.

This strategy, by itself, would probably decrease driving throughout California by between 15% and 25%. This is shown by Table 1 of A Plan to Efficiently and Conveniently Unbundle Car Parking Costs.

5.4 Increase Bicycle Use: Education and Projects to Support Bicycle Transportation

The criteria for spending money for bicycle transportation should be to maximize the resulting estimated reductions in driving. The SANDAG board has been told this many times but they ignore this suggestion. SANDAG has so many criteria for bicycle projects that the result is that staff can spend their “bicycle money” however they want. As usual, the Directors provide no useful direction. CARB should urge the MPO Boards to be rationale in setting their policies. SANDAG has $270M to spend on bicycle transportation. The following strategies will maximize driving reductions.

5.4.1 Projects

Each of the smart growth place types, both existing and planned, should be checked to see if bicycle access could be substantially improved with either a traffic calming project, a “complete streets” project, more shoulder width, or a project to overcome some natural or made-made obstacle. These projects should be prioritized using a cost/benefit ratio metric. It is hereby assumed that 40% of the $270M...
available for SANDAG’s Regional Bicycle Plan should be used to fund the projects. They should be selected for implementation, from the top of the list (lowest cost/benefit ratio) down, until the money (about $110M) is used up. An example of one of these projects, for the proposed town center near the corner of I-5 and SR-78, is to build a pedestrian/bike bridge, over I-5, to reconnect West Vista Way in Oceanside. This would better connect a coastal neighborhood with a large regional shopping center. The current bicycle route requires more distance and a significant hill to climb over.

5.4.2 Education

The remaining 60% of the $270M, about $160M, should be used to

1.) Teach interested adults about bicycle accident statistics (most serious injuries occur to cyclists in accidents that do not involve a motor vehicle), car-bike accident statistics (most are caused by wrong-way riding and errors in intersections; clear cut, hit-from-behind is rare), and how to ride in all conditions, to minimize problems.

2.) Teach riding-in-traffic skills and how to ride in other challenging conditions, by having the class members and instructor go out into real conditions and ride together, until proficiency is achieved.

Students that pass a rigorous written test and demonstrate proficiency in riding in traffic and other challenging conditions are paid for their time and effort. These classes should be based on the curriculum developed by the League of American Bicyclists and taught by instructors certified by the League.

Assuming a class size of 3 riders per instructor and that each rider passes both tests and earns $100 and that the instructor, with overhead, costs $500 dollars, for a total of $800 for each 3 students, means that the $160M could educate $160M/$800 = 200,000 classes of 3 students, for a total of 600,000 students. This is about 20% of the population of San Diego County.

This strategy, by itself, would decrease driving in San Diego County by at least 5%.

5.5 Replacing Freeway Expansion Projects by Transit Redesign, Construction, and Operations

5.5.1 Background Information

SANDAG’s 2007 RTP, “RTP2030”, called for increasing the number of freeway lanes by 38%. This would be in a region that already had one of the highest VMT-per-capita metrics in the state. SANDAG also supported a sales tax measure, “TRANSNET”, that was advertised as one that would spend two-thirds of its money on roads and one-third on transit. However, after it was passed, SANDAG defined all HOV lanes to be “transit”, thereby significantly reducing the fraction of money spent on true transit.

Out of a $57 billion dollar budget for RTP2030, SANDAG budgeted about 1% for mitigation. This mitigation is split evenly between “smart growth” incentive money and a Regional Bicycle Plan. They have published a Smart Growth Incentive Plan, a Smart Growth Design Guideline, as well as the Regional Bicycle Plan. SANDAG has an excellent staff. However, the Board does not provide useful direction. One obvious direction needed was to adopt a metric of reducing VMT to decide what “smart growth” should get funding, what “smart growth” design guidelines should be adopted, and what bicycle programs should be funded. They were asked repeatedly to put citizen comments, directed toward the early drafts of these documents, on line, to be viewed by all. Not doing this made it easy for the staff to ignore significant public comment and to instead spend bike money mostly for trails and smart-growth money for beautification projects in areas deemed suitable for eventual smart growth. If reduced driving reductions were used as a criteria for spending money, then funding the League of American Bicyclist’s class on how to ride a bike in traffic and the development of equitable and environmentally-sound parking policy (good enough to be politically acceptable), would have been a large part of the spending. Instead, bicycle education and car-parking policies were marginalized to the point of being essentially unfunded.
5.5.2 Putting a Stop to Freeway Expansion

One of the most powerful strategies to reduce GHG would be to stop expanding freeways. Instead of costing money, it would generate money. It is well understood that the metric of freeway-lane miles per square mile of developed land increases an area’s average car-trip length and thereby increases VMTs. SANDAG is ignoring this fact and this is probably one of the primary reasons that its 2035 GHG Reduction Target is unacceptably small. When the SANDAG TRANSNET tax was passed, few voters understood that we were threatened with a climate catastrophe and that our responsibility was to drive significantly less. Given our current understanding, SANDAG has a responsibility to go back to voters with a ballot measure that reconfigures TRANSNET to be 100% for transit, bicycles, and pedestrians.

One current freeway-widening project being considered is to widen I-5 from 8 to either 12 or 14 lanes, from La Jolla to Camp Pendleton, at a cost of over $4 billion dollars. The DEIR was released in early July. Caltrans is holding public meetings, where no member of the public is allowed to speak publicly. It sent postcard notifications to those living along the route. However, instead of honestly notifying the recipients of the radical, land-consuming nature of the proposal, these postcards only refer to a “managed lane project”. Nowhere on the postcard was there any information suggesting a wider freeway, a taking of land, a reducing of property-tax rolls, an increase in noise, an increase in driving, an increase in air pollution, an increase in GHG or even that there is any kind of construction project being proposed.

If TRANSNET was reconfigured to support transit, the Coaster service, for example, could be redesigned into an electric, automated system that would operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. With skip-stop stations, travel time from Oceanside to San Diego could be substantially decreased, especially at off-peak times.

This strategy, by itself, would decrease driving in San Diego County by between 5% and 10%.

6.0 Conclusions

Targets will have to be more stringent than the AB 32 and S-3-05 target trajectories if we are going to fulfill our world leadership responsibility and give the world a chance at avoiding climate destabilization. The 2020 Target of -7% (per-capita from VMT) can only result in an AB 32 level reduction if both “Pavley” and the LCFS factors are used. The 2035 reduction target of -13% would have to instead be -35.15%, to just meet the straight-line trajectory of S-3-05 for 2035, and this is assuming the Pavley reductions continue on the “Pavley 1” trajectory all the way to 2035. This assumption about “Pavley” may be overly optimistic. The science-supported 2035 reduction is -45%.

The best, largely overlooked strategies to reduce VMT are a comprehensive and variable road use fee pricing system, as is being installed by Skymeter; unbundling the cost of car parking; good bicycle projects and bicycle education; putting a stop to all freeway expansions; and reconfiguring sales taxes for freeways or freeway/transit combinations to instead be 100% for transit. These strategies could easily be implemented by 2020 and would easily decrease per capita driving by a sum of at least 45%. The strategies to do this are primarily those that increase fairness for families that drive less than average.

Given this set of conclusions, it is clear that the reductions proposed for SANDAG are neither just nor reasonable. By extension, this is true for the reductions proposed for the other MPOs.

Sincerely yours,

mike_bullock@earthlink.net
760-754-8025

Bullock to CARB Re Draft GHG Targets Page 16 Sept. 20, 2010
EXECUTIVE ORDER EXECUTIVE ORDER S-3-05
by the Governor of the State of California

WHEREAS, California is particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change; and WHEREAS, increased temperatures threaten to greatly reduce the Sierra snowpack, one of the State's primary sources of water; and WHEREAS, increased temperatures also threaten to further exacerbate California's air quality problems and adversely impact human health by increasing heat stress and related deaths, the incidence of infectious disease, and the risk of asthma, respiratory and other health problems; and

WHEREAS, rising sea levels threaten California's 1,100 miles of valuable coastal real estate and natural habitats; and

WHEREAS, the combined effects of an increase in temperatures and diminished water supply and quality threaten to alter micro-climates within the state, affect the abundance and distribution of pests and pathogens, and result in variations in crop quality and yield; and WHEREAS, mitigation efforts will be necessary to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adaptation efforts will be necessary to prepare Californians for the consequences of global warming; and

WHEREAS, California has taken a leadership role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions by: implementing the California Air Resources Board motor vehicle greenhouse gas emission reduction regulations; implementing the Renewable Portfolio Standard that the Governor accelerated; and implementing the most effective building and appliance efficiency standards in the world; and WHEREAS, California-based companies and companies with significant activities in California have taken leadership roles by reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide and hydrofluorocarbons, related to their operations and developing products that will reduce GHG emissions; and WHEREAS, companies that have reduced GHG emissions by 25 percent to 70 percent have lowered operating costs and increased profits by billions of dollars; and

WHEREAS, technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions are increasingly in demand in the worldwide marketplace, and California companies investing in these technologies are well-positioned to profit from this demand, thereby boosting California's economy, creating more jobs and providing increased tax revenue; and WHEREAS, many of the technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions also generate operating cost savings to consumers who spend a portion of the savings across a variety of sectors of the economy; this increased spending creates jobs and an overall benefit to the statewide economy.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor of the State of California, by virtue of the power invested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the State of California, do hereby order effective immediately: 1. That the following greenhouse gas emission reduction targets are hereby established for California: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels; and 2. That the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency ("Secretary") shall coordinate oversight of the efforts made to meet the targets with: the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, Secretary of the Department of Food and Agriculture, Secretary of the Resources Agency, Chairperson of the Air Resources Board, Chairperson of the Energy Commission, and the President of the Public Utilities Commission; and 3. That the Secretary shall report to the Governor and the State Legislature by January 2006 and biannually thereafter on progress made toward meeting the greenhouse gas emission targets established herein; and 4. That the Secretary shall also report to the Governor and the State Legislature by January 2006 and biannually thereafter on the impacts to California of global warming, including impacts to water supply, public health, agriculture, the coastline, and forestry, and shall prepare and report on mitigation and adaptation plans to combat these impacts; and 5. That as soon as hereafter possible, this Order shall be filed with the Office of the Secretary of State and that widespread publicity and notice be given to this Order. IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have here unto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed this the first day of June 2005. /s/ Arnold Schwarzenegger Governor of California

Mike Bullock's additional information:
1.) If the entire world achieved the reductions identified above, the world’s CO2_e would peak at 450 PPM.
2.) In 2005, it was thought that 450 PPM would probably prevent a destabilization of our climate.
3.) We now know that **350 PPM** is needed. In 1800 it was **280 PPM**. Unfortunately, it is now **390 PPM**, higher than it has been in over a million years.

The 2020 and 2050 targets produce the Gold trajectory shown on the Figure below. The figure also includes the best-estimate rate at which we can get our fleet of electric and other cars to reduce emitting CO2\_e (green line). It also includes the “clean fuel” advantage (the purple line). The blue line is the net effect emission level. It shows that we are going to have to drive less. We must get the blue line down onto the gold line. It can be shown that the correct reduction for 2035 is 35%, not the 13% provided by CARB, and not the 18% the SANDAG staff is saying they can achieve.

The conclusion is that we don’t need to expand our highway system. Instead, we need to adopt strategies that will reduce driving. Smart growth, electric cars, and great transit are all needed as soon as possible. However, they will take time and they are expensive. Therefore, we also need to unbundle the cost of driving and parking.

![Figure 1: Increasing VMT Threatens to Overwhelm Greenhouse Gas Savings From Cleaner Fuels and Vehicles](image)

Sincerely submitted,

Mike Bullock
Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05
Implications for SANDAG

Mike Bullock
mike_bullock@earthlink.net
760-754-8025

S-3-05*, Signed in 2005

• GHG Emission Trajectory:
  – 2000 levels by 2010
  – 1990 levels by 2020 (AB 32)
  – 80% below 1990 levels by 2050

• Achieved by Plans & Status
  – Every 6 months
  – For transportation
    • CALTRANS & CARB ➔ Cal EPA ➔ Governor

If the world achieves these reductions, our levels of atmospheric CO2_e will be capped at 450 PPM. However, 350 PPM is needed for climate stability. We are at 390 now. The world must be nearly carbon free by 2050.

*Roadmap for human survival
Trajectories to Support Calculations

Purple (Low carbon fuel), Green (C02/Mile), & Gold (S-3-05),

Required by S-3-05, Per-Capita VMT Reduction for 2035

Factor Change Definitions

1.) All are for for the year of interest, with respect to Year 2005 values.
2.) All are for cars and light-duty trucks (except population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Taken From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>net factor of the emissions of Greenhouse Gas</td>
<td>S-3-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f_{\text{Pavley}})</td>
<td>factor of the average statewide mileage</td>
<td>SB-375 Plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f_{\text{Fuel}})</td>
<td>factor of the reduction of GHG due to low-carbon fuels</td>
<td>SB-375 Plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f_{\text{Population}})</td>
<td>factor of the population in the region of interest</td>
<td>CARB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f_{\text{PerCapitaVMT}})</td>
<td>factor of per capita driving</td>
<td>NA²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Population estimates are from CARB’s http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo.co2.reduction.calc.pdf. Namely 3,034,388 for 2005 and 3,984,753 for 2035. So \(f_{\text{Population}} = 1.313\)

2 This is the dependent variable. It is a function of the other variables. It is computed to get the net factor required by S-3-05, given the other variable values.

\[
f = f_{\text{PerCapitaVMT}} \times f_{\text{Population}} \times f_{\text{Pavley}} \times f_{\text{Fuel}}
\]

\[
f_{\text{PerCapitaVMT}} = f / (f_{\text{Population}} \times f_{\text{Pavley}} \times f_{\text{Fuel}})
\]
Required by S-3-05, Per-Capita VMT Reduction for 2035

\[ f_{\text{PerCapitaVMT}} = \frac{f}{(f_{\text{Population}} \times f_{\text{Pavley}} \times f_{\text{Fuel}})} \]

\[ f_{\text{PerCapitaVMT}} = \frac{0.525}{(1.313 \times 0.685 \times 0.9)} \]

\[ f_{\text{PerCapitaVMT}} = 0.649 \]

This is a 35.1% decrease in GHG or VMT.

SB 375, Year 2035 VMT Reduction Summary

- 13%, request from SANDAG, to CARB
  - Claim: this was “Aggressive but Achievable”
- 13%, from CARB to SANDAG
  - Official target
  - Parroted claim “Aggressive but Achievable”
- 19%, SANDAG current calculation in RTP
  - Proves CARB failed to verify level of “Aggressiveness”
- 35%, value needed to achieve S-3-05
  - Correct minimum value
CARB’s Culture of Avoidance

----- Original Message -----  From: Withycombe, Earl@ARB  
To: Mike Bullock  
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2010 9:02 AM  
Subject: RE: Your Draft  

Hi Mike,  
I have drafted a response to your question, and management is reviewing it. When I get approval, I will get back to you on the 2035 question. Thanks for your detailed analysis.

Earl Withycombe, P.E.  
South Coast AQMD Planning Liaison  
Planning & Technical Support Division  
California Air Resources Board  
916-322-8487 voice  
916-322-3646 fax  
ewithyco@arb.ca.gov email

Bullock’s Note:  
Earl then called me and told me his management told him to never email me information about my question, which was why didn’t CARB’s SB 375 targets, for 2035, have to support S-3-05. Please do not be an accessory to CARB’s violation of S-3-05.

One More Conclusion

Save the Coast. Transit First!

www.SaveWebsite.to/policy-document/sb468.com
San Diego County Voter Preference

- Opinion poll of San Diego County Voters
  - Fairbank, Maslin Maullin, Metz & Associates
  - Sept 14, 2010

### Preference, Between Expanding Transit or Roads & Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanding public transit, including buses and rail</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding roads and highways</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both, neither, don’t know</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Global Warming Background

We must act decisively, now

• 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 14.4 Degrees Fahrenheit and that this poses a risk of “a devastating collapse of the human population, perhaps even to extinction.”

21st Century Transportation Solutions

• Redesigned rail or monorail systems
  – Electric, automated, 24/7, frequent service
  – Personal Rapid Transit distribution system
• Equitable driving fees to reduce taxes
• Unbundled car parking cost
Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy
Public Workshops & Public Hearings
(Dates and times are tentative and will be confirmed by May 6, 2011)

Subregional Public Workshops & Public Hearings
4 to 6 p.m. Public Workshops; Public Hearing begins at 6 p.m.

Tue, Jun 7
Encinitas Community & Senior Center (North County Coastal)
1140 Oakcrest Park Dr., Encinitas
4 to 6 p.m. Public Workshop; Public Hearing begins at 6 p.m.

Wed, Jun 8
Jacobs Center (Central San Diego)
404 Euclid Ave., San Diego
4 to 6 p.m. Public Workshop; Public Hearing begins at 6 p.m.

Thu, Jun 9
Sonrise Community Church (East County)
8805 North Magnolia Ave., Santee
4 to 6 p.m. Public Workshop; Public Hearing begins at 6 p.m.

Mon, Jun 13
Martin Luther King Jr. Center (South County)
140 East 12th St., National City
4 to 6 p.m. Public Workshop; Public Hearing begins at 6 p.m.

Thu, Jun 16
San Marcos City Council Chambers (North County Inland)
1 Civic Center Dr., San Marcos
4 to 6 p.m. Public Workshop; Public Hearing begins at 6 p.m.

Public Hearings

Fri, Jun 10
SANDAG Board of Directors Meeting – 10 a.m.
401 B St., San Diego

Tue, Jun 21
Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)
Meeting – 5 p.m.
Caltrans Office
4050 Taylor St., San Diego

The public workshops will be conducted in an open house format where participants can attend at any time during the workshop, view displays and information about the 2050 RTP and its SCS, ask questions of staff, complete comment cards, or speak to a bilingual English/Spanish transcriber to have their comments recorded. The public hearings will be officiated by one or more SANDAG Board member(s), or their designee(s), and a transcription will be produced and provided to the SANDAG Board of Directors and Policy Advisory Committees, as well as provided to the general public.

www.sandag.org/2050rtp
Borrador del Plan Regional de Transporte 2050 y su Estrategia de Comunidades Sustentables
Talleres Públicos y Audiencias Públicas
(Las fechas y horarios son tentativos y serán confirmados antes del 6 de mayo de 2011)

Talleres Públicos y Audiencias Públicas Subregionales
Talleres Públicos de 4 a 6 p.m. y las Audiencias Públicas comienzan a las 6 p.m.

Mar., Jun 7
Encinitas Community & Senior Center (Condado Norte Costa)
1140 Oakcrest Park Dr., Encinitas
Taller Público de 4 a 6 p.m.; Audiencia Pública comienza a las 6 p.m.

Miér., Jun 8
Jacobs Center (San Diego Central)
404 Euclid Ave., San Diego
Taller Público de 4 a 6 p.m.; Audiencia Pública comienza a las 6 p.m.

Jue., Jun 9
Sonrise Community Church (Condado Este)
8805 North Magnolia Ave., Santee
Taller Público de 4 a 6 p.m.; Audiencia Pública comienza a las 6 p.m.

Lun., Jun 13
Martin Luther King Jr. Center (Sur del Condado)
140 East 12th St., National City
Taller Público de 4 a 6 p.m.; Audiencia Pública comienza a las 6 p.m.

Jue., Jun 16
San Marcos City Council Chambers (Condado Norte Interior)
1 Civic Center Dr., San Marcos
Taller Público de 4 a 6 p.m.; Audiencia Pública comienza a las 6 p.m.

Audiencias Públicas

Vie., Jun 10
Reunión de la Mesa Directiva de SANDAG – 10 a.m.
401 B St., San Diego

Mar., Jun 21
Reunión del Grupo de Partes Interesadas en la Planeación Regional (SWG, por sus siglas en inglés) – 5 p.m.
Oficinas de Caltrans
4050 Taylor St., San Diego

Los Talleres Públicos se llevarán a cabo con un formato de diálogo abierto (open house) en donde los participantes que asistan al taller en cualquier momento, podrán ver las presentaciones e información sobre el RTP 2050 y su estrategia SCS, hacer preguntas al personal, llenar tarjetas de comentarios o hablar con un transcriptor bilingüe inglés/español para que sus comentarios queden registrados. Las Audiencias Públicas serán presididas por uno o más miembros de la Mesa Directiva de SANDAG, o sus designados, y se preparará una transcripción, la cual será presentada a la Mesa Directiva de SANDAG y los Comités Asesores de Políticas, así como al público en general.

www.sandag.org/2050rtp
Our Region. Our Future.

2050 Regional Transportation Plan

A Vision for Mid-Century

2050 RTP

Reliability

Mobility

System Preservation & Safety

Prosperous Economy

Social Equity

Healthy Environment
Sustainable Communities Strategy

Ensuring Social Equity

- Involvement from a wide variety of communities and stakeholders
- More robust regionwide environmental justice analysis
- Draft 2050 RTP includes metrics and performance measures to assess access to jobs, health care, schools, parks, beaches, and how well the investments are distributed
Paying for the Vision

- Based on current and reasonably available funding sources
- $196.2 billion in total revenues phased through 2050 (in year of expenditure)

Major Revenue Sources/Revenue Constrained Scenario

- Federal: 18%
- State: 22%
- Local: 60%

Offering More Travel Choices: Transit Network
Offering More Travel Choices: Highway Network

- Managed Lanes
- General Purpose Lanes
- Toll Lanes
- Operational Improvements
- Freeway Connectors
- HOV Connectors
- Freeway & HOV Connectors

C = Conventional Highway
F = Freeway
HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle
MB = Movable Barrier
ML = Managed Lanes
OPS = Operational Improvements
T = Toll Road

Offering More Travel Choices: Active Transportation
Making Better Use of What We Have

Incentives for the Path Less Traveled
A Public Plan, With Public Input

- Comprehensive public outreach and involvement program
- Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group
- Mini-grant program
- Spring 2010 public workshops
- Tribal consultation
- More than 140 presentations

Public Involvement and Outreach

- Public Workshops and Public Hearings
- Notices, advertising, media relations
- E-mail newsletters and notifications
- Social media
- Partnerships to extend awareness
- Envision 2050 Visualization Tool
- RTP Video
- Promote all ways public can comment on 2050 RTP
Public Hearings and Workshops
(Tentative Schedule)

- Tue, Jun 7  Encinitas Community & Senior Center (North County Coastal)
- Wed, Jun 8  Jacobs Center (Central San Diego)
- Thu, Jun 9  Sonrise Community Church (East County)
- Mon, Jun 13 Martin Luther King Jr. Center (South County)
- Thu, Jun 16 San Marcos City Council Chambers (North County Inland)

Public Hearings and Workshops
(Tentative Schedule)

- Fri, Jun 10 Board of Directors Meeting
- Tue, Jun 21 Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group Meeting
Envision 2050

Welcome to SANDAG’s Visualization Tool
A comprehensive blueprint for how the region’s transportation system will evolve during the next 40 years is needed for public review and comment. The Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) builds upon the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and changes land use to encourage more sustainable land use patterns by reducing traffic congestion and air pollution while increasing transportation options for all. The Draft RTP/SCS is the blueprint for how the region’s transportation system will evolve.

The Draft 2050 RTP incorporates a new Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The purpose of the SCS is to connect jobs, homes, schools, and other activities to an efficient transportation system that leads to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

We invite you to step through this Web site and envision 2050. See how your transportation system evolves by 2020, 2035, and 2050. Tell us what you think.

The Challenges We Face
Healthy Environment

Healthy environment is essential to environmental sustainability. We must invest in environmental sustainability for the region. Transportation investments should foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing, and employment density. New urban cores grow or urban centers away from rural areas and help promote a more sustainable transportation mode by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles.

2050 RTP and SCS Adoption Process

- **April 2011** Release Draft 2050 RTP and SCS for public comment
- **May 2011** Release Draft EIR for public comment period
- **June 2011** Public hearings, workshops, and close of Draft RTP/SCS public comment period
- **Sept 2011** Response to comments and proposed changes
- **Oct 2011** Adoption 2050 RTP, SCS, and EIR
Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to:

(1) accept the Draft 2050 RTP for distribution;
(2) authorize staff to distribute the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under development for the 2050 RTP as soon as it is available; and (3) schedule various public hearings and workshops on the Draft 2050 RTP, including its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and Draft EIR in June, and set the closing date of June 30, 2011, for public comments on the Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS.
Riding to 2050:
San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan

April 22, 2011
Proposed Programs

- Data Collection, Evaluation, and Modeling

Proposed Programs

- Safe Routes to Transit
- Transit Station Bicycle Parking
Proposed Programs

• Regional Wayfinding Signage Design Guidelines and Signing Plan

Proposed Programs

• Cycling Skills and Safety Education
Proposed Programs

- Share the Road
  Public Awareness Campaign

Funding Summary

TDA/TransNet $12.9M  
Transportation Enhancement $ 4.2M  
Total Revenues $17.1M  

Proposed Projects ($6.5M)  
Proposed Programs ($1.7M)  

FY 2012  
Local Call for Projects $8.8M
Regional Coordination

- Implementation Efficiencies
- Benefits of Regional Programs
- Balance Local and Regional

Next Steps

- With approval from Board of Directors integrate project funding into FY 2012 Program Budget
- Revised project evaluation criteria for the FY 2012 Active Transportation Program Local Call for Projects
Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors:

(1) approve funding for initial implementation of regional bicycle projects as shown in Table 1; and

(2) approve funding for initial implementation of regional programs as shown in Table 2.
Dear Mayor,

It is our honor to invite you to attend the Seventh Binational Mayors Summit on May 19-20, 2011 in Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico.

At previous summits, the mayors of several Southern California cities and their counterparts from cities in the State of Baja California, as well as key government staff, business and community leaders, have met to discuss common issues and set common goals with the purpose of establishing a network of cities, and develop effective solutions with the greatest possible benefit for all participating parties.

This year, the Mayors Summit, which will be held at the Grand Hotel Tijuana, has been expanded to reach more cities within our region with mutual interests and concerns. The areas of focus for this Summit are economic development, art and culture, public safety and tourism.

Your participation is very valuable, as it will add content and contribute to unite the Californias on key concerns affecting our region. For more information visit: www.binational.org.

We look forward to welcoming you to Tijuana.

Sincerely,

Carlos Bustamante
Mayor of the City of Tijuana
Surmtit Co-Chair

Jerry Sanders
Mayor of the City of San Diego
Summit Co-Chair