TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, September 20, 2013
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• PROPOSED REGIONAL BIKE PLAN EARLY ACTION PROGRAM

• SAN YSIDRO INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION CENTER STUDY DRAFT DESIGN CONCEPTS

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEBSITE 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.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Committee seated at the front table. Members of the public may address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

In order to keep the public informed in an efficient manner and facilitate public participation, SANDAG also provides access to all agenda and meeting materials online at www.sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for e-notifications via our e-distribution list at either the SANDAG website or by sending an email request to webmaster@sandag.org.

Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the email comment form available on the website. Email comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Transportation Committee meeting. **Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Transportation Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Committee no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.**

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or john.kirk@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

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 agenda materials can be made available in alternative languages. To make a request call (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information. **Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.**
**TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**  
Friday, September 20, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ITEM # 2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

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

**REPORTS (3 through 5)**

| +3   | AGREEMENT WITH UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE CONCERNING IMPLEMENTATION OF TransNet PROJECTS (Rob Rundle) | APPROVE |
|      |                                                                                                             |
| +4   | PROPOSED REGIONAL BIKE PLAN EARLY ACTION PROGRAM (Chris Kluth)                                             | RECOMMEND |
| +5   | SAN YSIDRO INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION CENTER STUDY DRAFT DESIGN CONCEPTS (Samir Hajjiri, City of San Diego; Rachel Kennedy) | DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION |

The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the Executive Director to execute an agreement with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to provide dedicated staffing in order to expedite the delivery of TransNet projects.

In 2011 the Board of Directors made a commitment to Active Transportation with the adoption of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy, which included integration of Riding to 2050: San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Bike Plan) previously approved by the Board of Directors in 2010. The final action by the Board included the development of a Bike Plan Early Action Program (EAP) for the projects included in the Bike Plan. In April 2012, the Transportation Committee accepted the goals of the EAP framework and approved funding to conduct preliminary engineering work and refine construction cost estimates. These estimates have been used to prepare funding scenarios and implementation options. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program with Scenario 1 as the preferred implementation option.

The Transportation Committee will be asked to recommend a preferred design concept for use in development of an ITC fiscal feasibility analysis and implementation strategy.
6. 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.

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for October 4, 2013, at 9 a.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

September 20, 2013

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 1

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2013

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Todd Gloria (City of San Diego) at 9:04 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Chairman Harry Mathis (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), and a second by Mayor Sam Abed (North County Inland), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the July 19, 2013, Transportation Committee meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

John Wotzka, member of the public, spoke about various transportation matters.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, announced SANDAG’s award of the recent Tiger Grants. Three applications were submitted and SANDAG received $14 million to help replace bridges along the LOSSAN corridor.

Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer, MTS, announced the launch of a new mobile ticketing app. The app will be used to target trolley riders at the stadium and an express line will be offered for riders using this app. MTS implemented a successful soft launch at a recent Aztec game.

Mayor Cheryl Cox (South County) thanked Caltrans and SANDAG staff for a job well done on the recent removal of the Palomar Bridge on I-805.

CONSENT (3 through 4)

3. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP (APPROVE)

The Transportation Committee was asked to approve the amended charter and membership for the ATWG.

4. PROPOSED FY 2014 PROGRAM BUDGET AMENDMENT: ORANGE AND GREEN LINE FIBER OPTIC CABLE PROJECT (RECOMMEND)

The Transportation Committee was asked to recommend that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Metropolitan Transit System to accept $1,317,617 for the Orange and Green Line Fiber Optic Cable Project (CIP 1144400) and approve the proposed amendment to the FY 2014 Program Budget.
Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Abed, and a second by MTS Chairman Mathis, the Transportation Committee approved consent items 3 through 4.

CHAIR’S REPORT (5)

5. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: SUMMARY OF INPUT RECEIVED FROM 2013 POLICY WORKSHOP SERIES (INFORMATION)

Chair Gloria introduced the item and said more than 500 people participated in various workshops and outreach efforts led by SANDAG staff.

Phil Trom, Senior Regional Planner, gave a brief overview of the workshops and summarized the extensive input received. Mr. Trom spoke about next steps, including a workshop to be held in mid-October on the scenario planning efforts.

REPORT (6 through 10)

6. 2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 8 ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION (APPROVE)

Michelle Merino, Associate Financial Analyst, gave the report and said this amendment is administrative and is being processed outside of the regular quarterly amendment cycle.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Abed, and a second by Mayor Mary Sessom (East County), the Transportation Committee approved Amendment No. 8 - Administrative Modification to the 2012 RTIP.

7. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: FISCAL YEAR 2014 MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING ALLOCATIONS AND COMPETITIVE LAND ACQUISITION GRANT CALL FOR PROJECTS (RECOMMEND)

Keith Greer, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Sessom, and a second by Deputy Mayor Lisa Shaffer (North County Coastal), the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve: (1) funding allocations totaling $4 million toward implementation of regional land management and biological monitoring activities, and (2) release of the Call for Projects for a competitive land acquisition grant program using economic benefit funding, pursuant to an executed Memorandum of Agreement with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the Environmental Mitigation Program.

8. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DEVELOPMENT OF DRAFT UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK (DISCUSSION)

Phil Trom, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item and asked the Transportation Committee to review the current 2050 Regional Transportation Plan Unconstrained Network along with changing demographic, jobs, housing, and population trends from the draft regional growth forecast.

Emily Serafy Cox, Mid-City CAN, spoke in opposition of the deletion of Light Rail Transit (LRT) Route 550, and spoke about concerns discussed at the Community Based Organization (CBO)
partners’ meeting. Ms. Serafy Cox suggested updating the modeling on this route to determine if there are social equity concerns related to the potential deletion.

The Transportation Committee discussed the item.

Staff will seek additional input from other various working groups, community-based organizations, tribal governments, Regional Planning and Borders Committees.

**Action:** This item was presented for discussion only.


Rachel Kennedy, Senior Regional Planner, presented the preliminary draft evaluation criteria to be used for prioritizing a list of transportation projects for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

Miguel Aguirre, San Ysidro Planning Group, spoke about optimizing existing current infrastructure at the San Ysidro Port of Entry, and suggested moving the trolley station above grade to allow mobility.

The Transportation Committee discussed the item and provided their input on the draft criteria.

**Action:** This item was presented for discussion only.

10. **2012 STATE OF THE COMMUTE REPORT (INFORMATION)**

Ellison Alegre, Associate Transportation Planner, presented the 2012 State of the Commute Report, which provided data on the region’s urban highways, bus systems, and rail services.

Elyse Lowe, Move San Diego, asked staff to measure and report transportation performance evaluation criteria such as reduced greenhouse gas emissions, impacted transit travel trip times, and other criteria in future State of the Commute reports.

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

11. **CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no additional public comments.

12. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, September 20, 2013, at 9 a.m.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Gloria adjourned the meeting at 10:59 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Lisa Shaffer</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Lee Haydu</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cheryl Cox</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Mike Woiwode</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Todd Gloria (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Marti Emerald</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Greg Cox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Dianne Jacob</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Rebecca Jones</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>John Aguilera</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Smisek</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lloyd Hubbs</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTCA</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>Raymond Hunter Sr.</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Tucker</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Jablonski</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Dale</td>
<td>Chairman, SANDAG</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
CONCERNING IMPLEMENTATION OF TransNet PROJECTS

Introduction

SANDAG is required to consult with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for projects that may impact threatened or endangered species. The consultation process can be lengthy and often requires multiple meetings with USFWS staff, and review of documentation that must be approved before SANDAG can complete the permitting process on TransNet projects.

Discussion

SANDAG currently has 18 active projects that will require consultation with the USFWS. Of these 18 projects, 13 are rail projects (LOSSAN and Light Rail Transit) and 5 are bicycle path projects. While the USFWS is required by law to consult and make determinations on projects that are submitted to its agency for review, staff limitations caused in part by the federal budget sequestration have resulted in schedule uncertainty. Therefore, a proposed funding agreement has been drafted (Attachment 1) that describes in detail how the USFWS would provide the necessary services required by SANDAG, the process for administering the agreement, and the standards by which the work products would be assessed. If SANDAG approves the proposed funding agreement, the USFWS is able to guarantee a dedicated staff person who will be able to work with SANDAG to prioritize projects and ensure completion of the consultation process to meet project schedules.

Providing reimbursement of a full-time staff person would cost approximately $210,000 annually and assumes full overhead costs. SANDAG only will be billed for the time worked on SANDAG projects, which would not exceed the full annual amount. The funding level is consistent with an existing agreement between SANDAG and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). That agreement has expedited issuance of RWQCB certifications and is the model for how the agreement with the USFWS is structured. Caltrans also has been using these types of agreements with resource agencies for a number of years on TransNet-funded projects.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Land Use and Transportation Planning Director


Key Staff Contact: Rob Rundle, (619) 699-6949, rob.rundle@sandag.org
DRAFT AGREEMENT
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AND UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
REGARDING REVIEW OF SANDAG PROJECTS

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is made and entered into effective as of this 1st day of October, 2013, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments ("SANDAG") and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS").

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Agreement:

WHEREAS, the USFWS will provide prioritized review for transportation and local agency planning projects to SANDAG; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has TransNet funded projects and requires consultation by the USFWS as it relates to potential impacts to threatened and endangered species; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG understands the increased workload placed on the USFWS by local, state, and federal agencies as well as private developers and the lack of federal resources available to fund positions to meet the increased workload; and

WHEREAS, by SANDAG funding a position at the USFWS, SANDAG will receive prioritized review of SANDAG projects and will enable the agency to meet funding milestones to implement TransNet-funded projects; and

WHEREAS, planning projects include transportation improvements within the LOSSAN Corridor, Regional Bicycle Plan, Environmental Mitigation Program, and other TransNet Program projects contained in the Regional Transportation Plan; and

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

AGREEMENT

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

SANDAG AGREES:

1. Work performed under the Agreement shall be under the direction of the USFWS.

2. To pay for all services performed by the USFWS on behalf of SANDAG as described in the TransNet Ordinance. Reimbursement shall be based on the hours of work actually performed. In no event shall the total amount paid to USFWS under this Agreement exceed $420,000, as described in Exhibit A (Budget).
3. The USFWS will invoice SANDAG in advanced, on a semiannual basis. Invoices shall be submitted to:

Rob Rundle, Principal Regional Planner
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

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

USFWS AGREES:

5. To perform work only on the category of projects to which the resources from SANDAG will be dedicated as described in the TransNet Ordinance.

6. To work with USFWS staff supervisors and other federal, state, and local agencies as appropriate to review and analyze projects that are prioritized by SANDAG, work with the proponent to identify issues that need resolution, and incorporate these resolutions into biological assessments and into associated biological opinion, or other environmental compliance documents.

7. To work with private landowners, local governmental agencies, and other state and federal agencies, as appropriate, to provide technical assistance and assist in the coordination of other regulatory permits.

8. To work and maintain regular communication with the immediate supervisors and other USFWS staff and coordinate with other USFWS programs and activities (management, GIS, external affairs, data management, etc.) to effectively carry out the duties described herein, keep supervisors and staff informed, and complete tasks necessary to advance SANDAG prioritized projects.

9. To participate in scoping meetings and other inter-agency meetings that occur doing the preliminary phases of projects.

10. To identify and assist with the development of project design necessary to ensure protection of sensitive resources and provide input to project planners and engineers.

11. To identify projects that will require environmental mitigation, the appropriate mitigation measures, and provide input to project planners and engineers.
12. To review project environmental documents and provide comments on sensitive species issues to lead agency.

13. To coordinate permitting activities with results from environmental reviews to ensure identified environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures are addressed in subsequent permits/consultations.

14. To provide the following work products per a mutually agreed upon schedule for each activity performed pursuant to this Agreement:
   
a. Review of the project description and written responses to the project.
   
b. Identification of changes needed to the project to meet the various regulatory requirements.
   
c. Monthly status updates regarding information needs, clarifications, and unresolved issues for all priority projects.
   
d. Monthly records showing withdrawals from the project account, including a list of staff names and hours charged to each project.
   
e. Regarding Section 7s, the USFWS will provide Biological Opinions within sixty (60) days of providing all information necessary to evaluate the project, including its conservation strategy; and no extenuating circumstances exist. The sixty- (60) day timeframe will be applied to ‘no jeopardy’ opinions, any ‘jeopardy’ opinion is not guaranteed under the sixty- (60) day timeframe due to the internal review process and issues associated with ‘jeopardy’ decisions.

15. To conduct regular meetings with SANDAG to review and coordinate ongoing activities performed in accordance with this Agreement. These meetings also will be used to discuss project priorities and USFWS resource allocation toward those project priorities. The USFWS will submit regular reports to SANDAG describing the USFWS activities, progress made, and time expended using the Agreement resources.

16. To pay its employees necessary and reasonable travel expenses and per diem allowance incurred during the performance of work under this Agreement from funds provided in this Agreement at a rate not to exceed those specified by the Department of Treasury Internal Revenue Service, Publication 1542, as updated.

17. To provide written notice to SANDAG thirty (30) days in advance of any proposed rate changes to salaries, wages, benefits, or operating expenses associated with the work to be performed under this Agreement.

18. At all times during the term of this Agreement and for three (3) years following final settlement, SANDAG or any designated representatives shall have access to the records of the USFWS related to work performed under this Agreement and the USFWS shall make such records available for inspection, audit, and copying by SANDAG or any designated representative.
Neither SANDAG nor any officer thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by USFWS under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to USFWS under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, USFWS shall fully defend, indemnify and save harmless SANDAG, all officers and employees from all claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by USFWS under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to USFWS under this MOU.

THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE:

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

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

   For SANDAG
   401 B Street, Suite 800
   San Diego, CA 92101
   Attn: Rob Rundle
   (619) 699-6949
   rob.rundle@sandag.org

   For USFWS
   6010 Hidden Valley Road, Suite 101
   Carlsbad, CA 92011
   Attn: Karen Goebel
   (760) 431-9440, ext. 296
   Karen_goebel@fws.gov

3. That unless it is amended by the parties in writing, this MOU shall terminate on September 30, 2015, or on such earlier or later date as the parties may agree to in writing.

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

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

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

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

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

9. Nothing in the provisions of this MOU is intended to create duties or obligations to or rights in third parties to this MOU or affect the legal liability of the parties to this MOU.
10. This MOU may be executed in any number of identical counterparts, each of which shall be
deemed to be an original, and all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same
instrument when each party has signed one such counterpart.

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

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS:        UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE:

GARY L. GALLEGOS                              MIKE FRIS, ASSISTANT REGIONAL DIRECTOR,
Executive Director                            ECOLOGICAL SERVICES

APPROVED AS TO FORM:                          APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Office of General Counsel                    Legal Counsel
1. Invoicing and Payment

A United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) may invoice SANDAG in advance, on a semiannual basis, in accordance with the payment schedule listed in the cost estimate under Section 2 - Rates - and the rates specified below. In no case shall USFWS invoice in advance for more than one federal fiscal year.

2. Rates

USFWS biological staff person day rate is $894.26. This rate represents a blended rate of all USFWS staff working on project review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Biologist Day Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional OH @ 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Biologist Day Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Biologist Hourly Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Allowable Costs and Payments

a. Amounts payable to the USFWS shall be determined in accordance with cost principles generally applicable to use of federal grant funds and the principles in Section 4 below, subject to the limitations in paragraph (b) below. Reimbursements shall be subject to audit for compliance with said principles following execution and final approval of this Agreement.

b. USFWS will be reimbursed for actual costs (including labor costs, employee benefits, Federal travel allowance, other direct costs and indirect costs) incurred by USFWS in performance of the work, not to exceed the amount of $420,000 over the life of the agreement, unless amended. USFWS will not be reimbursed for actual costs that exceed the estimated costs set forth in the Agreement (USFWS's Rates) without prior written agreement between SANDAG and USFWS.

c. The Agreement (USFWS's Rates) uses average rates per Staff Day, which include salaries, indirect costs, administrative costs, and estimated direct costs, such as travel.

d. Upon receipt of USFWS's invoice, SANDAG will make an advance payment to USFWS for the total amount specified for the time period.

e. Unless otherwise specified in an individual Task Order or agreed to in writing by SANDAG, USFWS shall provide the Task Order Manager with a monthly statement of expenditures for each Task Order. The statement will include all costs billed to the Task Order for the period covered, as well as cumulatively for the duration of the Task Order. The monthly statement shall include a summary of hours. Unless otherwise specified in the Task Order, the monthly statement shall be mailed to the Task Order Manager at the address identified in 1(b) above.
f. The total amount payable by SANDAG for the Task Order, and any subsequent amendments, shall not exceed the amount agreed to in the Task Order, or in such amendments. Changes to Task Order provisions require written agreement by USFWS and SANDAG.

g. The total amount payable by SANDAG, for all Task Orders resulting from this Agreement, shall not exceed $420,000 over the life of the agreement, unless amended. It is understood and agreed that this total is an estimate, and that the actual amount of work requested by SANDAG may be less. There is no guarantee, either expressed or implied, as to the actual dollar amount that will be authorized under this Agreement through Task Orders. In no event shall Task Orders be issued that will exceed this maximum amount.

h. At the conclusion of the Task Order, USFWS shall provide SANDAG with a final statement of expenditures for the Task Order within sixty (60) calendar days of the Task Order termination date.

i. At the conclusion of this Agreement, USFWS agrees to remit to SANDAG any unexpended balance of the advance payment within sixty (60) days of Agreement termination.

4. Cost Principles

a. Allowable costs issued under this Agreement must be necessary, reasonable, and allocable. A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost. A cost is allocable to a particular cost objective if the goods or services involved are chargeable or assignable to such cost objective in accordance with relative benefits received.

b. Costs which are prohibited under State or Federal laws and regulations are not allowable under this Agreement.

c. Allowable costs must be accorded consistent treatment. A cost may not be assigned as a direct cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose in like circumstances has been allocated as an indirect cost.

d. Allowable costs must be adequately documented.

e. USFWS shall promptly repay SANDAG for any costs for which payment has been made to USFWS that are determined by subsequent audit to be unallowable under this Agreement.
Introduction

*Riding to 2050: San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan* (Bike Plan) was approved by the Board of Directors on May 28, 2010. The Bike Plan was developed to support implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), both of which call for more transportation options and a balanced regional transportation system that supports smart growth and a more sustainable region.

On October 28, 2011, the Board of Directors made a major commitment to Active Transportation with the adoption of the 2050 RTP and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The final action by the Board calls for beginning work on an Early Action Program (EAP) for the projects included in the Board-approved Bike Plan within six months of the 2050 RTP/SCS adoption as well as planning for a broader Active Transportation Program, including Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Transit, within two years of the 2050 RTP/SCS adoption. The Transportation Committee accepted the goals for the Bike Plan EAP framework on April 6, 2012. This action also included funding to initiate preliminary engineering and detailed cost estimates for the Bike EAP network.

The EAP and proposed implementation scenarios were presented to the Transportation Committee as an information item on July 19, 2013. At that meeting, the Transportation Committee asked for a summary of the history of the Active Transportation Grant Program, which has provided competitive planning and capital grants to local jurisdictions since the 1970’s. The Transportation Committee also noted the importance of having constituents and advocacy groups understand the impact the EAP would have on the Active Transportation Grant Program. Finally, the Transportation Committee asked that Scenario 4, which would eliminate the Active Transportation Grant Program, be removed for further consideration. This report will address the issues raised by the Transportation Committee and present a review of the three remaining Bike Plan EAP funding options, a summary of the funding assumptions, and description of the overall programmatic approach for implementation of the Bike EAP network.

Discussion

**July 19, 2013, Transportation Committee Follow-Up**

Active Transportation Grant Summary

Table 1 shows a historical summary of the Active Transportation Grant Program grant funding allocations from FY 2005 to FY 2012. During this period, the process for funding allocations has
included a defined set of evaluation criteria approved by the Transportation Committee and applied to the projects submitted through a competitive call for projects. During this time, funding also was allocated to both local and regional bikeway projects. The EAP would potentially reduce the historical amount of grant funding allocated to local projects (that are not part of the regional network) from an average of $1.8 million per year to $1 million per year.

Table 1 - Active Transportation Grant Program Historical Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Funding Available (in $ millions)</th>
<th>Local Plans and Projects (in $ millions)</th>
<th>Regional Bikeway Projects (in $ millions)</th>
<th>Percentage of Regional Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1 No FY 2009 call for local plans and projects. All allocated funding went to regional projects: Inland Rail Trail, Bayshore Bikeway, and Lake Hodges Bridge. Balance of funding went into reserves and was applied to the FY 2010 Call for Projects.

2 No FY 2011 call for local plans and projects. In April 2011, $7.6 million was allocated to initial Regional Bike Plan implementation. Balance of funding was put toward combined FY 2011 and FY 2012 Call for Projects.

**Active Transportation Advocacy Support**

Staff has met with the Active Transportation-related advocacy groups in the region to explain the EAP and ensure that they understand that moving forward with the EAP could reduce the historical amount of funding available for local projects in the competitive Active Transportation Grant Program to $1 million per year. Some examples of the types of projects that have been funded through the Active Transportation Grant Program include local bicycle and pedestrian projects, bicycle and pedestrian master plans, education and awareness initiatives, and bike racks. It should be noted that stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian projects are eligible for funding within the TransNet Local Streets and Roads Program. The San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, WalkSanDiego, Move San Diego, and BikeSD are in support of advancing the Bike Plan EAP.

**EAP Framework Goals**

The accepted framework goals used to develop the Bike Plan EAP and funding strategy are as follows:

- Overall goal is to implement the Regional Bicycle Network High Priority Projects within 10 years
- Execute Regional Bicycle Programs to support the Regional Bicycle Network as outlined in the Bike Plan
• Continue to fund local bicycle and pedestrian plans, programs, and projects through a competitive grant program

In accordance with the framework goals, the projects proposed for the Regional Bike Plan EAP listed in Attachment 1 were prioritized using the criteria as shown in Attachment 2.

**Preliminary Engineering and Cost Estimates**

The Regional Bike Plan cost estimates were developed by SANDAG engineering and planning staff with the assistance of two engineering consulting teams. The summary project costs shown in Attachment 1 are the estimated costs to complete the projects. Project costs include planning, environmental approval, preliminary engineering, design, right-of-way acquisition, review and permitting, construction, construction management, a project contingency, and administrative costs, including communications and legal. Similar to the way Transportation Demand Management measures are a part of regional major corridor projects, the estimated construction costs for regional bikeway projects also include programmatic elements, such as targeted marketing efforts and community-based travel planning that will support the capital investments for construction of the Regional Bicycle Network in order to maximize usage and safety.

**Implementation Options**

One of the EAP framework goals is to continue funding the local grant program. This goal is an influential factor in determining the funding capacity of the Bike EAP and was used to develop the proposed scenarios. Four preliminary financial scenarios were initially evaluated, and based on Transportation Committee feedback, Scenario 4 was eliminated, leaving the three scenarios shown in Table 2. No changes were made to Scenarios 1 to 3 from what was initially presented to the Transportation Committee in July. In each scenario, assumptions for the investment levels for the Bike EAP and the grant program varied. The analysis shows that positive fund balances and adequate debt service coverage are maintained for the program during a 20-year analysis period, from 2014 to 2033.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAP Amount</td>
<td>$200M</td>
<td>$170M</td>
<td>$210M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Grant Amount</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>$2M</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Starting Year</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it maintain positive fund balance and adequate debt service coverage through the 20-year analysis period (2014-2033)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis shows the impacts of having varying investment levels for the Bike EAP ($170 million to $210 million), different annual grant amounts ($1 million or $2 million), and different annual grant program starting years (2014 vs. 2024).

Attachment 1 shows the proposed project priority list, with the $200 million Scenario 1 funding cut-off shown for illustration purposes. The other scenario funding cut-offs and corresponding project lists can be found by using the rolling total cost column in Attachment 1. Attachment 3 is a map showing all of the proposed projects that are listed in Attachment 1.
The scenarios illustrate how increasing the size of the annual grant program from $1 million (Scenario 1) to $2 million (Scenario 2) would reduce the size of the Bike EAP by approximately $30 million. Deferring the start of a grant program from 2014 (Scenario 1) to 2024 (Scenario 3) adds approximately $10 million to the potential size of the EAP, from about $200 million to $210 million. All three scenarios are similar in terms of the adequately covering the debt payments that would be required.

It is proposed to initially use the existing SANDAG commercial paper program as the means for financing the projects as the overall EAP ramps up. This strategy allows for borrowing only what is needed on an ongoing basis until the program is fully up and running. The potential to transfer the financing to long-term bonds could then be evaluated each time a new bond issuance is contemplated for the overall TransNet Program during the regular updates of the TransNet Program Plan of Finance (POF).

Preferred Implementation Scenario

Staff believes Scenario 1 (shown in Table 2 below) would provide the best balance among the EAP framework goals to advance the implementation of the Regional Bike Network and maintain funding for local projects through the Active Transportation Grant Program. The $200 million proposed as part of Scenario 1 would enable the region to leverage and compete for non-local funding sources.

Revenue Assumptions and Other Funding Opportunities

The assumptions for the revenues include the 2 percent TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety Program, and the Transportation Development Act Non-motorized Program.

The Bike EAP is modeled after the Board’s current TransNet EAP, which has advanced TransNet Major Corridor projects around the region. The EAP concept has enabled the construction of a number of major transportation projects, and has allowed others to move forward to construction readiness, which helps position the region well if additional funds become available. To maximize funding opportunities from other sources, the Bike EAP implementation would be timed to have different projects in every stage of development. All projects would be moving toward the construction phase on a rolling timeline, so at any given time there would be projects that are close to being “shovel ready” for construction. Partnerships and coordination with other regional and local projects are other opportunities that would be actively pursued by the project development team.

Potential funding opportunities could include the Transportation Alternatives Program that was included in the federal surface transportation authorization, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century, and for which specific state legislation is pending to determine the project selection and distribution processes. This program, in part, replaces the long-standing Transportation Enhancements federal funding program under which the region has historically been successful in competing for past regional bicycle projects.

Other opportunities could include future state and federal funds, including infrastructure bond measures and grant funds from environmental conservancies. In the event that the region is successful in securing additional funds, they would be incorporated into the annual TransNet POF update to identify potential additional opportunities to defer debt financing or advance additional bike projects. Changes to assumptions in project costs and schedules, and to revenues, would be included in the annual TransNet POF update reviewed by the Board each year.
Other Issues

Supporting Programs

With the implementation of the projects as part of the proposed Bike Plan EAP, it is proposed to integrate and coordinate other supporting programs within the individual project budgets, with the goal of increasing the number of people riding bikes for transportation. For example, targeted marketing efforts and community-based travel planning could be employed in a particular corridor to encourage greater usage of a new bike facility.

Data Collection, Evaluation, and Modeling

Proper planning for active transportation requires up-to-date and accurate data and model information on bicyclists, pedestrians, and the facilities they use. Development of the Regional Bike Plan EAP would be coordinated closely with ongoing data collection, evaluation, and monitoring efforts. Funding for this program was approved as part of the initial implementation efforts so that baseline data could be collected, and a bicycle/pedestrian model could be developed in time for incorporation into the Activity-Based Model that will be used to develop San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. The Activity-Based Model under development relies on data to improve analyses of bicycle/pedestrian usage. Funding for this program is allowing SANDAG to collect pertinent data, establish evaluation criteria, and develop a framework to monitor the impact of investments in active transportation.

Next Steps

Pending action by the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors on the Regional Bike Plan EAP, Capital Improvement Program budget amendments would be prepared for work that is anticipated for FY 2014 and FY 2015. These proposed budget amendments would be brought back to the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors for their consideration later this year.

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

Attachments: 1. Regional Bike Plan EAP – Proposed Project Priority
2. Regional Bike Plan EAP – Prioritization for Proposed Phasing
3. Regional Bike Plan EAP – Map

Key Staff Contact: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, chris.kluth@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Jurisdiction(s)</th>
<th>FY Standing</th>
<th>Existing Project Cost</th>
<th>Funding Through Project Phase</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>Uptown</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Design</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>17,079,000 $</td>
<td>40,666,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>Uptown</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,578,000 $</td>
<td>52,403,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Design</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>1,727,000 $</td>
<td>49,173,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,771,000 $</td>
<td>54,564,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Design</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>2,688,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,868,000 $</td>
<td>62,025,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,519,000 $</td>
<td>62,025,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,519,000 $</td>
<td>62,025,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Design</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>289,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>860,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>High-Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>North Park - North City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000 $</td>
<td>57,038,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All projects are listed with their respective locations and statuses. The table also includes costs and funding details.
REGIONAL BIKE PLAN EAP
PRIORITIZATION FOR PROPOSED PHASING

**Note: Urban projects and Class I projects prioritized separately**

**Urban Projects:**

1. Continue working on and finish projects started in the Initial Implementation phase

2. Base prioritization on existing results/criteria adopted by Transportation Committee when Initial Implementation was presented
   a. Demand Base Criteria
      i. Gravity model based on Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs)
      ii. Higher land use intensities and shorter distances between SGOAs lead to greater estimated demand
   b. Facility Based Criteria
      i. Network gaps
      ii. Bicycle crashes
      iii. Public comments

3. Group similarly prioritized projects together geographically

**Class I Projects:** Finish projects started in the Initial Implementation phase and continue working on projects SANDAG is lead implementation agency

1. Project readiness

2. Group geographically with other Urban Projects where feasible/efficient

3. Capitalize on other regional project implementation efforts
Regional Bicycle Plan
Early Action Program
SAN YSIDRO INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION CENTER STUDY
DRAFT DESIGN CONCEPTS

Introduction

In October 2012, SANDAG and the City of San Diego, in collaboration with Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the community, initiated a study to identify a multimodal concept for an Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) in the vicinity of the San Ysidro Port of Entry (POE). The study also will prepare a financial feasibility analysis to identify strategies for creation of the San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center (SYITC).

The purpose of the study is to produce a mobility and economic/fiscal feasibility analysis for a SYITC concept for evaluation and consideration as part of the comprehensive San Ysidro Community Plan update process. The study includes a demand and supply analysis for off-street parking facilities associated with the ITC concept, and an analysis of complementary on-site retail, commercial, and institutional uses that could enhance the SYITC as a community amenity and generate revenue toward its construction. A team of consultants has been selected to help envision and provide the technical tools needed to develop a SYITC concept that will serve as a gateway to the world's busiest POE. Staff provided an update on the study efforts to the Transportation Committee at its May 3, 2013, meeting. This report seeks the Transportation Committee’s input on two draft design concepts that have been developed for the project. The Borders Committee provided input at its July 28, 2013, meeting.

Discussion

The initial study efforts focused on reviewing past and ongoing studies; preparing a commercial and institutional market study; creating off-street parking projections; and gathering input on the needs and vision for a future SYITC from the community, local business leaders, transportation providers, border crossers, and other stakeholders. The information gathered through these efforts was used to inform the development of two draft SYITC concepts. The study has included extensive public outreach efforts, which are described in a subsequent section of the report.

Draft Design Concepts

The two draft concepts were crafted taking into account input gathered via public workshops, outreach to San Ysidro High School students, and surveys. Findings from the commercial market study, off-street parking projections, progress on the San Ysidro Community Plan Update, and existing and projected transit ridership and border crossing data also informed the development of the two draft concepts. These concepts incorporate the Trolley, MTS buses, private buses, jitneys, taxis, bicycle and pedestrian pathways, personal vehicle drop-off and pick-up facilities, and paid
parking; in conjunction with commercial development. Retail, office, hotel, and institutional/government space is included in line with the study's market analysis, and additional opportunities for increased private development also are identified. Both alternatives include a public plaza, landscaping, and public art; and look to develop a welcoming gateway to the region and link the ITC to the greater San Ysidro community to the north.

The transportation functions and commercial development square footage would be the same for the two alternatives; however, the siting of these various components would differ. Option 1 would keep the Trolley in approximately its current location, but would expand the facility to include a third platform and longer platforms to accommodate four-car trains. The transportation elements included in Option 1 are estimated to cost between $90 and $120 million. In Option 2, the Trolley would be moved further east and the private and MTS bus facilities would be located underground, below the Trolley station. Option 2 would include significant excavation and relocation of the Trolley and has an estimated cost of between $150 and $200 million. Both concepts identify locations where additional private commercial development could occur. With the relocation of the Trolley tracks, Option 2 may allow for additional street-front retail development along San Ysidro Boulevard. Both concepts could be constructed in phases and would likely require significant private investment.

Public Outreach

There have been three public workshops to date, which have been publicized by San Diego and Tijuana media, postcard mailings, email, SANDAG, and partner agency websites, social media, and local community organizations. Meeting information also was posted on MTS buses serving the San Ysidro POE and at ticket vending machines at the San Ysidro Trolley station. Simultaneous Spanish translation was provided and meeting materials were available in English and Spanish. The project webpage (sandag.org/syitc) includes information on the study and outreach efforts, an online survey and comment tool, and materials from the public meetings.

As previously reported, two public workshops were held on January 9, 2013, and March 13, 2013. The third public workshop was held on July 10, 2013, at 6 p.m., at the Colonel Irving Salomon Community Activity Center in San Ysidro, in conjunction with the San Ysidro Community Plan Update Advisory Committee. The meeting featured a presentation on community outreach efforts to date and the two draft San Ysidro ITC concepts. Meeting participants were asked to complete a scorecard stating their preferences on various transportation and design components of the alternatives. Attendees also provided public comments and participated in a sticker exercise where different colored stars were placed on posters of the ITC concepts to indicate elements that participants liked or would wish to see changed. Approximately 50 members of the public attended. Simultaneous Spanish translation was provided during the presentations, Spanish speaking staff were on-hand to answer questions, and meeting materials also were available in English and Spanish.

SANDAG staff also has partnered with Casa Familiar to gather community input on the SYITC Study at three Sin Limites workshops. At the July 11, 2013, Casa Familiar Sin Limites workshop, SANDAG staff presented the two draft ITC concepts and gathered community input through public comments, a preference scorecard, and sticker activity. The meeting presentation was conducted in Spanish and meeting materials were available in English and Spanish. Approximately 55 members of the public participated in the workshop.
SANDAG staff also has met twice with members of the Border Transportation Council (BTC) and sought input and data regarding current and future facility needs to be incorporated into a future San Ysidro ITC facility. Input was sought on the two draft design concepts at the August 13, 2013, BTC meeting. SANDAG staff also presented the two draft design concepts to the South County Economic Development Corporation at its August 6, 2013, meeting.

On August 8, 2013, project staff met with members of the San Ysidro Smart Border Coalition (SYSBC) regarding the two draft design concepts and received input from the group. The SYSBC noted its preference for Option 2 and stated a need for additional facilities for private buses, jitneys, vans, pedicabs, taxis, bicycles, and personal vehicle pick-up/drop-offs. The SYSBC also voiced interest in greater widening of San Ysidro Boulevard between the current MTS bus drop-off area and Camino de la Plaza. The group also requested that elevating the Trolley to a second level in Option 2 be considered. The project team is currently evaluating the input provided by the SYSBC and exploring opportunities for inclusion in a revised San Ysidro ITC concept.

In addition, the consultant team conducted an intercept survey of over 450 northbound pedestrian border crossers to gather demographic data, reasons for crossing, use of public transportation, and their input on elements preferred in a future San Ysidro ITC. Survey respondents noted their desire for additional Trolley and bus services with longer hours of operation, greater service frequency, and additional seating capacity. Respondents also noted the desire for additional trees and green areas adjacent to the Port of Entry; the need for areas with shade; and waiting areas with seating and public restrooms.

**Next Steps**

A technical analysis of the two alternatives is underway and a revised alternative that incorporates the strengths of both concepts and incorporates public and stakeholder input is under development. The results of this analysis will be presented to the SANDAG Transportation Committee in Octoberfall 2013. The Transportation Committee will be asked to accept a preferred ITC concept for which a cost estimate and phasing plan will be developed. The study also will develop a strategy for implementing the preferred SYITC concept and off-street parking resources. The study is expected to conclude in spring 2014.

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

Attachment: 1. Draft San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center Study Design Concepts

Key Staff Contact: Rachel Kennedy, (619) 699 1929, rachel.kennedy@sandag.org
OPTION 1  
VIEW 14 - POSSIBLE FUTURE PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT
Option 1

VIEW 17 - POSSIBLE FUTURE JOINT/PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT - FROM SOUTH FROM STATION PLAZA
Option 1

Option 1 - View 19 - Minimal Development - Schematic Section Looking North
Option 2

OPTION 2  VIEW 11 - POSSIBLE FUTURE PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT
Option 2

VIEW 16 - SCHEMATIC SECTION LOOKING NORTH
REGIONAL BIKE PLAN
EARLY ACTION PROGRAM

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
September 20, 2013

EAP Framework Goals

1. Implement Regional Bicycle Network High Priority Projects

2. Regional Bicycle Support Programs

3. Competitive Local Active Transportation Grant Program
LEVERAGE TRANSNET

Bayshore Bikeway

MOBILITY
## EAP Implementation Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAP Amount</td>
<td>$200M</td>
<td>$170M</td>
<td>$210M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Grant Amount</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>$2M</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Starting Year</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program with Scenario 1 as the preferred implementation option.
San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center Study

September 20, 2013

San Ysidro ITC Study

- Project Need
  - Busiest international land border crossing in the world
  - 35,000 northbound vehicles and 25,000 northbound pedestrians daily
  - Transportation services in multiple locations
  - Create a welcoming gateway
Public Outreach

- Public workshops
- Casa Familiar Sin Límites
- San Ysidro High School
- Pedestrian surveys
- Border Transportation Council
- San Ysidro Smart Border Coalition
- Coordination with SIDUE
- South County Economic Development Corporation

Findings of Commercial and Institutional Market Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Estimate of Square Feet</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>30,000 to 105,000 by 2020 • 42,000 to 170,000 by 2035 Phased development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>75 rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting space</td>
<td>3,000 SF                Combined with hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Up to 10,000 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Up to 20,000 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 1
San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center Study
Option 1 continued

OPTION 1  VIEW 4 - STATION PLATFORMS PHASE 2

Option 1 continued

OPTION 1  VIEW 5 - STATION PLATFORMS PHASE 3
  36" Valley Platforms
Option 1 continued

Option 1 continued
Option 1 continued

Option 1 continued
Option 1 continued

OPTION 1 VIEW 14 - POSSIBLE FUTURE PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

Option 1 continued

OPTION 1 VIEW 15 - MINIMAL DEVELOPMENT - FROM SOUTH FROM STATION PLAZA
Option 1 continued

Option 1 continued
Option 1 continued

OPTION 1
VIEW 1B - POSSIBLE FUTURE JOINT/PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT - FROM NORTH ALONG SAN YSIDRO BLVD AT VIA

Option 1 continued

OPTION 1
VIEW 1F - MINIMAL DEVELOPMENT - SCHEMATIC SECTION LOOKING NORTH
Option 2

San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center Study
Option 2 continued

Option 2 continued
Option 2 continued

Option 2 continued
Option 2 continued

OPTION 2 VIEW 6 - STATION PLAZA AND AMENITIES
11. Security and information
12. Entry Free Store

Option 2 continued

OPTION 2 VIEW 7 - STATION ATRIUM ROOF
Option 2 continued

OPTION 2 VIEW 12 - MINIMAL DEVELOPMENT - FROM SOUTH FROM STATION PLAZA

Option 2 continued

OPTION 2 VIEW 13 - MINIMAL DEVELOPMENT - FROM SOUTH FROM STATION PLAZA
Option 2 continued

- Technical evaluation of two alternatives
- Fall 2013: SANDAG Transportation Committee and Borders Committee, City of San Diego Planning Commission
- Late 2013 – preferred alternative and implementation plan
- Late 2013 – public meeting to present preferred alternative
- Spring 2014 – Incorporate ITC concept into San Ysidro Community Plan update and final study report
Project Webpage

www.sandag.org/syitc

- Project information
- Fact sheets
- Online comment tool
- Survey
- Meeting materials
Dear Chair Gloria and TC Members:

I regret that the North County Coastal cities will not be represented at the Sept. 20 meeting of the Transportation Committee. I will be in Sacramento at the League of California Cities annual conference, and my alternate, Deputy Mayor Haydu, is also unavailable. Therefore, I am submitting these comments ahead of time.

We strongly support the Bicycle Early Action Plan. It is vitally important for us to provide safe, effective infrastructure for bicycles and pedestrians, whether for commuting, shopping, recreation, or physical fitness. I would prefer the funding strategy in Scenario 1, as an appropriate balance between local and regional investments.

Lisa Shaffer  
Deputy Mayor  
City of Encinitas
September 19, 2013

Honorable Todd Gloria
Transportation Committee Chair, SANDAG
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego, CA 92010

Chairman Gloria,

On behalf of the City of Encinitas, I want to express our strong support for the Region Bike Plan Early Action Program (EAP). We appreciate the inclusion of four segments of the Coastal Rail Trail within the initial $200m cap. We are working with SANDAG staff to make sure that we look holistically at transportation investments. The Encinitas City Council recently approved the next phase of funding for the North Coast Highway 101 Streetscape Project, which includes full construction design for Highway 101 between A Street and North Court. We are eager to coordinate with SANDAG and NCTD on our Streetscape project, the corresponding segment (39B) of the Coastal Rail Trail, as well as the proposed pedestrian rail crossing at El Portal Street. It is important that the design, and ultimately the construction, of these three important projects are coordinated to assure a cohesive program of projects. Located within this segment of the Coastal Rail Trail is Paul Ecke Central School. This elementary school is one of the City’s focus areas in our Safe Routes to School Program. Combining these transportation elements – traffic calming, a Class 1 Bike Path, and a safe pedestrian rail crossing adjacent to a public school – would make a dramatic improvement in safety, and enable greater participation in active transportation, while effectively leveraging all our investments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Glenn Pruim
Director of Public Work/Engineering
City of Encinitas

cc: Gus Vina, City Manager
    City Council
September 20, 2013

Honorable Chairman Todd Gloria
SANDAG Transportation Committee
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Item 4 Proposed Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program—SUPPORT

Honorable Chairman Gloria and Committee Members,

Move SD is here today in support of SANDAG moving forward with the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program for our region, with Scenario 1 as the preferred implementation option. We appreciate your leadership on the issues relating to sustainable communities, improving mobility, and reducing climate emissions. The outcomes Move SD envisions for healthy, sustainable communities include:

- *A San Diego where families can get around with one car instead of 2,*
- *Reduced average transportation costs to under $10,000 annually,*
- *Improved overall public health due to active mobility.*

By supporting this step in implementing the region’s active transportation plan today, you will take San Diegans one step closer to achieving those outcomes.

Investing in a first-class active transportation network will generate many economic benefits for the entire region by:

- Creating a sense of community, livelier and safer streets, and supporting local businesses.
- Encouraging the use of the transit network by helping to close the “first-mile/last-mile” gap that can be the critical factor in a person’s commute choices
- Mitigating the increase in traffic congestion on our roadways and reducing greenhouse gas and other harmful emissions by providing safe and attractive alternatives to driving
SANDAG Transportation Committee
September 20, 2013

- Restraining growth in healthcare and transportation costs, allowing more dollars to spent supporting the local economy

Move San Diego supports the balance of funding as planned in Scenario 1 of the options presented to the Transportation Committee in July and believes that this level of investment is the right way to begin fulfillment of the commitment made by the Board of Directors in adopting the 2050 RTP and its Sustainable Communities Strategy in October 2011.

I can be reached at (858) 204-6545 or elowe@movesandiego.org. Thank you for your public service. We respect and value your leadership, your opinions and insight, and hope to collaborate with you on action items in the near future.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Elyse Lowe
Executive Director

Cc: SANDAG Board Chairman Jack Dale

MOVE SAN DIEGO

is the public non-profit voice in support of effective and sustainable transportation and smart growth in the San Diego region. We organize and serve a broad collaboration of people and organizations to prioritize, fund, and implement sustainable, healthy, convenient transportation and related land use solutions. Move San Diego raises awareness of the benefits of smart transportation options and how they will result in a more livable, healthy and vibrant San Diego

www.movesandiego.org
Six Trains Added to COASTER Schedule
More options, same fare in NCTD/Caltrans/Amtrak Agreement

What: 3 NB and 3 SB Amtrak Pacific Surfliners® will make all 8 COASTER stops.


Who: Any COASTER passenger may ride these trains at No Additional Charge with any valid COASTER fare media.

Times: NB will leave Santa Fe Depot at 8:24 a.m., 10:42 a.m., and 9:05 p.m. SB trains will depart Oceanside Transit Center at 7:03 p.m., 9:19 p.m., and 11:52 p.m.

SVCC: The Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection weekday shuttle will meet NB Pacific Surfliner (A567) at the Sorrento Valley station at 8:51 a.m.

**Coaster** passengers may ride Amtrak Pacific Surfliner trains 572, 573, 574, 784, 789/790, 796 and Thruway bus 5911 at no additional charge with the trip limits printed on their Coaster ticket.

* Sonoma Valley Coaster Connection shuttle service not available for this train.

Coaster operates on a holiday schedule on the following dates: Thanksgiving, Christmas Day, New Year’s Day.

**Schedule and platform assignments are subject to change.**

Amtrak policies and terms of travel apply and may differ from NCTD policies including photo ID requirements, unaccompanied minors, accessibility, and baggage restrictions. Please visit www.amtrak.com/train-travel-plan for complete details. Coaster tickets are not valid for accessing or transporting bicycles on Pacific Surfliner trains. In order to secure a bicycle reservation, the purchase of an Amtrak ticket is required. Please visit www.amtrak.com/buy-your-bicycle-onboard for more information.

Coaster fare media accepted on designated Amtrak Pacific Surfliner trains and Thruway buses every day of the week except Med-Sun of Thanksgiving week.

Amtrak fares, schedules, routes, equipment and services subject to change without notice. Other policies and restrictions apply. Amtrak and Pacific Surfliner are service marks of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation. Ticketing,_horarios, trenes, y servicios de Amtrak están sujetos a cambios sin previo aviso. Se aplican otras políticas y restricciones. Amtrak y el Pacific Surfliner son marcas registradas de National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

**Promociones de Coaster pueden viajar en trenes Amtrak Pacific Surfliner 572, 573, 574, 784, 789/790, 796 y Thruway autobús 5911 sin costo adicional dentro de los límites de viaje impuestos en el boleto Coaster.**

El horario Sonoma Valley Coaster Connection no está disponible en este tren. El Coaster opera a un horario de fin de semana los siguientes días festivos: Año Nuevo, Navidad y Año Nuevo.

Horarios y plazas asignadas están sujetos a cambios. Todos los pasajeros de Amtrak y los horarios de viaje aplican y pueden diferir de los de NCTD independientemente de las normas para identificación con fotografía, menores sin acompañante, accesibilidad y reservaciones de equipaje. Para hacer reservaciones, visite www.amtrak.com/train-travel-plan para detalles completos. Boleto Coaster no es válido para acceso o transporte de bicicletas en los trenes Pacific Surfliner. Para hacer dicha reservación se requiere comprar un boleto de Amtrak. Para hacer reservación se requiere comprar un boleto de Amtrak. Para obtener información adicional, visite www.amtrak.com/buy-your-bicycle-onboard para más información. Todos los billetes de Coaster son emitidos en trenes designados por Amtrak Pacific Surfliner y autobuses Thruway todos los días de la semana excepto el Martes al Domingo de las semanas de Año Nuevo.

**Tickets sold at vending machines VALID ONLY for the SAME DAY of purchase - NO REFUNDS.**

One-way ticket valid for 2 hours from time of purchase. Tickets may be purchased online at GoatND.com and via smartphones.

Boleto adquiridos en las máquinas son VÁLIDOS SOLAMENTE EL MISMO DÍA DE SU COMPRA. NO REEMBOLSOS.

Boletos de viaje sencillo son válidos por 2 horas desde el momento de compra. Se pueden comprar boletos por internet @GoNCTD.com y vía teléfono inteligente.

To obtain this document in an alternate format, please contact NCTD Customer Service (760) 966-6500 or download online at GoNCTD.com. Para pedir este documento en otros formatos por favor llame a Servicio a Cliente al (760) 966-6500 o abajo de GoNCTD.com.