TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Friday, February 16, 2018
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- HOWARD AVENUE SEGMENT OF THE HOWARD – ORANGE BIKEWAY: CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT EXEMPTION
- FY 2019 – FY 2023 TransNet AND TRANSIT RELATED REVENUES
- SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE 2019-2050 REGIONAL PLAN – FUNDING SCENARIOS

PLEASE SILENCE ALL ELECTRONIC DEVICES DURING THE MEETING
YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEBSITE AT 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 (Committee) on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Request to Comment form, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the form to the Committee Clerk 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 Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Both agenda and non-agenda comments should be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the committee name and meeting date, agenda item, your name, and your organization. Any comments, handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting. All public comments and materials received by the deadline become part of the official project record, will be provided to the members for their review at the meeting, and will be posted to the agenda file as a part of the handouts following each meeting.

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 either at the SANDAG website or by sending an email request to webmaster@sandag.org.

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 the 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 or (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.

Los materiales de la agenda de SANDAG están disponibles en otros idiomas. Para hacer una solicitud, llame al (619) 699-1900 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.

如有需要, 我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。请在会议前至少 72 小时打电话 (619) 699-1900 提出请求。

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or visit 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.
## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Friday, February 16, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

The Transportation Committee is asked to review and approve the minutes from its February 2, 2018, meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+3.</th>
<th>2016 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 10 – ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION (Sue Alpert)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Amendment No. 10 – Administrative Modification to the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+4.</th>
<th>HOWARD AVENUE SEGMENT OF THE HOWARD – ORANGE BIKEWAY: CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT EXEMPTION (Alison Moss and Andrew Martin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the California Environmental Quality Act exemption for the Howard Avenue segment of the Howard – Orange Bikeway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+5.</th>
<th>PROPOSED FY 2018 PROGRAM BUDGET AMENDMENT: LIGHT RAIL VEHICLE (LRV) PROCUREMENT SUPPORT (Chip Finch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Transportation Committee is asked to: (1) approve an amendment to the FY 2018 Program Budget, creating a new Capital Improvement Program Project No. 1131400: Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Procurement Support; and (2) accept $150,000 from the Metropolitan Transit System to fully fund the project.
+6. **PROPOSED FY 2018 PROGRAM BUDGET AMENDMENT: I-15 MANAGED LANES DYNAMIC SIGNAGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT** (Ryan Ross)

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve an amendment to the FY 2018 Program Budget, adding $118,000 in Interstate 15 (I-15) Toll Reserves to the I-15 Managed Lanes Dynamic Signage Improvement project (Capital Improvement Program Project No. 1400302), for additional construction administration support.

+7. **PROPOSED FY 2018 PROGRAM BUDGET AMENDMENT: ELVIRA TO MORENA DOUBLE TRACK PROJECT** (Peter d’Ablaing)

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2018 Program Budget, adding $3.404 million in funds from the City of San Diego to the Elvira to Morena Double Track project (Capital Improvement Program Project No. 1239811), to fully fund two wet utility agreements.


The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the FY 2019 – FY 2023 Transportation Development Act, TransNet, and Federal Transit Administration estimates and apportionments.


Staff will provide an overview of the discussion held at the annual SANDAG Board of Directors retreat on which funding scenarios should be used as part of the development of San Diego Forward: The 2019-2050 Regional Plan.

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.

11. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, March 2, 2018, at 9 a.m.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

FEBRUARY 2, 2018

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Jim Desmond (North County Inland) at 9:02 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

**Action:** Upon a motion by Vice Chair Garry Bonelli (San Diego Unified Port District [SDUPD]), and a second by Vice Chair John Aguilera (North County Transit District [NCTD]), the Transportation Committee approved the meeting minutes of January 19, 2018. Yes: Chair Desmond, Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego), Councilmember Bill Baber (East County), Councilmember David Arambula (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), NCTD Vice Chair Aguilera, and SDUPD Vice Chair Bonelli. No: None. Abstain: Councilmember Jewel Edson (North County Coastal) and Ms. April Boling (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority [SDCAA]). Absent: City of San Diego and South County.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Desmond welcomed Councilmember Edson and Councilmember Arambula.

Clive Richard, a member of the public, spoke about his recent positive experience taking MTS transit.

Andrew Yancey, Latham & Watkins, submitted written comments and spoke about concerns related to the County of San Diego Climate Action Plan.

John Wotzka, a member of the public, submitted written comments and spoke about various transportation matters.

**REPORTS**

4. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE 2019-2050 REGIONAL PLAN - EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES WHITE PAPER (INFORMATION)

Phil Trom, Senior Regional Planner, Antoinette Meier, Principal Regional Planner, and James Dreisbach-Towle, Senior Analyst/ITS Project Manager, provided an overview of the Emerging Technologies White Paper, which outlines technological developments to be considered in the development of San Diego Forward: The 2019-2050 Regional Plan.
Jack Shu, Cleveland National Forest Foundation, spoke about concerns with economic justice related to technology.

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


Rachel Kennedy, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item.

Maya Rosas, Circulate San Diego, spoke regarding advancing transit scenarios in the Regional Plan.

Jordan Beane, a member of the public, spoke regarding support for complete transit connections.

Mr. Shu spoke regarding reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the region.

The Transportation Committee members provided feedback on the draft performance measures to be used in the development of San Diego Forward: The 2019-2050 Regional Plan.

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

5. **CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no continued public comments.

6. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, February 16, 2018.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Desmond adjourned the meeting at 10:57 a.m.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Cox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
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<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>David Arambula</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
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<td>No</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>April Boling</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Garry Bonelli</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Zucchet</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ADVISORY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Cory Binns</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Fox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTCA</td>
<td>Erica Pinto</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees</td>
<td>Matt Tucker</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Jablonski</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

On September 23, 2016, the Board of Directors adopted the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the multiyear program of proposed major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2017 to FY 2021. The 2016 RTIP is a multibillion dollar program of projects funded by federal, state, TransNet local sales tax, and other local funding sources. The 2017 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, which incorporates the SANDAG 2016 RTIP, received federal approval on December 16, 2016.

Discussion

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve an administrative modification amendment to the 2016 RTIP. The proposed change is summarized below with further programming details included in Table 1 (Attachment 1).

City of San Diego

State Route 163/Friars Road Interchange Modification (SD83) — This amendment proposes to replace $1,086,000 of Local Funds in FY 2017 with federal repurposed earmark funds in FY 2018. Total project remains at $61,394,000.

Administrative Modification

There are two types of processes to update the RTIP, administrative modifications and formal amendments. Formal amendments require, among other things, a 15-day public notice period, while administrative modifications are considered minor in nature and do not require a public notice period. Chapter 2 of the adopted 2016 RTIP provides additional details regarding the differences between formal amendments and administrative modifications. Amendment No. 10 is considered an administrative modification because the programming for each project, or grouped listing, is increasing by less than 40 percent of the total programmed amount, or $10 million, which is consistent with the federally accepted administrative modification procedures.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Amendment No. 10 – Administrative Modification to the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.
SANDAG is processing Amendment No. 10 to the 2016 RTIP as an administrative modification due to timing-related issues related to federal, state, and local funding. The federal agencies delegated the approval of administrative modifications to the state, thereby streamlining the approval process.

**Fiscal Constraint Analysis**

Federal regulations require the 2016 RTIP to be a revenue constrained document, with programmed projects based upon available or committed funding and/or reasonable estimates of future funding. Funding assumptions are generally based upon: (1) authorized or appropriated levels of federal and state funding from current legislation; (2) conservative projections of future federal and state funding based upon a continuation of current funding levels; (3) the most current revenue forecasts for the Board approved short-term TransNet Program; and (4) the planning and programming documents of the local transportation providers.

As an administrative modification, an updated fiscal constraint analysis is not required. The proposed changes included in Amendment No. 10 do not affect the fiscal constraint submitted as part of the federally approved 2016 RTIP. Chapter 4 of the Final 2016 RTIP discusses in detail the financial capacity analysis of major program areas, including discussion of available revenues. The 2016 RTIP, including Amendment No. 10, continues to be reasonable when considering available funding sources.

**Air Quality Analysis**

On September 23, 2016, SANDAG found the 2016 RTIP in conformance with the Regional Air Quality Strategy/State Implementation Plan (SIP) and with the 2009 Regional Air Quality Strategy for the San Diego region. All of the required regionally significant capacity increasing projects were included in the quantitative emissions analysis conducted for the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (Regional Plan) and the 2016 RTIP. The Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration jointly approved the conformity determination for the 2016 RTIP and the conformity redetermination for the Regional Plan on December 16, 2016.

The proposed amendment does not reflect a change in the design, concept, or scope of the project or the conformity analysis years as modeled for the regional emissions analysis of the 2016 RTIP. Projects in the 2016 RTIP Amendment No. 10 meet the conformity provisions of the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR §93.122(g)). Capacity increasing projects were included in the quantitative emissions analysis conducted for the Regional Plan and 2016 RTIP. Amendment No. 10 does not interfere with the timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures. The 2016 RTIP, including Amendment No. 10, remains in conformance with the SIP.

**JOSÉ A. NUNCIO**

*TransNet Department Director*

Attachment: 1. Table 1: 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program – Amendment No. 10 – Administrative Modification

Key Staff Contact: Sue Alpert, (619) 595-5318, sue.alpert@sandag.org
San Diego, City of

MPO ID: SD83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>SR 163/Friars Road Interchange Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Description:</td>
<td>Friars Road from Friars Road to SR 163 - widen and improve Friars Road and overcrossing; reconstruct interchange including improvements to ramp intersections (Phase 1); construct new connector roadways and structures (Phase 2); construct auxiliary lanes along northbound and southbound SR163 (Phase 3) (CIP Legacy#52-455.0,WBS# S-00851)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Reason:</td>
<td>Revise Fund Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Status:</td>
<td>CI Exempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt Category:</td>
<td>Non-Exempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Total Cost:</td>
<td>$61,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$2,207</td>
<td>$2,207</td>
<td>$2,207</td>
<td>$2,207</td>
<td>$2,207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td>$13,391</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,909</td>
<td>$2,227</td>
<td>$19,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI Carry Over</td>
<td>$3,905</td>
<td>$3,068</td>
<td>$836</td>
<td>$1,086</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,975</td>
<td>$930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmark Repurposing</td>
<td>$1,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$2,240</td>
<td>$2,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$19,026</td>
<td>$12,026</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,153</td>
<td>$14,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local RTCIP</td>
<td>$11,630</td>
<td>$4,930</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,980</td>
<td>$8,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,394</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,862</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,536</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,086</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,909</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,802</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 16-08**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - L</td>
<td>$2,207</td>
<td>$2,207</td>
<td>$2,207</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td>$13,391</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,909</td>
<td>$2,227</td>
<td>$19,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI Carry Over</td>
<td>$3,905</td>
<td>$3,068</td>
<td>$836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,975</td>
<td>$930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$2,240</td>
<td>$2,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$20,112</td>
<td>$12,026</td>
<td>$8,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,154</td>
<td>$15,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local RTCIP</td>
<td>$11,630</td>
<td>$4,930</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,980</td>
<td>$8,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,394</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,862</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,622</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,909</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,803</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RTIP Fund Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Federal Funding</strong></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARREPU</td>
<td>Earmark Repurposing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ/RSTP Conversion</td>
<td>Reimbursement of advanced federal funds which have been advanced with local funds in earlier years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Local Funding</strong></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTCIP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-L</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local Streets &amp; Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local System Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI Carry Over</td>
<td>TransNet - LSI funds previously programmed but not requested/paid in year of allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 16, 2018

AGENDA ITEM NO. 18-02-4

HOWARD AVENUE SEGMENT OF THE HOWARD – ORANGE BIKEWAY: CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT EXEMPTION

File Number 1223079

Introduction

SANDAG staff has completed preliminary engineering design for the Howard Avenue segment of the Howard – Orange Bikeway (Project). The Project is covered by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provisions for classes of projects that are exempt from requirements to prepare environmental documents. Attachment 1 includes a detailed description and map of the Project.

Discussion

Howard – Orange Bikeway Overview

The Howard – Orange Bikeway comprises two segments: (1) Howard Avenue, from Park Boulevard to Interstate 805 (I-805) in the San Diego community of North Park; and (2) Orange Avenue, from I-805 to Estella Avenue in the San Diego community of City Heights. While staff has completed preliminary engineering design for the Project, the preliminary design for the Orange Avenue segment is ongoing as staff conducts further study to determine the feasibility of additional traffic calming measures. Staff will provide the Transportation Committee with an update on the Orange Avenue segment when the results of the study are available and preliminary design has been completed as part of the CEQA determination of that segment.

Project Overview

The Howard Avenue segment of the Project will improve east-west connectivity for people who bike and walk within San Diego’s North Park community, and it will connect to the Mid-City (City Heights), Uptown and Eastern communities. The Project will begin in North Park at the intersection of Howard Avenue and Park Boulevard, and will extend eastward on Howard Avenue to I-805, where it will ultimately connect to the planned Orange Avenue segment of the Project in City Heights. Proposed Project features include buffered bike lanes, neighborhood traffic circles, bend-out treatments, raised crosswalks and improved pedestrian crossings, all of which will create safer biking and walking conditions for people of all ages and abilities.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the California Environmental Quality Act exemption for the Howard Avenue segment of the Howard – Orange Bikeway (Attachment 1).
California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The CEQA Statutes (Public Resources Code [PRC] 21000-21189) and the Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR], Sections 15000 et seq.) identify classes of projects that do not have a significant effect on the environment, and declare these classes of projects to be categorically exempt from CEQA requirements to prepare environmental documents (categorical exemptions) and classes of projects that have been granted exemptions from CEQA by the Legislature (statutory exemptions). There are exceptions to using categorical exemptions depending on the nature or location of a project or its environmental impacts, but there are no such exceptions for statutory exemptions.

Staff has reviewed these provisions and concluded that the Project is covered by a combination of three CEQA exemptions: two categorical exemptions, “Class 1. Existing Facilities” and “Class 4. Minor Alterations to Land” (CCR Sections 15301[c] and 15304[h]), and one statutory exemption for “Restriping for Bicycle Lanes in Urbanized Areas” (PRC Section 21080.20.5). The Project’s compliance with these CEQA provisions is summarized below and described in more detail in Attachment 2.

The Class 1 and Class 4 categorical exemptions cover the types of physical improvements included in the Project, including but not limited to alterations to existing city streets, curbs, intersections, and related facilities that result in negligible or no expansion of existing uses and creating new bicycle lanes in existing rights-of-way. Moreover, the Project does not meet any of the exceptions that preclude use of the categorical exemptions provided in CCR Section 15300.2.

The Project also is covered by the statutory exemption because it includes restriping for bicycle lanes in an urbanized area, consistent with the City of San Diego’s Bicycle Master Plan. As described below, staff has completed the actions that CEQA requires before the Transportation Committee can consider approving the statutory exemption: (1) prepared an assessment of the Project’s vehicular traffic and bicycle and pedestrian safety impacts (traffic and safety impact assessment); (2) held a noticed public hearing; and (3) heard and responded to public comments.

Traffic and Safety Impact Assessment

As required by PRC Section 21080.20.5(b)(1)(A), staff prepared an assessment of the Project’s traffic and safety impacts, which concludes that the Project does not result in any vehicular traffic impacts as defined by City of San Diego Significance Thresholds for Traffic Impacts. The assessment also concludes that the Project would not have any negative bicycle and pedestrian safety impacts. The assessment was published on July 12, 2017, along with notice of the Project’s public hearing. The assessment analyzed both the Project and the Orange Avenue segment of the Howard – Orange Bikeway, but as explained above, staff is conducting further study of the Orange Avenue segment and will provide an update to the Transportation Committee once the results of the study are available and the preliminary design has been completed. The assessment is provided as Attachment 3.

Public Hearing

As required by PRC Section 21080.20.5(b)(2), a noticed public hearing was held on July 27, 2017, to hear public comments on the Project. The hearing was held in the Project area at the Lafayette Hotel on El Cajon Boulevard in the San Diego community of North Park. Public comments made at the public hearing, along with staff responses to those comments, are described below.
Responses to Comments

Responses to public comments on the Project are provided in Attachment 4. A total of 39 individuals or organizations provided comments on the Project. Verbal and written comments were provided and accepted at the open house and public hearing on July 27, 2017. Comments were also submitted to staff via email between July 24, 2017, and July 27, 2017. Sixty-three people attended the open house and public hearing.

Overall, the majority of comments received expressed support for the Project. Specific concerns regarding the Project related mostly to on-street parking, specific Project features and proposed Project design in City Heights. Staff organized all comments received according to common themes and provided a written response to each common theme.

Copies of all written comments, emails, and court reporter-prepared transcripts of the verbal comments are provided in Appendix A of Attachment 4.

Public Outreach

In addition to the July 27, 2017, public hearing, public outreach and community involvement have occurred throughout the planning and development of the Project. The Howard – Orange Bikeway Project is one of six projects included in the North Park | Mid-City Bikeways. Since the North Park | Mid-City Bikeways planning process began in 2013, seven community workshops were held and at least 90 presentations were made to community groups. Presentations specifically on the Howard – Orange Bikeway have been made to these community groups throughout the life of the Project: North Park Planning Committee, the El Cajon Boulevard Business Improvement Association, City Heights Area Planning Committee and the City Heights Built Environment Team. Throughout the process, the Project website has been kept up-to-date to inform interested persons about the Project.

Next Steps

Pending approval of the CEQA exemption, staff would move forward with final design and construction of the Project, which is expected to be ready to advertise for construction in January 2020, with construction expected to begin in May 2020, and the bikeway open to the public in May 2021.

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

Attachments: 1. Project Description for the Howard – Orange Bikeway (Howard Avenue portion)
   2. Notice of Exemption for the Howard – Orange Bikeway (Howard Avenue portion)
   3. Traffic and Safety Impact Assessment for the Howard – Orange Bikeway
   4. Responses to Comments on the Howard – Orange Bikeway

Key Staff Contact: Alison Moss, (619) 595-5354, alison.moss@sandag.org
Howard Avenue Segment of the Howard – Orange Bikeway

Project Description

The Howard – Orange Bikeway comprises two segments: (1) Howard Avenue, from Park Boulevard to Interstate 805 (I-805) in the San Diego community of North Park (the Project), and (2) Orange Avenue, from I-805 to Estella Avenue in the San Diego community of City Heights. While staff has completed preliminary engineering design for the Project, the preliminary design for the Orange Avenue segment is ongoing as staff conducts further study of additional traffic calming measures suggested by the members of the surrounding community.

The Howard Avenue segment of the Project would improve east-west connectivity for people who bike and walk within San Diego’s North Park community, and it would connect to the Mid-City (City Heights), Uptown and Eastern communities. It would help implement the vision laid out in the San Diego Regional Bike Plan to make riding a bike a more convenient and safer choice for everyday travel and is consistent with the City of San Diego’s Bicycle Master Plan. The Project will begin in North Park at the intersection of Howard Avenue and Park Boulevard, and will extend eastward on Howard Avenue to I-805, where it will ultimately connect to the planned Orange Avenue portion of the Project in City Heights. The proposed Project would connect with other planned bikeways, including the Georgia Street portion of the Georgia – Meade Bikeway and the University Bikeway.

Proposed Project features include buffered bike lanes, neighborhood traffic circles, bend-out treatments, raised crosswalks and improved pedestrian crossings, all of which will create safer biking and walking conditions for people of all ages and abilities. A more detailed description of the proposed Project – from west to east – is provided below and the Project alignment is illustrated on Figure 1. The description is based on the proposed Project’s current level of design and would be finalized during the final engineering design phase before the start of construction.

Howard Avenue between Park Boulevard and Georgia Street

In this segment, the proposed Project maintains the same basic existing configuration: two travel lanes and no center turn lane, and would install shared lane markings. On the north side of the street, parallel parking would remain, while on the south side it would be converted from head-in and parallel to reverse angle and head-in angle parking.

Howard Avenue between Georgia Street and Florida Street

In this segment, the proposed Project would remove the center turn lane to provide one extra-wide buffered bike lane on the uphill (westbound) portion, and a shared lane marking on the downhill (eastbound) portion. This hybrid design is intended to provide greater accommodation for people biking where it’s most needed, on the uphill portion (i.e., where more space is needed for climbing, and where bicycle and vehicle speeds are greatest).
Howard Avenue between Florida Street and Oregon Street

In this segment, the proposed Project would remove the center turn lane to provide buffered bike lanes on both sides of the street. Parallel parking would remain on both sides of the street. In addition, this segment of Howard Avenue proposes many intersection treatments intended to facilitate safe crossings and calm traffic: neighborhood traffic circles, raised crosswalks, and a bend-out treatment.

Howard Avenue between Oregon Street and Idaho Street

In this segment, the proposed Project would remove the center turn lane, and add shared lane markings and reverse angle parking to the south side of the street. It would retain parallel parking on the north side of the street. This segment of Howard Avenue would also propose the following intersection treatments, all of which further enhance the traffic calming along this segment: neighborhood traffic circles, curb extensions and new painted crossings.

Howard Avenue between Idaho Street and I-805 Freeway

In this segment, the proposed Project would remove the center turn lane to provide buffered bike lanes on both sides of the street. Parallel parking would remain on both sides of the street. For Howard Avenue, between Idaho Street and I-805, the Project proposes the following intersection treatments, all of which further enhance the traffic calming along this segment: neighborhood traffic circles, bend-out treatments, a raised crosswalk, and a series of cushions and midblock curb extensions.

Other Improvements

In general, other physical improvements that may be installed as part of the proposed Project could include new painted crossings at intersections or at mid-block, pedestrian crossing signals (e.g., flashing beacons), advanced signal phases for people walking and biking, new raised medians, curb extensions, accessible curb ramps, sidewalks, pedestrian refuge islands, modifications to existing curbs, gutters and drainage inlets, colored concrete and/or colored pavement, intersection crossing (or “conflict”) markings, shared lane markings, new signage, repaving the roadway surface (e.g., slurry seal), re-striping of travel lanes, re-striping of relocated or reconfigured parking stalls, new trees, landscaping or other measures to treat storm water, relocating existing underground utilities, new bikeway lighting at priority locations, bike parking, and similar minor physical improvements.
Figure 1. Howard Avenue Segment of the Howard – Orange Bikeway

THE IMPROVEMENTS ON THIS MAP ARE NOT FINAL AND MAY BE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
To: Office of Planning and Research  
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From: San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
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County of San Diego  
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Project Title: Howard Avenue segment of the Howard – Orange Bikeway (“proposed project”).  

Project Location: City of San Diego, San Diego County.  

Description of Specific Location, Nature, Purpose, and Beneficiaries of Project: The proposed project will improve east-west connectivity for people who bike and walk within San Diego’s North Park community, and it would connect to the Mid-City (City Heights), Uptown and Eastern communities. The Project will begin in North Park at the intersection of Howard Avenue and Park Boulevard, and will extend eastward on Howard Avenue to Interstate 805, where it will ultimately connect to other planned bikeways, including the Orange Avenue portion of the Howard – Orange Bikeway. The project will also intersect with the planned Georgia – Meade and Central Avenue Bikeways. Proposed project features include buffered bike lanes, neighborhood traffic circles, bend-out treatments, raised crosswalks and improved pedestrian crossings, all of which support safer biking and walking conditions for people of all ages and abilities.  

The proposed project would help fulfill the vision laid out in the San Diego Regional Bike Plan to make riding a bike a more convenient and safer choice for everyday travel. The proposed project is part of the SANDAG Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program (Bike EAP), a 10-year effort to expand the regional bike network and complete high-priority bikeway projects approved in Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bike Plan (Bike Plan). The Bike Plan and Bike EAP are part of the region’s efforts to make riding a bike a viable, attractive choice for everyday trips.  

The purpose of the proposed project is to make it more convenient, attractive, and safe for people to ride bikes for everyday trips. In addition to benefitting people on bikes, the traffic calming elements in the proposed project will also benefit people who walk and drive by making roadways safer for all users. By supporting bike riding as a viable choice for everyday trips, the proposed project would support local, regional, and state efforts to reduce greenhouse gas and air pollutant emissions through reductions in vehicle miles traveled. A description of the proposed project is provided below  

Howard Avenue between Park Boulevard and Georgia Street  

In this segment, the proposed project maintains the same basic existing configuration: two travel lanes and no center turn lane, and would install shared lane markings. On the north side of the street, parallel parking would remain, while on the south side it would be converted from head-in and parallel to reverse angle and head-in angle parking.  

Howard Avenue between Georgia Street and Florida Street  

In this segment, the proposed project would remove the center turn lane to provide one extra-wide buffered bike lane on the uphill (westbound) portion, and a shared lane marking on the downhill (eastbound) portion. This hybrid design is intended to provide greater accommodation for people biking where it’s most needed, on the uphill portion (i.e. where more space is needed for climbing, and where bicycle and vehicle speeds are greatest).
Howard Avenue between Florida Street and Oregon Street

In this segment, the proposed project would remove the center turn lane to provide buffered bike lanes on both sides of the street. Parallel parking would remain on both sides of the street. In addition, this segment of Howard Avenue proposes many intersection treatments intended to facilitate safe crossings and calm traffic: neighborhood traffic circles, raised crosswalks, and a bend-out treatment.

Howard Avenue between Oregon Street and Idaho Street

In this segment, the proposed project would remove the center turn lane, and add shared lane markings and reverse angle parking to the south side of the street. It would retain parallel parking on the north side of the street.

The success of this design, in encouraging safe driving speeds, and safe and comfortable lane sharing between people bicycling and driving, is dependent on adjacent traffic calming treatments. This segment of Howard Avenue proposes the following intersection treatments, all of which further enhance the traffic calming along this segment: neighborhood traffic circles, curb extensions and new painted crossings.

Howard Avenue between Idaho Street and I-805 Freeway

In this segment, the proposed project would remove the center turn lane to provide buffered bike lanes on both sides of the street. Parallel parking would remain on both sides of the street. The success of this design, in encouraging safe driving speeds, and safe and comfortable intersections for all road users, is dependent on adjacent traffic calming treatments.

For Howard Avenue, between Idaho Street and Interstate 805, the project proposes the following intersection treatments: neighborhood traffic circles, bend-out treatments, a raised crosswalk, and a series of cushions and midblock curb extensions.

Other Physical Improvements: In general, other physical improvements that may be installed as part of the proposed project could include new painted crossings at intersections or at mid-block, pedestrian crossing signals (e.g., flashing beacons), advanced signal phases for people walking and biking, new raised medians, curb extensions, accessible curb ramps, sidewalks, pedestrian refuge islands, modifications to existing curbs, gutters and drainage inlets, colored concrete and/or colored pavement, intersection crossing (or “conflict”) markings, shared lane markings, new signage, repaving the roadway surface (e.g., slurry seal), re-stripping of travel lanes, re-stripping of relocated or reconfigured parking stalls, new trees, landscaping or other measures to treat storm water, relocating existing underground utilities, new bikeway lighting at priority locations, bike parking, and similar minor physical improvements.

Name of Public Agency Approving and Carrying out Project: San Diego Association of Governments

Exempt Status:

☒ Statutory Exemption. State code number: 21080.20.5
☒ Categorical Exemption. State type and section number: 15301(c); 15304(h)

Reasons why project is exempt:

The attached table explains the reasons why the proposed project is exempt from CEQA.
Notice of Exemption

Lead Agency Contact Person: ____________________________

Area Code/Telephone: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ______________ Title: ____________________________

☒ Signed by Lead Agency
Notice of Exemption

Howard Avenue Bikeway

Reasons Why Exempt from CEQA

The table below explains the reasons why the proposed project qualifies for a Statutory Exemption pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.20.5, and Categorical Exemptions pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301(c) and 15304(h).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Exemption</th>
<th>Reasons Why Proposed Project Qualifies for Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory Exemption, Section 21080.20.5 Restriping for Bicycle Lanes in Urbanized Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) This division does not apply to a project that consists of the restriping of streets and highways for bicycle lanes in an urbanized area that is consistent with a bicycle transportation plan prepared pursuant to Sec. 891.2 of the Streets and Highways Code.</td>
<td>As explained below, the proposed project is consistent with the City of San Diego’s Bicycle Master Plan (“City’s Bike Plan”) (City of San Diego 2013), which meets the requirements of a bicycle transportation plan set forth in Section 891.2 of the Streets and Highways Code. The proposed project would provide buffered bike lanes, neighborhood traffic circles, bend-out treatments, raised crosswalks, and improved pedestrian crossings along Howard Avenue from Park Boulevard to Interstate 805. These improvements are consistent with and enhance the proposed Bicycle Boulevard classification in the City’s Bike Plan (Figure 6.2 (page 98); Table 3-2 (page 21)). While some of the facility types proposed by the project are not identical to those identified in the City’s Bike Plan, the proposed project is consistent because it proposes bikeways and improvements that provide equal or enhanced levels of perceived and actual safety, comfort, connectivity, and attractiveness to people on bikes than the facility types identified in the City’s Bike Plan. In addition, Section 6.1.2 of the City’s Bike Plan (page 94) explains that its proposed bikeway classifications are expected to be used as a guide and may change at project implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Prior to determining that a project is exempt pursuant to this section, the lead agency shall do both of the following:</td>
<td>Please see the following cells for explanation of how the proposed project meets both of the following requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Notice of Exemption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Exemption</th>
<th>Reasons Why Proposed Project Qualifies for Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) (A) Prepare an assessment of any traffic and safety impacts of the project and include measures in the project to mitigate potential vehicular traffic impacts and bicycle and pedestrian safety impacts.</td>
<td>SANDAG has prepared an assessment of the proposed project’s traffic and safety impacts, which concludes that the proposed project would not result in any adverse vehicular traffic impacts or bicycle and pedestrian safety impacts. The assessment was published by SANDAG on July 12, 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (B) The requirement to prepare an assessment pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall not apply if either of the following conditions is met:  
   (i) Measures to mitigate these impacts are identified in an environmental impact report, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration prepared pursuant to this division for the bicycle transportation plan, certified or approved no more than five years prior to making the determination, the measures are included in the plan, and those measures are incorporated into the project.  
   (ii) An assessment was prepared pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Sec. 21080.20 no more than five years prior to making the determination, the measures to mitigate these impacts are included in the plan, and those measures are incorporated into the project. | Subparagraphs (B)(i) and (ii) do not apply to the proposed project and therefore SANDAG has prepared an assessment as required by subparagraph (1)(A). |
| (2) Hold noticed public hearings in areas affected by the project to hear and respond to public comments. Publication of the notice shall be no fewer times than required by Sec. 6061 of the Government Code, by the public agency in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the proposed project. If more than one area will be affected, the notice shall be published | SANDAG held a noticed public hearing at the Lafayette Hotel in the San Diego community of North Park on July 27, 2017. SANDAG received public comments at the public hearing and has prepared written responses to public comments. Notice of the public hearing was published in both English and Spanish. The English and Spanish versions were published on July 12, 2017, in the San Diego Union Tribune and El Latino, respectively. |
### Notice of Exemption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Exemption</th>
<th>Reasons Why Proposed Project Qualifies for Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in the newspaper of largest circulation from among the newspapers of general circulation in those areas.</td>
<td>This subparagraph does not apply to the proposed project because SANDAG is not a state agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) (1) If a state agency determines that a project is not subject to this division pursuant to this section, and it determines to approve or carry out that project, the notice shall be filed with the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in the manner specified in subdivisions (b) and (c) of Sec. 21108.</td>
<td>If the SANDAG Board of Directors approves the use of this exemption for the proposed project, then SANDAG shall file notices with the Office of Planning and Research and the Clerk of San Diego County as specified in subdivisions (b) and (c) of Section 21152.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) If a local agency determines that a project is not subject to this division pursuant to this section, and it determines to approve or carry out that project, the notice shall be filed with the OPR, and filed with the county clerk in the county in which the project is located in the manner specified in subdivisions (b) and (c) of Sec. 21152.</td>
<td>The SANDAG Transportation Committee will be asked to consider approving this exemption on February 16, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2021, and as of that date is repealed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Categorical Exemption, Section 15301(c)**

15301. Existing Facilities

Class I consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, mechanical equipment, or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the lead agency’s determination. The types of “existing facilities” itemized below are not intended to be all-inclusive of the types of projects which might fall within Class I. The key consideration is whether the project involves negligible or no expansion of an existing use.

The proposed project qualifies for this exemption because it consists of minor alterations to existing City streets, including vehicle lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, curbs, gutters, crosswalks, parking stalls, and similar facilities. The proposed project would make improvements to and repurpose space within existing City streets, and there would be negligible or no expansion of existing streets. The types of minor alterations to existing City streets proposed by the project that fall under this exemption include but are not limited to:

- Buffered bike lanes that are separated from vehicle traffic with a painted buffer.
- Class II bike lanes that are separated from vehicle traffic with a painted stripe.
- Class III shared lane markings consisting of signage and painted shared lane markings (i.e., sharrows) indicating that lanes are to be shared by vehicles and...
### Notice of Exemption

#### CEQA Exemption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c) Existing highways and streets, sidewalks, gutters, bicycle and pedestrian trails, and similar facilities</th>
<th>Reasons Why Proposed Project Qualifies for Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people on bikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other minor alterations of existing City streets such as other physical improvements that may be installed as part of the proposed project could include new painted crossings at intersections or at mid-block, flashing beacons, advanced signal phases for people walking and biking, new raised medians, curb extensions, accessible curb ramps, sidewalks, pedestrian refuge islands, modifications to existing curbs, gutters and drainage inlets, colored concrete and/or colored pavement, intersection crossing (or “conflict”) markings, shared lane markings, new signage, re-striping of travel lanes, new trees, landscaping or other measures to treat storm water, relocating existing underground utilities, new bikeway lighting at priority locations, and similar minor alterations that involve negligible or no expansion of an existing use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Categorical Exemption, Section 15304(h)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15304. Minor Alterations to Land</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 4 consists of minor public or private alterations in the condition of land, water, and/or vegetation which do not involve removal of healthy, mature, scenic trees except for forestry or agricultural purposes. Examples include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td>The proposed project qualifies for this exemption because it involves the creation of bicycle lanes on existing rights-of-way, including buffered bike lanes, Class II bike lanes, and Class III shared lane markings. The proposed project may involve the removal of existing trees, but it does not involve removal of any trees that are considered scenic resources, part of scenic views or vistas, or otherwise considered scenic by any adopted plan, policy, or regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) The creation of bicycle lanes on existing rights-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Exceptions to Use of Categorical Exemptions, Section 15300.2

| (a) Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located -- a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies. | The proposed project does not meet any of these criteria that would preclude use of the above-listed categorical exemptions from CEQA (i.e., Sec. 15301(c) and 15304(h)). The proposed project and its environmental effects would be typical of other projects within Class 1 and Class 4. The types of construction equipment and duration of construction activity required to construct the proposed project, the operation of the proposed project, and the resulting environmental effects (e.g., temporary increases in noise levels, air emissions) would be typical of other projects in Class 1 involving minor alterations to existing streets, sidewalks, gutters, bicycle and pedestrian trails, and other facilities, and other projects in Class 4 involving the creation of bicycle lanes on existing rights-of-way. Similar to the proposed project, |
| (b) Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are | |

---
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**CEQA Exemption**

Inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.

(c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

(d) Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.

(e) Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Sec. 65962.5 of the Government Code.

(f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

**Reasons Why Proposed Project Qualifies for Exemption**

Other projects in Class 1 and Class 4 involve removal of existing center turn lanes. From a review of existing physical conditions in the project area, construction and operation of the proposed project would:

- Not result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources within a scenic highway.
- Not be located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 or otherwise have an impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern.
- Not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.
- Not have a reasonable possibility of causing a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances, or contribute to cumulative impacts from successive projects of the same type in the same place over time, including effects related to:
  - Scenic vistas, visual character, and light or glare;
  - Natural resources including agricultural, archaeological, biological, forestry, mineral, paleontological, and water supply resources;
  - Air and water quality, greenhouse gas emissions, energy, noise, and vibration;
  - Earthquakes, soil erosion, or other geologic conditions;
  - Transport, use, emission, or disposal of hazardous materials;
  - Hazards related to airports, wildfires, or flooding;
  - Adopted land use plan, policy, or regulatory conflicts;
  - Growth inducement, housing displacement, or physically dividing a community;
  - Public services, facilities, or utilities including parks, stormwater, water supply, wastewater, landfills, schools, libraries, police and fire protection;
  - Performance or safety of the transportation system, including for vehicles, public transit, people walking and on bikes, and emergency access.
Item 6 – Attachment 3:
Traffic and Safety Impact Assessment for the Howard – Orange Bikeway


Hard copies are available by contacting the Public Information Office at (619) 699-1950 or plo@sandag.org.
Responses to Comments on the Howard – Orange Bikeway

SANDAG held an open house and public hearing for the Howard – Orange Bikeway (proposed project) on July 27, 2017, from 6 to 8 p.m., at The Lafayette Hotel. On July 12, 2017, SANDAG published a notice of the open house and public hearing and made available online the proposed project’s Traffic and Safety Impact Assessment.

A total of 39 individuals or organizations provided comments on the proposed project. Comments provided in writing and verbally at the open house and public hearing on July 27, 2017, and submitted to staff via email between July 24, and July 27, 2017, are shown in Table 1. Table 1 provides a list of all comments received, including the name of each individual or organization that submitted a comment, the date of the comment, and how the comment was submitted (i.e., written, verbal, email). All written and transcribed verbal comments are included as Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual or Organization</th>
<th>Comment Date</th>
<th>Public Hearing-Written</th>
<th>Public Hearing-Verbal</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Hebshi</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Ryder</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasia Brewster, City Heights CDC</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Goodbody</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjorn</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Rodriguez-Back Alley Bikes</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Rodriguez- Climate Action Campaign</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Thibault</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniella Trujillo- SD County Bike Coalition</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionne Carlson</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanza Gonzales</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual or Organization</td>
<td>Comment Date</td>
<td>Public Hearing-Written</td>
<td>Public Hearing-Verbal</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteban Del Rio-California Bicycle Coalition</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Luna</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Burleton</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ixchel R.</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wingert</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Samuels</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Greer</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Kucharski</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Varnadore-City Heights Town Council</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Cosgrove</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Franco Garcia-Environmental Health Coalition</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Schalow</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla Amador</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Cortez</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Thompson</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jamason</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph Van Vleck</td>
<td>7/24/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasaun Robinson</td>
<td>7/25/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Leit</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roddy Jerome-Environmental Health Coalition</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Ford</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Michael</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The concerns and feedback expressed in the comments fall into common themes. Staff has organized the comments according to these common themes, listed below, and provided a written master response to each:

- Master Response 1: On-Street Parking
- Master Response 2: Project Features
- Master Response 3: Proposed Project Design in City Heights

Master Response 1: On-street Parking

Introduction

Several commenters expressed concern with removal of on-street parking as part of the proposed project. They stated that it can be difficult to find an available street parking space in certain parts of the project area during certain times of the day (e.g., evenings after work). Other commenters stated a preference for using on-street parking spaces for other purposes such as proposed project improvements that promote walking and biking. Multiple commenters offered parking garages as potential solutions to create additional parking spaces within the project area.

Response

Although the proposed project will likely cause the removal of existing on-street parking spaces, SANDAG and the project design team are taking every effort to minimize the loss of parking without sacrificing the purpose and need of the project which is to create a safe and comfortable bikeway facility that would encourage more people in the community to walk or ride a bike for many of their every day trips. SANDAG has received comments from many community members citing parking as their number one concern, and is making every practical effort to reduce the number of on-street parking spaces that will be lost.

The proposed project does not include the creation of parking garages.
Master Response 2: Project Features

Introduction

Commenters suggested various treatments or features be included in the proposed project. Below is a listing of each project treatment or feature raised in the comments, followed by a staff response.

Response

Connections with future north-south bike projects

Multiple commenters requested that the proposed project be designed to allow for connections with future active transportation projects on north-to-south trending streets.

Response:

SANDAG understands the importance of network connectivity and has designed the Howard – Orange Bikeway to enhance connectivity to – existing and future – bikeway projects (e.g. at Georgia Street, Utah Street and Central Avenue – by way of neighborhood traffic circles and a raised crosswalk). SANDAG has also identified locations where connectivity, between the Howard – Orange bikeway and other – existing and future – bikeways may be enhanced (e.g. at 30th and 35th Streets – through the addition of two-stage queue boxes). At this point, the Howard – Orange Bikeway has only been designed to the “preliminary level;” further enhancements to north/south connectivity may be made in Final Design.

Project Amenities

One commenter asserted that the project will be more successful if they are “green and beautiful” and include public art and landscaping, and that SANDAG should create a “maintenance endowment fund” for the project.

Another commenter asked for certain project features to incorporate irrigation for landscaping. One commenter requested that trash cans be installed at either end of the proposed project, and another individual noted a lack of lighting along the segment of Howard and Orange avenues that crosses over I-805.

Response:

The Howard – Orange Bikeway includes funding for landscaping and public art, but not for the maintenance thereof. Per the City of San Diego’s guidelines, irrigation-dependent landscaping and public art would fall under the category of “extraordinary maintenance” and would therefore not be maintained by the City of San Diego. Features requiring extraordinary maintenance would require a maintenance agreement between a 3rd party (e.g. a Maintenance Assessment District (MAD), Business Improvement District (BID), etc.) and the City of San Diego. To date, SANDAG has not identified any 3rd parties willing to enter into such maintenance agreements with the City.

The creation of a maintenance endowment fund is beyond the scope of this project.
Additional street lighting will be proposed in Final Design, where appropriate. As part of the final design efforts, the project team will evaluate lighting deficiencies along the corridor and consider lighting needs throughout the corridor, including the crossing over the I-805.

**Existing roadway conditions**

Multiple individuals made comments about the pavement of Howard Avenue being in poor condition. Another commenter requested that the proposed project not worsen existing flooding problems in the vicinity of Orange Avenue, between 41st Street and Marlborough Avenue.

Response:

Pavement rehabilitation, beyond that needed for the Howard – Orange Bikeway, is beyond the scope of this project. Once the project enters Final Design, the extent of pavement rehabilitation needed to provide a safe and comfortable bicycling experience, as well as safe and comfortable pedestrian crossings, will be evaluated as part of the final design efforts (and proposed, as a part of this project).

In Final Design, vertical features that may contribute to ponding or flooding will be evaluated and where feasible, improvements to alleviate this condition will be added to the project. As part of the final design efforts, a drainage study will be prepared following the City of San Diego requirements to determine measures needed to meet current standards and local ordinances.

**El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue**

One commenter asked to see “bike lanes and resources extend throughout all of El Cajon Boulevard.” Another asked for traffic signal synchronization along El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue in response to “traffic diverted to those main (streets).” One comment expressed concern with free right turns at the intersection of 54th Street and University Avenue.

Response:

Bike lanes and other resources along El Cajon Boulevard are beyond the scope of this project.

Per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements, a Traffic and Safety Impact Assessment (TSIA) was conducted for the Howard – Orange Bikeway project. The study did not identify any appreciable diversion resulting from the Howard – Orange Bikeway project to parallel streets like El Cajon Boulevard.

The intersection of 54th Street and University Avenue is beyond the scope of the Howard – Orange project.

**Surveillance for Orange Avenue**

One commenter asked for surveillance on Orange Avenue to increase safety for people walking.
Response:

At this time, SANDAG is conducting further study of the City Heights/Orange Avenue Segment of the project to determine the feasibility of additional traffic calming measures. The Orange Avenue Segment will be designed to encourage people to walk and bike along it, providing more “eyes on the street.”

Bike Parking Near the University Heights Public Library

One commenter asserted that locating bike parking near the University Heights Public Library is not realistic because of the transients in the area and that it could block access to the library or nearby bus service.

Response:

The provision of bike parking – including the type, quantity and locations of bike parking – will be determined in the Final Design phase of the project. Bike parking will not be proposed in areas with poor passive surveillance, or in areas that block access to buildings or transit service.

Master Response 3: Proposed Project Design in City Heights (this section applies to the Orange Avenue Segment)

Introduction

Several commenters expressed concerns with the proposed project design in City Heights (Orange Avenue, between Interstate 805 and Estrella Avenue). These concerns include the safety of the proposed bend-outs for people walking and biking; driver visibility of bend-outs; use of bend-outs and raised crosswalks in City Heights relative to the number of neighborhood traffic circles in North Park; the removal of traffic diverters included in an earlier design of the proposed project; a perceived lack of traffic-calming features in City Heights relative to North Park; and a perceived lack of financial investment in City Heights relative to North Park. Commenters specifically identified concerns with bend-outs proposed at the intersections of Orange Avenue with Marlborough, Euclid, and Fairmount. Other commenters asked that the bend-outs be removed from the project entirely or moved to a part of the project away from where they live.

Response

At this time, SANDAG is conducting further study of the City Heights/Orange Avenue Segment of the project to determine the feasibility of additional traffic calming measures, including median islands at select intersections. Median islands would calm traffic along Orange Avenue by reducing cut-through traffic while maintaining local access. The potential use of these traffic calming measures will ultimately be subject to review and approval by the City of San Diego.

Environmental review of the Orange Avenue Segment – including response to comments received between July 24, 2017 and July 27, 2017 – is currently on hold, pending the results of further study. If the additional traffic calming measures are added to the project design, then a revised Traffic and Safety Impact Assessment may be required for the Orange Avenue Segment. If so, it will be made available for public comment at an additional open house and public hearing.
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MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Good evening, everybody.

Welcome, and thank you for coming this evening. My name is Terry Sinnott. I'm the Vice Chair of the Board of Directors for SANDAG. I will serve as your hearing officer, which just means I just kind of keep time; that's really all I do.

The purpose of this open house and public hearing is to present the Howard-Orange project to you, the preliminary design, to give you a chance to review on these placards what the design is looking like, and ask and get questions answered from our staff.

Then our purpose, starting now, will be to try to capture your thoughts, reactions to the project as to what you like, any concerns you might have, any constructive thoughts as to how we can make the project better. So it's a -- it's part of the CEQA process.

What we'll be doing is we're asking anybody that would like to make some comments about the project, to fill in a speaker slip, and then we'll bring people up. And I think we'll give about a three-minute time limit on it. So if you can make your comments, we have a reporter who will record those comments.
If you would rather not come up and speak, there's also a larger piece of paper where you can handwrite your comments.

All comments will go into our review, CEQA review. It will be presented to our Transportation Committee, and ultimately the Board, so that we respond to all comments, and make sure all comments are covered.

So that's the general process. We'll go through the comments. And then I think there will be time, even after these comments, for you to further talk with people about the project and get your comments responded to.

How many comments do we have now?

MR. WES JONES: About 16.


So what I would request that you do, is we'll call your name. If you could come up, give us your name again and your address, just briefly, and then give us a brief -- and I emphasize the "brief" -- thought as to what your reactions or what your suggestions might be, and we'll record those. And that will be very, very helpful, and we really appreciate it.

So we'll start off. I'll call from here, I guess, and if you could come to this lovely podium.

Anastasia Brewster.

MS. ANASTASIA BREWSTER: I think we're all so
excited. These boards represent a lot of blocks of Mid-City.

My name is Anastasia Brewster, and I live at 5205 Leah Street, San Diego, 92105.

This is -- I live in the eastern part of the North Park/Mid-City Bikeway in City Heights, and I regularly bike, commute along Orange Avenue to my office at City Heights CDC, where I work as an active transportation coordinator.

On weekends, I also bike this corridor with my elementary-aged kids. We like to go to our favorite ice cream shop in Normal Heights or to their soccer games in North Park. I'm thrilled that the Howard-Orange Bikeway will bring improved connections to important destinations to my family and neighborhood.

Mid-City is a very bikeable part of the urban core of San Diego. We need transformative traffic-calming and traffic-reducing bikes facilities that encourage more people to ride to achieve our city's climate action goals for bike ridership.

As a staff facilitator of the City Heights Belt Environment Team, I have the privilege of working with a dedicated grassroots group of pedestrian and bicycle advocates, whom you'll hear from tonight.

City Heights CDC has been working with the Belt
Environment Team to shape, advocate, allocate funding and generate support for this project since it was started about five years ago.

With our resident leaders, we've walked the streets, canvassed neighbors, written letters, engaged businesses, organized calls to action at community planning groups from the City Heights to the eastern area and more. City Heights CDC deeply and strongly supports the Mid-City Bike Corridor Project.

With that said, City Heights CDC is concerned with the current design of some of the features along the low income, densely-populated Orange Ave. segment from the 805 East to Estrella Ave. aren't sufficient to create a truly pleasant bike boulevard.

The planned road diagram to allow for buffered bike lanes will surely calm traffic and increase cyclist safety, but we're unconvinced that the bend-outs will work as intended.

The Orange Ave. segment experiences high pedestrian volumes throughout the day, especially at peak dismissal times. The Belt Environment Team has identified inevitable bike-ped conflicts in the mixing zones of the bend-out treatments, especially at Marlborough, Fairmount, and Euclid, near churches and schools.
Further, we noticed that the Howard segment is receiving 11 concrete treatments along the 11 blocks, while Orange is only getting 10 along its 34 blocks. The Orange Ave. segment is situated along densely populated neighborhoods that have the highest rates of car-less households and transit ridership in the county; in other words, many potential would-be bikers. Further, serving at least seven public schools, the Orange Ave. segment has the potential to serve a huge number of youths, many of whom don't ride today because their parents don't feel that they have a safe route to school. We want this project to offer them a viable option. We need equitable and transformative features to capture these would-be riders here in City Heights. So what am I asking for?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: More time?

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Let's sum up.

MS. ANASTASIA BREWSTER: Let's see. We're asking for a side-by-side analysis of what we saw back in 2015 for the traffic diverter to decrease car volumes along the traffic circles next to this current design with the bend-out treatments.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you very much, Anastasia.

MS. ANASTASIA BREWSTER: Thank you.
MR. TERRY SINNOTT: It's appreciated.

Maria Cortez. Maria?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're not doing this alphabetically, are we?

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: No, not at all.

MS. MARIA CORTEZ: Hi, my name is Maria Cortez, and I live at 4326 Marlborough. I've been a resident of City Heights for 44 years, community activist, very involved in the community.

First of all, I would like to say thank you for at least doing something for those of us in City Heights, but not only in City Heights, but throughout San Diego. But it's about time that we finally got noticed after all these years.

I live right there on Marlborough and Orange Avenue. I have witnessed several accidents. Needless to say, two days ago, this was the ninth time I've almost been hit crossing that intersection. And what do I do? I'm in the middle of the intersection, somebody comes out in front, I have to throw my hands up and say some unpleasant words.

Out of those nine times, eight times, I have had to put my hand out for my granddaughter not to be hit. I have witnessed several accidents on 42 -- on the 42nd block of Marlborough and Orange Avenue in front of the
The church is going to be a drive-through pretty soon, because every time somebody hits, they get closer and closer to the church. And, also, the police department said that that is a very dangerous street.

But not only that, Orange Avenue itself has a lot of traffic, a lot of traffic going through. The cars speed. They don't pay attention to the pedestrians. The bicyclists, too, they also speed, and the pedestrians don't pay attention.

So I think with something -- with something like this, there's going to be a lot of people paying attention. Yes, you are going to have some people that still are going to take some time to get used to it.

But my main concern is the bend-outs. I was -- I finally got an explanation about the bend-outs, and how they're going to have the, you know, caution signs and the lights and everything, for, you know, for the bicyclists and the pedestrians. Now that I understand that much better, I think that that's a good idea.

My question is, though, how is that going to interfere with the emergency vehicles that have to go through?

But I just would like to say thank you for reaching out to the community. But also because a lot of
the residents still didn't know what was going on, they were upset because we feel that you should have -- you should at least hold more workshops for us, so that way we can know, you know, what is going on.

But I just would like to take the opportunity to say thank you very much. And I am in support of what you're doing, but we need to reach out more to the community. Thank you.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you, Maria.

Sidney Michael. Welcome.

MR. SIDNEY MICHAEL: Thank you. Thank you. My name is Sidney Michael. And I am a resident at 5480 University Avenue.

Okay. And my concern, just briefly, is that they hurry up and make a decision on what they're going to do with those free rights over at 54. There's a lot of traffic going through there and a lot of pedestrians are nearly getting hit, and there's a lot of problems over in that area.

And I know it's good that we -- that you guys are making an effort to start the project, but once the project is started, on this end, let's not forget about the City Heights and the La Mesa end.

But we really need to make a decision on the 50 -- 54th free rights, and it needs to be made as soon
as possible so they fall into place with the construction
of the rest of the project.

Thank you very much for what you are and what
you have done.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.


MS. ESPERANZA GONZALEZ: (Through the
interpreter) Hi, I'm Esperanza Gonzalez. I'm a resident
of Talmadge, but at Talmadge, they don't need my help, so
I've been advocating for a lot of similar communities.
I've been walking these streets for 20-something years,
and I have seen the thousands of accidents that have
happened, and many of which I've gotten to witness
firsthand.

Anyway, my concern is, that I'm a volunteer at
three schools along Orange Avenue, and -- three, four
schools, of which, again, all along Orange Avenue, and
when I was looking at the map that was circulated last
week, I saw that they were going to have roundabouts in
the North Park area. And so while going around, I asked,
"Why not in City Heights?" because there are schools
there, and there's a church -- there's three schools,
counting Hoover.

So I asked them. And they said that they're
going to have raised sidewalks -- crosswalks, rather, and
my question is, with all the kids that attend all of those schools, will that be safe enough?

I would like to have something that could show us that these raised crosswalks will protect all these children from all these schools. Thank you.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you, Ms. Gonzalez.

Carolina Rodriguez Adjunta.

Carolina?

MS. CAROLINA RODRIGUEZ ADJUNTA: Yes.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Welcome.

MS. CAROLINA RODRIGUEZ ADJUNTA: Hi, my name is Carolina Rodriguez Adjunta. I am a North Park resident that lives off of Howard Avenue.

I ride my bike every day. And I also work for an organization called Climate Action Campaign. We're a watchdog nonprofit in San Diego who is dedicated to making sure the City reaches its ridership transit and walking goals for the City's Climate Action Plan.

And, you know, right now, we're about 2 percent, but we're bound to get 6 percent by 2020 and 18 percent by 2035. So that's a huge way to go, but what we know for sure is that we need the infrastructure to help people feel safe on the street and protected.

And so I guess we're really excited to see this project come to fruition after five years of development,
a lot of community outreach, what we've heard from Maria and City Heights CDC, and we just want to uphold their concerns; that, yes, we are so excited to see this infrastructure, but we want to make sure that it's distributed equitably.

We know that the residents in City Heights per capita are receiving less resources than us on this side of the 805. That's not okay, so we want to see that addressed. And we want to see, especially, those traffic-calming infrastructure on that side. So we really want to see, perhaps, more roundabouts than the bend-outs.

And, I guess, lastly, the final request, to see the time limit plans, since we have been talking about this project for already five years. So that's something we are looking forward to.

So we just want to say thank you for all your hard work, but please do keep in mind that we can't plan ahead if we don't plan equitably, and it's very important. Thank you.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you very much.

Brenda Rodriguez. Is there a Brenda?

Going once. Oh, there she is. Welcome.

MS. BRENDA RODRIGUEZ: Hi, everyone. My name is Brenda, and I am a native of San Diego. And I'm visiting
my family right now. They live in City Heights on 39th Street. And I'm from -- well, right now, I'm coming from Detroit, Michigan.

And just a little -- just to let you know, as a disabled woman of color, I have become empowered to use cycling as my main source of transportation in the southwest portion of Detroit since they do count on bicycle lanes on every little portion of the streets. It's just -- I mean, it's just a line, but it's all I need. And it would be nice to see that all throughout San Diego; most importantly, City Heights.

It's the main reason I never even thought about, like, getting on a bicycle and getting -- going outside, which was -- on a bicycle because there were no lanes.

So, please, the plan looks great, but make sure that it gets all the way to City Heights on every little corner and little spot by every street, that would be awesome. Thank you.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you very much.

Julie Schalow. Welcome.

MS. JULIE SCHALOW: Thank you.

My name is Julie Schalow, and I live at 3125 Howard Avenue. And while I am a proponent of biking and walking, especially in the North Park and the City Heights area, I have a problem with the real estate
allocation.

First of all, roundabouts and mid-block curb extensions is taking up a lot of viable real estate in already a parking-deprived area. In three blocks, you're going to be taking up six spaces away from our parking. And that's not going to be acceptable. It's already challenged enough as it is.

So let's take some of those curb -- mid-curb block extensions, or whatever they are, and either eliminate them or put them down in the other side of town, in City Heights, where maybe they'd be more effective, but in the Howard area of North Park, it's not. It's not going to help.

So, anyway, just a reallocation of the funds and reallocation of the real estate, but be sensitive to the residents as we homeowners and landlords and renters up there are already challenged enough as it is.

So I appreciate your time and appreciate your efforts.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.

Aaron Hebshi. Welcome.

MR. AARON HEBSHI: Thank you. Hi. My name is Aaron Hebshi. I'm a resident of North Park, 33rd Street, and I ride my bike every day down to the Navy building, where I practice as a biologist.
I really appreciate what I've seen here today, in terms of planning and the design. I think we've made a lot of headway, not just with this project, but the whole consortium of projects, that hopefully when put together, will really increase the amount of bikes on the road as people feel that they can come out of the woodwork and feel more safe and be able to get themselves and kids on the street.

I am less concerned about losing parking. I think that when you're talking about liveable neighborhoods, I think first and foremost, we need to be worried about people walking, people biking, people who are getting around their neighborhood without a car.

I think parking a private vehicle on a street should be a luxury. And I think if this is something that the City ends up being worried about, then we can have more centralized parking garages, or some other solution. But maybe in the long run, as we're shifting to a less car-dependant society, especially in this uptown area, that some people will feel free to get rid of their cars, and this would be a better place to live.

That's all I would like to say.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.


MS. UNA NELSON-WHITE. Hi. Again, I'm Una
Nelson-White. I've lived downtown in 1229 10th Avenue. I cycle here quite frequently, and I go to a lot of different things here, events and so on. So I have ridden this corridor, and it's nerve-racking. It's scary. It's frightening to ride in this area because of the lack of proper bike facilities, and even being a pedestrian in this area can be downright scary.

And I think the project is wonderful. And I support it wholeheartedly. I am concerned that motorists in this area are going to put up huge roadblocks, and they're going to bring up parking concerns and having to ride so slow through their neighborhoods, because, let's face it, motorists like to get from Point A to Point B as fast as possible, and that this is always a concern.

What we might want to do is find some kind of compromise, like the parking garages, or something along that line so that we don't have what happened in Hillcrest, where it was those kind of things were stonewalled for a very long time because of those concerns.

You know, it's great on paper, but I don't want it to stay on paper. I want it to become a reality. And that's not going to happen if it gets stonewalled. So maybe we need to consider some compromises and some other possibilities so that we can work together with the
motorists and get it done. That's my concern.

You know, it makes very pretty little diagrams, but diagrams don't help us cyclists and pedestrians stay alive, so ...

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you very much.

Jim Varnapore [sic].

MR. JIM VARNADORE: Varnadore.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Varnadore.

MR. JIM VARNADORE: Who doesn't need a microphone.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: We have one for you if you need it.

MR. JIM VARNADORE: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chairman. I appreciate it.

Mr. Vice Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am Jim Varnadore. I do live in City Heights. I also am head of the City Heights Town Council, and I'm secretary of the City Heights Area Planning Committee. I've been involved in building and planning bicycles through City Heights for a lot longer than anybody else in this room.

I am recently very encouraged by a court decision, Mr. Vice Chairman, to the effect that the California High-Speed Rail Agency must comply with CEQA. It may not duck it. That gives me, I believe, legal
basis for demanding that this project, likewise, go through CEQA.

And I'm encouraged by that because, perhaps, just perhaps, once in the life of SANDAG, the board will choose the no bill alternative. It's never done that before.

That aside, Mr. Vice Chairman, before we do anything else on Howard Avenue, could we please fix it? Every driver who has ever driven Howard Avenue in the last six months, and certainly every bicyclist who has ever tried to ride it in the past six months, knows what a damn disaster it is. So may we please, in the order of proper order of things, fix Howard Avenue first, and then do what we will with the bike lanes.

Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.

Vickie Church. Welcome.

MS. VICKIE CHURCH: Hello, my name is Vickie Church. I live at 5251 Spruce Street, San Diego. That's the Oak Park community, but I drive Howard and Orange two or three times a week, starting from the University Heights Library, transgressing through North Park, over in through City Heights, so I can get to 54th and go on my merry way.

There's a few comments that I have in regards to
what we have over here, is, one, ensure your project
improvements, whether they're roundabouts, speed bumps,
or others, do not increase flooding problems in heavy
rains.

I was pointing out an issue on the graphics for
Orange at 41st and Marlborough. There could be other
ones. But make sure the improvements do not become road
hazards submerged beneath the rainwater, because I will
probably still be driving through there.

The other thing I'll say on that part is, get
rid of all your bend-outs. Why you are wasting the
concrete, why you're taking those few little parking
spaces, it's beyond me. But you need -- you need to
utilize that particular part.

The next portion I'm here about is, ensure that
the traffic lights synchronization along El Cajon
Boulevard and University Avenue for traffic diverted to
those main areas is accomplished. You're going to force
people off of these streets. We are forcing people to
cross from other streets, outside of University and El
Cajon, to come over to Howard and Orange to ride their
bicycles. So let's keep a good flow of traffic along
there so that people can, one, we're not out on our cars
and having more pollution, but, also, that it's safe for
those pedestrians or bicyclists to get to this particular
Because my experience in San Diego, it takes a long time to put these things into effect. And a lot of times, they have beautiful maps, "Here's our future bike path." I moved here in '79. A lot of those things never came to fruition. So I like that we have a -- I would rather have a bike path than a bike lane, or some of the other stuff that you have on -- bikeways -- it's a whole lot safer than what's there.

Another reason I'm here is, note the elimination of stop signs in the project area that are on your graphics that are over here. I take issues with -- your graphics do not show where the traffic lights are. So, you know, it doesn't -- your engineer says, "Oh, they're going to stay," but I would prefer your graphics show where those stoplights or traffic lights are, and that we know for a fact they're going to remain.

It seems that the City of San Diego has an issue about traffic lights and putting them in. Unfortunately, it's until too many people die before we do put some of these in here.

The next thing on here is, there's a reference on these things for bike parking in or near the University Heights Library and Sprouts. I tell you, that site is unrealistic because anyone who parks there, the
transients who pass through that area will remove
everything from your bicycle that is possible to take
from there.

   Additionally, that is, you cannot block the
access to go into the library. That library has no
parking in and of itself that is there for the public,
but it's also the sidewalk access to all the buses, the
rapid transit and the other buses in the area. So
wherever you put the bike thing, think about it.

   But I am also saying, put a trash can at the
beginning of what this route is and put a trash can at
the end of this route so the people who are accessing can
get rid of their excess stuff so it doesn't blow out into
the path, or other things that they have.

   Biker vehicles -- biker and vehicle safety is
important. And kids, we need to ensure that they are all
wearing their helmets when they're going along on here,
that they know not to ride on the sidewalks, and -- thank
you, Jim -- I'll finish on this sentence here -- and
ensure that people are not running the stop signs that
are listed on here; that's the bicyclists and the cars.

   Thank you.

   MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.

   Jose Franco Garcia. Welcome.

   MR. JOSE FRANCO GARCIA: Thank you. Hello, I'm
Jose Franco Garcia. I'm with Environmental Health Coalition.

I wanted to express -- actually, I wanted to thank you for kind of this whole process. You know, back in 2013, I was part of gathering over 500 petitions when we were selecting the routes. And one of the big routes that we really wanted to be along this was Orange Avenue. And the big thing residents in City Heights expressed on that was because of how many times they're -- you know, they go through there.

And one of the big things that became very important to folks there, was not just, you know, the bike access, which is the overall active transportation, and, you know, we really look at that as kind of a holistic approach to it -- right? -- as active transportation, and seeing that this route and that these -- you know, the selection of the routes and all that be safe, not just for cyclists, but also for people walking and everybody who is accessing that road -- excuse me -- so that was really important.

You know, like I said, we gathered 500 petitions, and folks there expressed that there is a lot of schools along that route, you know, especially in the City Heights area. And, you know, kids leave those schools, parents walk up there and get them. A lot of
parents who take their kids to those schools who don't have cars, who may not have -- you know, who may not ride bikes, but feeling safe walking, but it was about making the proper areas for bikes, making it proper -- making the road proper for everybody, for everybody that accesses it.

And when we're looking at this now, I mean, you know, I think we thank you, we thank you for selecting those routes to begin with. That was a huge victory. We were really happy to see that. And we want to see that all the way through. Right?

So some of the things that we see here, is those same residents who expressed that they wanted this to be a good road for active transportation are now expressing concerns about what is being put in, and that they are not seeing as much infrastructure being put in on the City Heights side as -- you know, as there is west of the 805. So they have concerns there.

They want to make sure that the bike routes that are selected with the bend-outs are safe for the people that are walking along the sidewalk as well because they're -- you know, they see some danger there.

From everything I have heard, and I think, you know, I don't want to speak incorrectly here, but some of those -- some of the structures being put in there
aren't -- haven't been tested and haven't been seen in other places. So it's a little scary that that will be put there for the first time, and that that is where our families, that's where our children will be walking, and that's for something that is being tested and experimented with.

So, you know, those are the concerns that the residents have expressed. Again, the residents are really excited to see this. We're really excited to see access to active transportation. So it's really important to the City Heights community where not everybody drives cars, a lot of people don't have cars. So we want to see this. We want to see this ability, and are supportive of this project as a whole.

We all want to make sure it's happening in a way that supports everybody who has access to these roads and has to get through here. So we really hope that you continue to go on that process. And we'll be here every step of the way to make sure that we do whatever we can with that. Thank you.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.

Robert Leit. Welcome.

MR. ROBERT LEIT: I'm a trained scientist and property owner at Hopi Place, way over on the west part of town, but we have property here.
And the first thing I would like to enter into evidence is a San Diego Union Tribune, Thursday, July 27th article, "We are not opposed to bike lanes, but we are opposed to loss of parking spaces."

When people want to take away people's rights to drive, they are being ridiculous. People -- and, also, you've got small businessmen and people working here holding on by the nails of their hands, and you want to make them not even have that amount of money.

Then, as far as the engineering is concerned, there was no formal hazard analysis, as far as I know. No one has looked at all the economic opportunities. There's nothing as screwed up as the streets for straightening them out and turning them into good businesses through, my thought, the UCSD Connect.

As I said, the parking is very important. Then there's the fetish of the bicycles. As a kid, I liked a bicycle, but it was very low population density. And the trouble with bicycles is there's no room for air bags; so if you fall off, you die sometimes, including one of the people who had headed Connect, which is very sad.

There is no refrigeration -- or air conditioning on bicycles. I think we need something between a bike and a little Smart Car. And that possibly can be done. There's always engineering solutions that are much better
than people's solutions; engineering is nicer. We need to have wide streets to hold the bikes, not narrow streets where you are trying to put everything on one street, and then you have a wide street. There are two sized streets in San Diego: too wide or too narrow. And we have to balance that off.

One thing that has absolutely shocked me is something called a transponder. It's a little box that puts out something that says, "I'm here." And why the bicyclists haven't got transponders and the cars receivers, so that you don't open that door and cream someone, I don't know.

And I will point out with that newspaper article, the first hundred people who are late to work because of what you're going to do, I will be glad not to be in the room with you when they arrive.

So the other thing I want to make is very radical. I happen to think the idea of mixed modalities to make the system work makes sense. You have too low a population density for a true rapid transit-only system. So what you have to do is have modalities, where you can, one, exchange, and, two, where you can take and haul your bike or skateboard, or whatever, on the bus, and that should be free. Instead of trying to make these modalities share with each other, your bicycles should be
a bus or trolley ticket. And they really should have
shown some engineering by leaving room for the bikes on
the buses and on the trolley.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Mr. Leit, please sum up.

MR. ROBERT LEIT: To sum up, we have to gather
the data so at least we won't make the same mistake
twice, or four times, or ten times. Thank you.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.

Abigail Ryder. Welcome.

MS. ABIGAIL RYDER: Hi, I'm Abby Ryder. I live
at 4156 Kansas Street. I am -- I actually biked here
today. But my chief concern is parking, because I am a
renter, and I have to use off-street parking, and it's
really challenging to find parking right now as it is.

And on the corner of Utah and Howard, there's
some construction going on that has taken away three or
four spaces right now, and even just the loss of those
spaces has made it that much harder right around that
area to park. So the further loss of parking spaces will
make it even more difficult.

Also, as a cyclist, I bike along Howard Avenue a
lot. And at least in this area, to me, it feels
perfectly safe. It's not a very high-traffic area. So I
don't feel like I necessarily need a bike lane right
around this area. Thank you.
MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.

Daniella Trujillo. Welcome.

MS. DANIELLA TRUJILLO: Hello, my name is Daniella Trujillo. I'm here representing the San Diego County Bike Coalition.

First, I wanted to tell you a little story. I live in Rolando. And I actually bike to downtown through Orange Avenue as well. So I am also familiar with it as a cyclist. And I definitely appreciate the project and what is being proposed; however, I would definitely love to see a little bit more traffic-calming features on the east side of the 805, because it's true, there is a lot more traffic there.

Also, I just wanted to say that if we don't make it safe enough for all types of cyclists, all types of abilities, all ages, people aren't going to be using the bike routes that are being proposed.

So even if some of you do feel safe as it is right now, not everybody feels that way. And there's an estimated two-thirds of the population that would be the interested but concerned riders and who would be more willing to ride; as we had somebody else mentioned that bike lanes made her feel safe and empowered her to want to ride, and so it changed her quality of life. It changed her style of living; she no longer depended on a
And I understand that we need to have complete streets; so it has to be for bicyclists, for pedestrians, for cars. I'm not saying get rid of bike lanes, and I'm not saying get rid of car lanes because, hey, I drive, too. And I'm sure we -- most of us drive, like you said, some people ride some days, some people drive some days. And that's kind of how our belt environment is made at the moment. But we also need to make it more equitable for other types of mobility choices for many reasons, as people have mentioned, for health reasons. Not only for that, but also it helps real estate values. It's been proven to help real estate values, and also to improve businesses as well.

So it's not really a matter of we have to choose like what is best; it's also, you know, having a holistic approach in how we develop for the future of San Diego. It's not just right now, but it's for the future as well. And I'd definitely love to support this project, with more improvements on the east side of 805 to have more traffic-calming features.

Thank you for your time.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.

Matt Thompson.

MR. MATT THOMPSON: I didn't realize I would be
getting Toastmaster's credits tonight. I just have a few questions, but I do have to make a statement, based on a couple of things.

I just want to caution everybody to consider positions to become so extreme, because I hear a lot of exuberance about pro-street parking, anti-street parking; it's a luxury.

I guarantee you that when your parking is being looked at going from ample parking to zero parking, you have a lot more skin on the game side. So I hope people can be a little bit more observant of what other people are experiencing as a result of some of the features of the bike path.

I'm a proponent of it. I live at the corner of Utah and Landis, which is on the Landis Street corridor. And I'm here representing myself, my daughters over there, and my wife. And we really like it. But we think that there needs to be some intelligent design going into some of the features that impact people negatively, too.

I just have questions that I'd like to have answered for everybody here, not just on an individual comment basis.

I'm curious on the period of time between when the draft and the final plans are introduced, is there any opportunity for public outreach or input during that
time? Because I'm seeing features that have changed from
draft to final in the various arteries that there was
definitely input given at the draft stage that have not changed, and I haven't heard any reasons why those were not considered to be viable for change. And so I'm just wondering what those opportunities are.

Second, I'm wondering why those individuals who are directly impacted by some of the features, the outreach to them by the SANDAG planning staff is being put off behind the ERI process once the concrete is already drying in the planning stage, rather than working with them prior to the final plan release. Really seems like anybody having direct impact from some of these features should be spoken to before, see if there's some way to help find an equitable interim position.

Second -- thirdly, I'm wondering, how are unintended hazards and perceived risks with the program being captured and addressed? There's give and take with all of these things. And I just want to address the safety issue.

I absolutely have two young children that I would like to have out and active with them being as safe as possible. But really, my responsibility to keep them safe means putting them in appropriate environments. And I don't think that we can make a metropolitan area
completely safe. I think that isolated portions of bike paths where they're separated from the roadway are definitely one of the ways to do that.

But I don't have my children ride on Howard or Orange with me. I take them down to Mission Bay where it's secluded from traffic. So we shouldn't try and make everything completely safe. That's just not workable.

So how are these unintended hazards being captured and addressed? Because when we introduce certain features, we are going to have to give and take; there's going to be impacts on the local area.

Lastly, I just want to know, are the crosswalks all raised traffic circles? I need to have that addressed, because as I heard Esperanza's question before, I wasn't clear on whether that was only adjacent to school-ways or in all neighborhoods, with the intended noise associated with it.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: And to address some of your comments, at the end of the comment period, I'll ask Alison, and maybe Linda, to just address what your thoughts are and publicly give you some feedback as to when we can have other comments, what the timeline is, and that type of thing.

MR. MATT THOMPSON: Thank you.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Okay. Thank you.
Esteban Del Rio. Welcome.

MR. ESTEBAN DEL RIO: Hello, thank you. My name is Esteban. And I'm board chair of the California Bicycle Coalition. I'm a newly elected member of the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition. I helped start Bike SD. I'm also a motorist. I have a '66 Volvo I drive around. And I'm also a homeowner in La Mesa. I live off University and Troy. And I recognize that the psychology of my home ownership makes me obsessed, maybe irrationally, about the parking in front of my house, but that's just me.

I think this is great. I think this is terrific. I'd like to see east of the 805 more traffic-calming, more bend-outs, more traffic circles, more infrastructure. I would love to see synchronized lights, where there -- where there's connections. I would like them synchronized at 12 miles and create green waves.

I don't -- I don't -- I recognize that for a lot of people, the function of streets as a place where one stores private property is important. I don't think that that is a priority for living in the city. I think, first of all, human scale considerations, people who walk, people in wheelchairs, people who take transit, people on bicycles, the businesses that benefit from
slowing things down in human scale, the communities that thrive when automobile traffic isn't raging through them is the priority.

The other thing I want to say, which is great, that City Heights should also be the starting point -- a starting point. When I hear 2013, 2015, I ride through City Heights every day. I work at the University of San Diego, and this is urgent. It is a hostile place for humans to move around. And so I would -- I mean, it's a little bit of a lost opportunity in transmission to University. I ride on Wightman, because it's -- there's actually 16 stop signs between Euclid and Boundary. That slows things down, you know.

So good, more slower human scale. Thank you.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.

All right. Roddy Jerome.

MR. RODDY JEROME: Hi, my name is Roddy Jerome. I'm at 3729 35th Street. I'm with the Environmental Health Coalition, as well as the Belt Environmental Team. I was the representative from the start of this project. I have a few comments.

I concur, like everyone, who wants to see more traffic-calming on the City Heights side. They need more traffic-calming. There's a lot of schools there. They need some more attention, as far as the amount of people
that walk on there. That was our main concern with the environmental team.

I think the corner of Marlborough and 40th and Orange should be readdressed with the church there.

As far as the parking, I mean, you're going to lose some things, you know. The idea is to get people out of their cars, you know. We are trying to meet the San Diego's Climate Action Plan, so we can't do that with more cars, you know. And you will lose a few parking. Big deal. I mean, I know businesses that have -- that have lost parking have more business people from bikers, so, you know --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, as long as the bicyclists are more responsible. Okay?

MR. RODDY JEROME: You can't control everything, but --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, but the --

MR. RODDY JEROME: Anyway --

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Okay. Let's --

MR. RODDY JEROME: -- so I just wanted to mention that. And let's get this started. You know, it's been a long time.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you very much.

The last speaker is Dionne Carlson.

Is that right? Sorry if I messed it up.
MS. DIONNE CARLSON: That's fine. Hi, my name is Dionne Carlson. I actually live at the north end of North Park, but I've attended all of these SANDAG meetings as part of our North Park Planning Committee outreach for the last five years on this. So I have a number of comments that are from me, individually.

Firstly, let me say, I'm really in favor of this. I think these are fabulous. As many of you have said, we have to meet our Climate Action Plan, we have to think of further generations, your children and grandchildren. It's really important that we do get people out of cars.

Our North Park Community Plan, we just updated it recently. And you're going to see a lot of density increase along El Cajon Boulevard which will make that street much busier. So having a bike lane and parallel to El Cajon is going to really help people bike more safely.

Then I have some geeky things for all of you at SANDAG. Please spend the whatever limited budget you have wisely to allow for future north-south bike route extension in the future, particularly at the major intersections.

So in North Park, we've been giving input for a long time now, and I'm really pretty happy with how this
is looking. 30th Street is -- doesn't have room for bike lanes going north-south, but it is the most used bike street, despite the fact it has no bike infrastructure. So I'm happy to see what you're doing.

But, also, if you have budget, think about making sure that when you do pop-outs, when you do that infrastructure, you make it bi-permeable for the north-south route, not just for this bike route. And that pertains to all future bike routes coming through.

So, again, we've -- you're doing in north -- and my comments pertain to the North Park planning area particularly; that you're focusing on our busiest, most dangerous intersections because this -- for people who are struggling with not understanding why these bike lanes are so important, this provides pedestrian safe infrastructure. This is a multi-motor safe infrastructure both for cars, for your kids walking to school, for bicycles. So where we have the most dangerous intersections, that's where we want to see the money spent. If we -- if you're going to cut anything, don't cut our busy intersections.

And then, please, set yourself up for success for future bike projects. Where these bike projects go in, we want residents to love them. We want them to be green and beautiful. We want public art. We want
landscaping, and we want maintenance for them, because this is one of the first bike projects that are coming to the Mid-City. And if we get butt-ugly city standard with no landscaping and no infrastructure and no art, you're going to have a tough time selling other communities on this stuff.

So the things I'd like -- and maintenance is a big issue. So I'm -- and I've been pushing this for five years, and I am going to push it again publicly, SANDAG should really look at setting up a maintenance endowment fund for these bike lanes.

The maintenance assessment districts in a lot of these areas don't have the money. They don't have the budget to fund the things that will make the people love them, the beautiful trees, all of that infrastructure that we need. So I'm begging you, think about that, and work with the City.

And then, just lastly, I had a lovely conversation about the mid-block crossing with one of the engineers. And if he could come forward and explain why they're doing that, but I think there's some concern from the Connect's view in this iteration. And I think it looks like residents are not happy with that, and maybe we can look at some alternatives to that. But if you can help people understand the constraints, the way you did
1 meet that, that would be helpful. Thank you.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Thank you.

That's our last speaker.

Well, thank you all for the good comments. And it's nice to hear everybody with different perspectives and different emphasis.

I want to give an opportunity for Alison -- where is she? Is she around? Does anybody want -- Alison or Linda -- want to make any comments regarding what you've heard?

And these are our project folks. And introduce yourselves and give your reactions to whatever you think you heard.

MR. ANDREW MARTIN: Hi, my name is Andrew Martin with SANDAG staff. I just want to tell you about the process going forward.

So what we do, we will take all the comments received tonight, both those spoken, and the ones you submitted in writing and otherwise. We'll evaluate those at staff. We'll identify all the issues raised, including the questions that have been raised by some of the speakers. We will respond to all of those in writing. That package of comments will be provided to our Transportation Committee, which we anticipate now on September 15th. They'll be asked to approve this bike
project be exempt from CEQA.

In advance of that meeting, typically the Friday before, so on or around September 8th, we'll publish the agenda for that meeting. As part of that agenda, all of your comments will be included, including the transcript of the spoken comments, all of our responses to those comments will be included. It will be summarized in the staff report.

And then what we'll also do, for all of you who provided us as part of your comments or otherwise throughout this process your contact information, when we electronically distribute that, we'll make sure you all get copied on that as well.

So that's what I'll say about the process.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Good.

MS. ALISON MOSS: I think it just would be neither equitable, nor do we really have the time to sort of get into a Q-and-A town hall-type meeting.

The structure is, again, as Andrew mentioned, just securing or receiving the comments, then we are going to take time to write thoughtful and researched replies.

But my email address is Alison -- A-l-i-s-o-n -- dot Moss -- M-o-s-s -- @sandag.org. That's just another avenue, if you have thoughts and impressions about the
project, and you want to let me know. I can just add
those to the pile that's going to be growing, you know, a
lot after all the comments we are receiving tonight, and
make sure that we address those for you.

MR. TERRY SINNOTT: Okay. We will close the
hearing. If you have any other comments, you can go
ahead and write them on the slips and submit them.

And I think the SANDAG staff is going to be
around until 8 o'clock to review any of the details that
might have come up, and you can further ask questions and
get clarifications as to what your concerns are.

We really appreciate you coming out tonight.
And it's very productive. We want to make this a
successful project and something that we can all be proud
of. So thank you very much for coming.

---

(End of public hearing at 7:51 p.m.)

---

(No further comments given.)

---

(End of proceedings at 8:00 p.m.)

---
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COMMENTS

Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME  ADDRESS  PHONE  EMAIL

Jean Samuels

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

I fully support this project! I no longer ride my bike for errands and general transportation as much as I used to because at age 65, I can't keep up with the cars. If there were more protected bike lanes and cycle tracks, I would ride much more often instead of driving.

Thank you!!

One suggestion for the curb bump outs: Paint them or do something else to make them stand out. It can be confusing for drivers turning right because they are not easily seen. 25th & C Street is a good example (SW corner).
COMENTARIOS

Por favor, comparta sus comentarios a continuación. Tenga en cuenta que los documentos de SANDAG se consideran registros públicos y pueden hacerse del conocimiento público de ser solicitados. Gracias.

Por favor, envíe información actualizada del proyecto en el futuro (se requiere una dirección de correo electrónico arriba).

COMENTARIOS:

Me gustaría que se hicieran observaciones por la oruga y posiblemente otra casa más segura por muchas personas que caminen por esa calle.

El Corridor sería especialmente para más familias caminarian y arriau ejercicio y tendríamos un aire limpio y no gastaríamos tampoco en gasolina para salir en carro.

Solamente para uso oficial:
Proyecto de vía ciclista: ____________
Fecha de recepción: ____________
COMENTARIOS

Por favor, comparta sus comentarios a continuación. Tenga en cuenta que los documentos de SANDAG se consideran registros públicos y pueden hacerse del conocimiento público de ser solicitados. Gracias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMBRE</th>
<th>DIRECCIÓN</th>
<th>TELÉFONO</th>
<th>CORREO ELECTRÓNICO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Por favor, envíeme información actualizada del proyecto en el futuro (se requiere una dirección de correo electrónico arriba).

COMENTARIOS:

... para mí es muy importante que las calles tengan seguridad para uno poder moverse en bicicleta casi es imposible mucho veces me a toado ver cuando atropellan a las bicicletas, gracias...
COMMENTS

Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME

ADDRESS

PHONE

EMAIL

Vernita Gutierrez

Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

I am in favor of the Bikeway. That said, if the ultimate goal is to reduce vehicular traffic and emissions, please invest more in public mass transit!! Not everyone can or should be forced to cycle or walk everywhere. Most people who live in central San Diego work outside the area and it is extremely difficult to get around on public transportation. Lastly, do not discount the impacts of the project for parking and the concerns of residents. It is a very real issue that should not be taken lightly, particularly to those living close to the 30th Street business corridor and high-density infill projects where businesses do not usually provide parking for their patrons. Lastly, please be diligent and continue to engage in robust community engagement and outreach.
Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME: James Wingert

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

I support this project and any others that improve rider safety!
Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME
Kathy Jerome

ADDRESS

PHONE

EMAIL

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

I'm concerned about the corner of Orange and Marlborough. Thrus a Southwest corner and the bend out on the south east corner seems inappropriate. As well as the corner @ Euclid & Orange. It should get some additional surveying, it also seems inappropriate. It also seems that the traffic side is getting more traffic calming per area than the City Heights area which has more block area. I would like to see this project get started.
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COMMENTS

Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME       ADDRESS       PHONE       EMAIL

Susan Patch  [Redacted]  [Redacted]  [Redacted]

☑ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

I am impressed with this plan! It spans a long distance and would really help with people's ability to cycle in the area. Currently only Adams Avenue is somewhat suitable. It seems awkward that each direction shifts between having an actual bike lane and a shared lane with sharrows. I hope that connections with north/south bike routes will be reinforced. I would encourage City officials to push this project into motion on time rather than several years late as similar projects usually run. We have the budget, let's make it happen!

For official use only:
Bikeway Project: ________________
Date Received: ________________
Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

- In the popouts and cross section, please put in plumbing for future plantings.
COMMENTS

Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME: Ixchel R.

ADDRESS: [Redacted]

PHONE: [Redacted]

EMAIL: [Redacted]

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

As a native SanDiegan, we hope to see all new bike lanes + resources extend throughout all of El Cajon Blvd, this includes City Heights. We need to make sure that safety increases + that the money budgetted is allocated evenly. El Cajon Blvd. is a very, extremely diverse street, therefore I hope to see City Heights community members also benefit by new bike lanes, roundabouts, etc., in their neighborhood. I hope that my siblings & cousins grow up with the accessibility to safely ride their bikes.
Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME: BUGEN

ADDRESS

PHONE

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

When will the potholes be fixed? They are a priority! Teach bicyclist some traffic behavior, tired of them ignoring rules!
Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Cosgrove</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☑ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

**COMMENTS:**

I am very supportive of the project and believe that the removal of parking is important to create a safe in North Park/Morning Heights Neighborhood.

I would like to request that in addition to supporting the removal of parking and lanes of traffic for pedestrian facilities, SANDAG work in conjunction with MTS to increase BRT route 215’s headways to 10 minutes throughout the day to provide an active transportation option. This is a great project I support it 100%. Thank you for your hard work!! 😊
Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME: Wendy Miller  ADDRESS: [Redacted]  PHONE: [Redacted]  EMAIL: [Redacted]

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

I'm currently commuting between Balboa Park and City Heights by bicycle. It's awesome! I wish more people felt safe enough to ride it with me. My neighbors don't feel safe enough. So yay!! bike lanes!! Plan looks good! Build it soon!!
COMENTARIOS

Por favor, comparta sus comentarios a continuación. Tenga en cuenta que los documentos de SANDAG se consideran registros públicos y pueden hacerse del conocimiento público de ser solicitados. Gracias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMBRE</th>
<th>DIRECCIÓN</th>
<th>TELÉFONO</th>
<th>CORREO ELECTRÓNICO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Por favor, envíe información actualizada del proyecto en el futuro (se requiere una dirección de correo electrónico arriba).

COMENTARIOS:

As an Adams Ave resident, I'm supportive of this project. Every time I ride past, the lack of bike lane is very noticeable. Initially, I'm most excited for the roundabouts and bulb outs. I hope the remain a part of the plan.

Improving bike lane infrastructure is important to improve the growth of Nois Park and other projects. This project would be a step forward even with its flaws.
Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME: Hugh Burket

ADDRESS: 

PHONE: 

EMAIL: 

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

Where can we park our cars?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

For official use only:
Bikeway Project: ____________________
Date Received: ____________________

SANDAG TransNet
COMMENTS

Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME
Jeff Kucharcki

ADDRESS

PHONE

EMAIL

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

Great project for the community. This is great start to safe routes throughout upstate.

Suggested improvements:

1) Faster timelines. Project outreach has been ongoing for 4 years.

2) Sufficient traffic east of 805 to lower speeds ≤ 30 mph and lower amount of traffic.
COMMENTS

Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME
Tuan Luu

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

I just want to know that SANDAG have any plan to have another hearing in City Heights area. I feel is not fair for the City Heights residents and especially for the people who lives along the corridor did not heard about this hearing. Thank you - I support the project.
I'm a commuter and live in the area, and unfortunately I don't have my own parking spot in front of my apartment. Unfortunately I'm not for this project for various reasons because for the past 7 years, I have spent so much time coming home from work, trying to find a parking spot in the evenings, after work, and I'm competing with construction, water tower participants where they play indoor soccer, and a section 8 housing community where most residents have more than (1) vehicle, and knowing that we have to move our car, 2nd & 4th week will due to street sweeping. It's restless and I'm asking for a better alternative for residents like myself to come home after a long's day of work & fighting traffic to at least find something near my apartment. Thank you.
COMMENTS

Please share your comments below. Please note that SANDAG documents are public records and may be disclosed to the public upon request. Thank you.

NAME
Vickie Church

ADDRESS

PHONE

EMAIL

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

COMMENTS:

1. Ensure Project "Improvements" (speed hump) do not increase flooding problems in heavy rains (Orange 41st to Marlborough).

2. Ensure traffic light synchronization among El Camino Blvd and University for traffic diverted to those main areas.

3. Note elimination of stop signs in project area. Why didn't the graphics people show the stop lights? It looks like they are going away.

4. Bike parking in oz near the UH Library / Sprouts site is unrealistic. Transients in the area will steal everything. Do not block access to the library or the sidewalks providing access to buses. Great place for bikers - vehicle safety is important. Kids with trash helmets. People not running stop signs on side streets.

5. Get rid of costs. Education for all is needed.

For official use only: Bikeway Project: Date Received: 
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I was told speakers would speak in the order of submies submitted. That is not what happened. Mr. Varanadze submitted his long after me.
Catherine Thibault

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

☐ Please email me project updates in the future (email address required above).

**COMMENTS:**

This is a great project that will greatly improve safety for cyclists. San Diego needs an interconnected network of buffered and separated bike paths so that more people feel comfortable using the bicycle as a way of getting around.

This project will make the streets safer and nicer for everyone, drivers included.
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7/27/17

Name: Anastasia Brewster

Agenda Item #: _______ □ In Favor □ Opposed

Representing: City Heights CDC

Address: [Redacted]

Phone: [Redacted]

E-mail: [Redacted]

Request to Speak: ☑ Yes □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

SANDAG

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7-27-17

Agenda Item #: ________ □ In Favor □ Opposed

Name: Maria Cortez

Representing: COC BET

Address: __________________________

Phone: __________________________ E-mail: __________________________

Request to Speak: □ Yes □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

SANDAG

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7/27/17

Name: Sidney Michouel

Representing: City Heights

Address:

Phone: 

E-mail:

Request to Speak: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
SOLICITUD PARA EMITIR COMENTARIOS

Fecha: ____________________________  Tema de la agenda #Orange  □ A Favor  □ En oposición

Nombre: Esperanza González  Representando a: EHC, CDC, CH.

Dirección: ____________________________

Teléfono: ____________________________  Correo electrónico: ____________________________

Solicitud para hablar: □ Sí  □ No

Si prefiere no emitir comentarios verbalmente puede escribir a continuación los comentarios que desee que sean incluidos como parte del registro público:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

SANDAG

Favor de entregar a la secretaria de la Directiva
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7/27/17

Agenda Item #: ________ □ In Favor □ Opposed

Name: Carolina Rodriguez-Adjunta

Representing: Clinere Action Campaign

Address: ____________________________________________

Phone: _____________________________________________ E-mail: [REDACTED]

Request to Speak: □ Yes □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

SANDAG

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: July 27th 2017

Name: Brenda Y. Rodriguez

Address: [Redacted]

Phone: [Redacted]

E-mail: [Redacted]

Request to Speak: [✓] Yes  [ ] No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

SANDAG

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 1/27/17
Name: JULIE SOUTHWAY
Agenda Item #:    □ In Favor ☒ Opposed
Representing: MYSELF

Address: [redacted]
Phone: [redacted]
E-mail: [redacted]

Request to Speak: ☒ Yes    □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7/27/17

Name: Aaron Hebski

Agenda Item #: ___

Representing: individual

Address: ___

Phone: ___

E-mail: ___

Request to Speak: Yes No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

The Bikeway design is encouraging. I would like to see uphill continuity from Georgia to Park, however, by removing parking on the northside of Howard on that block.
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7/27/2017

Name: Una Nelson-White

Representing: private Rider

Address:

Phone:

E-mail:

Request to Speak: ☑ Yes ☐ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 9-21-11

Name: Jim

Address: 

Phone: 

E-mail: 

Request to Speak: Yes

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 0/29/19

Agenda Item #: __________ □ In Favor □ Opposed

Name: Vickie CHURCH

Representing: ________________________________

Address: __________________________________

Phone: __________________________ E-mail: __________________________

Request to Speak: ☑ Yes □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

SANDAG

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7/27/17

Agenda Item #: _______ □ In Favor □ Opposed

Name: Jose Franco Garcia
Representing: Environmental Health Coalition

Address: __________________________

Phone: ___________________________ E-mail: ___________________________

Request to Speak: □ Yes □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 27 Jun 17
Agenda Item #: __________ □ In Favor □ Opposed

Name: Robert □ Leif
Representing: _______________________

Address: __________________________

Phone: ___________________________ E-mail: _______________________

Request to Speak: □ Yes □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

See page First Page UT Thursday July 27, 2017

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
# REQUEST TO COMMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Agenda Item #:</th>
<th>□ In Favor</th>
<th>□ Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/27/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Representing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abigail Ryder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone:</th>
<th>E-mail:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Request to Speak:**  □ Yes  □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

---

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7/27/17

Agenda Item #: __________ [In Favor] [Opposed]

Name: Daniela Trujillo

Representing: San Diego County Bike Coalition

Address:

Phone: __________________________ E-mail: __________________________

Request to Speak: ☑ Yes   ☐ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: ___________________________  Agenda Item #: ________  □ In Favor  □ Opposed

Name: THOMPSON MATT  Representing: THOMPSON FAMILY

Address: ___________________________  Phone: ___________________________

E-mail: ___________________________

Request to Speak:  □ Yes  □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

WHAT OPPORTUNITY EXISTED FOR COMMUNITY INPUT ON FEATURES OF THE PLANS BETWEEN DRAFT AND POST EIR (WHEN FEATURES WERE TENTATIVE BECOME FIXED IN DRYING CONCRETE)

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board

Why doesn't individual comment get addressed before EIR?
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 28 July

Name: Esteban Del Rio

Representing: CABK/E SCBC

Address: 

Phone: 

E-mail: 

Request to Speak:  Yes  No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7/1/17

Name: Rodney Jerome

Agenda Item #: ________ □ In Favor □ Opposed

Address:

Representing: Environmental Health Coalition

Phone: ___________ E-mail: ___________

Request to Speak: □ Yes □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

SANDAG

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7/29/2017

Agenda Item #: _______ ☑ In Favor  □ Opposed

Name: Dianne Carlson

Representing: Self

Address: __________________________________________________________________________________________

Phone: __________________________________________________________________________________________

E-mail: _________________________________________________________________________________________

Request to Speak: ☑ Yes  □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

SANDAG

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: ___________________________    Agenda Item #: _______  □ In Favor  □ Opposed

Name: ___________________________   Representing: ___________________________

Address: __________________________

Phone: ___________________________   E-mail: ___________________________

Request to Speak:  □ Yes  □ No

If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

This project is much needed in San Diego once it is constructed, I’m sure everyone will see the benefit and support more active transportation in the future. I’m excited to run errands on my bike and go for leisure bike rides and leave my car at home!

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
REQUEST TO COMMENT

Date: 7/26/17
Name: PAUL JAMASON
Representing: BIKE SD

Address: [Redacted]
Phone: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

Request to Speak: □ Yes □ No
If you do not wish to speak, you may write any comments below you want included in the public record:

Pedestrian/bicyclist safety improvements are badly needed in N.E./Ch. This project accomplishes this. People’s lives are more important than a few parking spaces.

Please Submit to the Clerk of the Board
ES>EN Translation
Howard-Orange Bikeway Public Hearing Comments

Name: Esperanza Gonzalez (p. 2)

X Please email me project updates in the future

Comments:
I would like to have surveillance around Orange and to have something else in place to make the street safer as many people walk around there.
The corridor would be excellent because more families would walk around and get exercise.
Also, we would have cleaner air and would not spend money in gasoline to get around by car.

1) Name: Eva (p. 3)

Comments:
Street safety is very important for me to be able to get around by bike as this is almost impossible. I have witnessed bicycles getting hit by cars many times. Thank you.
Hello
I will not be able to attend tonight’s open house, but I would like to voice my disappointment with this proposal. Any elected official who is in favor of this, needs to be removed. I will not vote for them next election cycle. This is going to mess up a street which does not need it. I would prefer to see someone fix the parking situation in no park North Park or repair the roads. I cannot believe traffic circles are going take over Howard Avenue and cause more headaches than fixes.
I really hope everyone involved with this awful idea is removed from any decision making role regarding my community.
Thanks, Alison and team.

We’ve been discussing the bend-out treatments quite a bit this past week. We’ve had questions about them since we 1st heard about them being planned for Orange Ave.

Based on what we know now, we’re not compelled to support the bend-outs. As you point out, there aren’t any known built examples of the facility used in this way. They remain largely unproven in the U.S. Because of that we don’t know if they will be effective at improving traffic safety, curbing motor vehicle traffic volume, or increasing bike ridership to City of SD Climate Action Plan levels. Those are critical unknowns.

In addition to being unproven, the feedback at the Built Environment Team indicated that the bend-outs in this location will be prone to pedestrian-bike conflicts. In particular, children walking will be most exposed. About 90% of City Heights elementary school kids walk to school (Source: SDUSD school safety officer, interview). The area near Euclid Ave & Orange Ave has some of the highest propensity of zero-car households in the region. I can rarely think of a time that Euclid & Orange didn’t have pedestrians on the corners readying to cross. It seems that the higher the pedestrian volume, the more likely it is that a cyclist/pedestrian conflict will emerge. Would you say that’s true?

When the diverters were removed before a community decision was made, we were surprised. Residents at the BET supported the diverters. We’ve heard that the diverters were removed because they wouldn’t deter motorist traffic enough. So a feature with less diverting potential was recommended instead? What was the anticipated ADT with the diverters? What is the anticipated ADT with the bend-outs?

In regards to ADT, I believe that at the BET meeting where you and Chris presented, Chris stated that the roundabouts were removed because the ADTs were too high. Yet the ADT on University Ave is larger than on Orange Ave and roundabouts and widened sidewalks are moving forward there. How can this be? How can the City’s opinion on conditions that warrant the use of roundabouts be so different than SANDAG’s? This is a bit concerning especially if at the end of the day the City has to sign off on all of the Mid City Bikeway design features.

The bend-outs also seem prone to being watered down. What’s to say the concept won’t be watered down into a larger than normal pop-out w/ an extra ramp on it? Forgive the cartoon, but when I first saw this cartoon I immediately thought of the bend-out concept:
The features east of the I-805 on Orange seem to thin out compared to the features west of the I-805. Just did a quick count. Of the 16 blocks in the project corridor west of I-805, there will be 15 traffic calming features. That’s almost one per intersection. East of the I-805, there will be 15 traffic calming features in the span of 28 blocks. **North Park gets 15 traffic calming features in 16 blocks, while City Heights gets 15 in 28 blocks.** If you did a per capita analysis here the numbers would be even more startling due to City Heights’ densities.

What are the capital budgets for these segments of the Mid City Bike Corridor project?

A few years ago we raised some equity-related questions in regards to funding. We created this chart and shared it with Chris:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Uptown (1)</th>
<th>City Heights (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>37,849</td>
<td>78,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Size (acres)</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population/acre</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Corridor Funding</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding per capita</td>
<td>$925</td>
<td>$279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Data from City Heights Redevelopment Area 2010 Fact Sheet.

At the time we put this together, **Uptown residents benefitted from 3.3 times more funding per capita than City Heights residents.** This wasn’t resolved.
These are equity concerns that, as proposed now, will lead to City Heights having significantly fewer resources per capita than nearby communities west of the I-805.

We’d like to request that roundabouts, diverters, and traffic circles be analyzed in place of the bend-outs along Orange Ave in both the Environmental Document and in the design process moving forward. In addition we’d like to request that funding be re-allocated to allow for an equitable distribution across Mid City and Uptown.

Thank you and we look forward to your feedback,

Randy

Randy Van Vleck  
Active Transportation Manager  
City Heights Community Development Corp.  
4001 El Cajon Blvd., Suite 205  
City Heights, San Diego, CA 92105  
Direct: 619.961.1066  
Mainline: 619.584.1535  
Fax: 619.584.7992  
www.cityheightscdc.org  
rvanvleck@cityheightscdc.org

Working to improve the quality of life and economic wellbeing of people who live and work in City Heights  
Donate here, support CHCDC today!

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Moss, Alison [mailto:Alison.Moss@sandag.org]  
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2017 11:22 AM  
To: Randolph Van Vleck <rvanvleck@cityheightscdc.org>; Anastasia Brewster <abrewster@cityheightscdc.org>  
Cc: Sweitzer, Brandy <Brandy.Sweitzer@sandag.org>  
Subject: RE: Orange Ave Bikeway RE: Door Hangers: Open House/Public Hearing (Howard -- Orange Bikeway)

Hi Randy,

Thanks for following up about the door hangers. Through other inquiries and our own sleuthing, it does seem that a bunch of them did go out, but it’s hard to know exactly how many.

To respond to you questions:
New materials/visuals to share – I did share some things with Anastasia on May 17th (the most recent PPT, a 3rd party video on “protected intersections,” etc.). Unfortunately, I cannot share materials intended for the public hearing until the 27th.

Bend-out treatments – Yes, we are still recommending bend-out treatments for several locations along the Howard – Orange corridor. I am not aware of any built examples of the “bend-out” treatment, per se, but there numerous examples of related treatments: protected intersections and Class I facilities that are bent out at intersections. Principles behind all of these treatments include: (a) offering an extra buffer between cyclists and drivers, (b) improving visibility between cyclists and drivers by facilitating a tighter (closer to 90 degree) turn for drivers, and (c) giving cyclists a head-start through positioning and/or signal timing.

Spanish/Vietnamese translation – I want to clarify that we are translating all materials into Spanish for the July 27th event, and that we will have an interpreter and headsets staffing the event. We will not, however, translate materials or have interpretation available in Vietnamese, unless requested. This is what the event flyer states, and this is what is required by our LEP (Limited English Proficiency) policy. If you know of anyone who requires translation or interpretation, please let us know.

Lastly, I’m sorry that you won’t be able to make the Public Hearing. Still, we appreciate any help you can give in terms of getting the word out!

Thanks, and please feel free to call with any questions.

Alison Moss, AICP
Active Transportation Planner
SANDAG
Phone: (619) 595-5354
401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101

Facebook | Twitter | YouTube

-----Original Message-----
From: Randolph Van Vleck [mailto:rvanvleck@cityheightscdc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2017 5:24 PM
To: Moss, Alison <Alison.Moss@sandag.org>; Anastasia Brewster <abrewster@cityheightscdc.org>
Subject: Orange Ave Bikeway RE: Door Hangers: Open House/Public Hearing (Howard -- Orange Bikeway)

Hi Alson,

Thanks for reaching out.
Our co-worker Maria Cortez lives on Marlborough Ave in btwn El Cajon Blvd and Orange Ave. She said she did not receive one.

We called one of our BET members to ask if he received a notice. He lives on Orange Ave near Euclid Ave.

As mentioned, I won’t be able to make the July 27 Open House : ( Would you be able to send the materials to us before hand?

There is a BET meeting this Thursday. We’d like to be able to share some visuals.

By the way, is your team still recommending bend out treatments for certain intersections on Orange Ave? Have any cities in the U.S. or California implemented these treatments before?

Finally, thanks for securing Spanish and Vietnamese interpretation for the hearing. We’re glad to hear SANDAG will provide headsets so that Spanish and Vietnamese speakers can understand what other members of the public are saying during their testimony.

Thanks,

Randy

Randy Van Vleck
Active Transportation Manager
City Heights Community Development Corp.
4001 El Cajon Blvd., Suite 205
City Heights, San Diego, CA 92105
Direct: 619.961.1066
Mainline: 619.584.1535
Fax: 619.584.7992
www.cityheightscdc.org
ryanvleck@cityheightscdc.org

Working to improve the quality of life and economic wellbeing of people who live and work in City Heights Donate here, support CHCDC today!

Please consider the environment before printing this email

-----Original Message-----
From: Moss, Alison [mailto:Alison.Moss@sandag.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 9:38 AM
To: Randolph Van Vleck <ryanvleck@cityheightscdc.org>; Anastasia Brewster <abrewster@cityheightscdc.org>
Hi Randy & Anastasia,

I hope this finds you both well.

I am writing to see if there might be any way you can help me track down some information.

We (SANDAG) hired a company to distribute 6,000 door hangers (advertising the Open House/Public Hearing) along the Howard – Orange corridor yesterday (7/12). This included the corridor itself, plus – I believe – 300’ in either direction.

I am wondering if you know of anyone who received such a door hanger or if you are willing to reach out, in some manner, to your contacts to check. Alternatively, if it did go out, maybe there is some buzz on NextDoor?

We want to be extra-sure this door hanger was actually distributed in the project area. Any help is appreciated.

In advance, thanks a bunch!

Alison
Alison Moss, AICP
Active Transportation Planner
SANDAG
Phone: (619) 595-5354
401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101

Hello Alison-
My name is Rasaun, and I'm emailing you re: the Orange- Howard Bikeway. I am very excited over the increase in accessibility of central San Diego neighborhoods! I recently purchased (and live) at 3310 Orange Avenue, right at the corner of Orange and 33rd. I love making Orange more bike- and pedestrian friendly.

So I have a couple questions/ statements that I wanted to send you, in case I don't make the meeting on Thurs at Lafayette.

- I see car's speeding on Orange constantly. In the 6 months I've lived here, I've seen numerous potential accidents (cars slamming on breaks, blowing through red lights, etc.), and one pedestrian injured badly. I'd like to propose more raised sidewalks or traffic calming measures be added along Orange ave, specifically approaching the 805.

- The howard- orange bridge over the 805 has no lighting, and is constantly filled with litter, even dumped furniture. Vans/ trailers have people sleeping in them constantly, and doesn't feel safe, I think this is a barrier for those east of the 805 to access North Park by foot. Im hoping some of this will be addressed when the bike lanes go in.

- Will the bend out going in at 33rd and orange use the current curb, sidewalk, landscaping? Will part of the sidewalk be torn out? There's currently a tree planted in the grass on the street side of the sidewalk, and I've contemplated doing some of my own landscaping, applying for another tree from the city. Interested in what the city plans are for where the bend- outs are going in.

Thanks Alison!

Rasaun Robinson
619-307-9751
https://www.linkedin.com/in/rasaunrobinson
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 16, 2018

PROPOSED FY 2018 PROGRAM BUDGET AMENDMENT: LIGHT RAIL VEHICLE (LRV) PROCUREMENT SUPPORT

Introduction

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) exercised an option to an existing contract with Siemens Corporation to procure 45 additional low floor light rail vehicles (LRVs). Thirty-six of these vehicles are being procured for SANDAG’s Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit project and nine are being procured by MTS to supplement its existing fleet.

Discussion

SANDAG has engaged WSP USA (formerly Parsons Brinkerhoff) to assist with inspection and engineering support services during the LRV manufacturing process, including a Buy America audit. At the January 18, 2018, MTS Board of Directors meeting, MTS approved reimbursing SANDAG for its share of the WSP USA services associated with the support services for the nine non-Mid-Coast vehicles task order, which amounts to $140,502. Subsequently, MTS authorized additional funds for administrative support, raising the total amount to $150,000 (Attachment 1). The Transportation Committee is asked to approve an amendment to the FY 2018 Program Budget to accept the $150,000 from MTS and create a new project (Capital Improvement Program Project No. 1131400: Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Procurement Support) in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 2.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to: (1) approve an amendment to the FY 2018 Program Budget, creating a new Capital Improvement Program Project No. 1131400: Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Procurement Support; and (2) accept $150,000 from the Metropolitan Transit System to fully fund the project, in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 2.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments: 1. MTS Board of Directors Fund Transfer Authorization, MTS Agenda Item No. 13, January 18, 2018, and Addendum 17 Project Scope of Work
2. Proposed Budget Amendment for CIP No. 1131400, Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Procurement Support

Key Staff Contact: Chip Finch, (619) 595-5617, chip.finch@sandag.org
MEETING OF THE SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

January 18, 2018

SUBJECT:

WSP/PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF (WSP) PROCUREMENT OF INSPECTION AND ENGINEERING SUPPORT SERVICES DURING THE MANUFACTURING OF MTS LIGHT RAIL VEHICLES (LRV)

RECOMMENDATION:

That the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Board of Directors authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute MTS Doc No. G0930.17-04.65 with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) for the procurement of inspection and engineering support services during manufacturing of up to 9 LRVs (Attachment A).

Budget Impact

The total value of this agreement will not exceed $140,502.40. Funding for costs related to the inspection and engineering services will be provided by SD9 Procurement Project (Capital Improvement Program (CIP) No. 20021029) through a reimbursement agreement with SANDAG.

DISCUSSION:

The Mid-Coast project, currently under construction requires 36 LRVs in order to provide the additional trolley service contemplated by the project and MTS requires an additional 9 vehicles to supplement the existing MTS LRV fleet for a total of 45 vehicles. MTS has an existing contract with Siemens Industry, Inc. to procure the 45 LRVs consistent with SDTI’s technical specifications.

Through SANDAG’s Architectural & Engineering contracting process, SANDAG has hired WSP to assist with inspection and engineering support services during the LRV manufacturing process in the amount of $702,512.00. These services include: (a) project
management assistance; (b) design review and vehicle manufacturing first article inspection services; and (c) prepare and perform post-delivery audit of rolling stock.

MTS is responsible for funding 20% of the service cost since nine of the total vehicle orders of 45 are being funded by MTS. SANDAG shall invoice MTS and MTS shall reimburse SANDAG for the consultant services described herein.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% cost of Inspection and Engineering Services 45 LVRs</td>
<td>$702,512.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS's 20% share for Inspection and Engineering Services of 9 LVRs</td>
<td>$140,502.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inspection and engineering support services are necessary to ensure that the 9 LRVs manufactured on schedule and to the technical specifications set forth by MTS. SANDAG will administer a consultant contract and provide oversight during the performance period.

Therefore, staff recommends that the MTS Board of Directors authorize the CEO to execute MTS Doc No. G0930.17-04.65 with SANDAG for inspection and engineering support services during the LRV manufacturing process.

/s/ Paul C. Jablonski
Paul C. Jablonski
Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff Contact: Sharon Cooney, 619.557.4513, Sharon.Cooney@sdmts.com

Attachment: A. SANDAG Addendum 17, 5000710 SOW 65
Addendum 17 Project Scope of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTS File No.</th>
<th>G0930.17-04.65</th>
<th>SANDAG Reference No.</th>
<th>5000710 SOW 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CIP Title: MTS SD9 LRV Procurement

CIP/WBSE No. 20021029  
Project Managers: MTS – Karen Landers/Andy Goddard, Jr. SANDAG – Chip Finch

Lead Agency: SANDAG  
Operating Agency: MTS

Estimated Start Date: 11/15/2017  
Original SOW 65 Budget $140,502.40

Estimated Completion Date: 12/1/2020  
Additional SOW 65... Budget (this amendment) N/A

Total CIP Budget $39,272,000  
Total SOW Budget (value of work to be invoiced between SANDAG/MTS): $140,502.40

Intended Source of Funds:
Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP), Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP), TDA, STA

Describe Any Necessary Transfers of Project Funds Between the Parties:
MTS will be responsible for funding 20% of the project cost since nine of the total vehicle order of 45 are being funded by MTS. SANDAG shall invoice MTS and MTS shall reimburse SANDAG for the consultant services described herein.

Project Description:
The Mid-Coast project requires 36 LRVs in order to provide the additional trolley service contemplated by the project and MTS requires an additional 9 vehicles to supplement the existing MTS LRV fleet. MTS has an existing contract with Siemens Industry, Inc. to procure the total of 45 LRVs consistent with SDTI’s technical specifications. Through SANDAG’s A&E contracting process, SANDAG has hired WSP/PB (“Consultant”) to assist with inspection and engineering support during the LRV manufacturing process., these services include: a) project management assistance; b) design review and vehicle manufacturing first article inspection services, and c) prepare and perform post-delivery audit of rolling stock. In performing its monitoring work, Consultant shall not be responsible for Siemens’ manufacturing means, methods, techniques, or safety in connection with the project.

Scope of Work to be Performed by SANDAG and SANDAG Consultant:
The Consultant scope of work is attached herein as Exhibit A and SANDAG will administer Consultant contract and provide oversight during the performance period.

Any Additional Project-Specific Conditions:
N/A
Exhibit A – WSP/PB Contract #5007814 Task Order 3 Scope of Work
Addendum 17 Project Scope of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTS File No.</th>
<th>G930.17-04.65</th>
<th>SANDAG Reference No.</th>
<th>5000710 SOW 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIP Title:</td>
<td>MTS SD9 LRV Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP/WBSE No.</td>
<td>20021029</td>
<td>Project Managers:</td>
<td>MTS – Karen Landers/Andy Goddard, Jr. SANDAG – Chip Finch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency:</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Operating Agency:</td>
<td>MTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Start Date:</td>
<td>11/15/2017</td>
<td>Original SOW 65 Budget</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Completion Date:</td>
<td>12/1/2020</td>
<td>Additional SOW 65. Budget (this amendment)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CIP Budget</td>
<td>$39,272,000</td>
<td>Total SOW Budget (value of work to be invoiced between SANDAG/MTS):</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intended Source of Funds:

Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP), Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP), TDA, STA

Describe Any Necessary Transfers of Project Funds Between the Parties:

MTS will be responsible for funding 20% of the project cost since nine of the total vehicle order of 45 are being funded by MTS. SANDAG shall invoice MTS and MTS shall reimburse SANDAG for the consultant services described herein.

Project Description:

The Mid-Coast project requires 36 LRVs in order to provide the additional trolley service contemplated by the project and MTS requires an additional 9 vehicles to supplement the existing MTS LRV fleet. MTS has an existing contract with Siemens Industry, Inc. to procure the total of 45 LRVs consistent with SDTI’s technical specifications. Through SANDAG’s A&E contracting process, SANDAG has hired WSP/PB (“Consultant”) to assist with inspection and engineering support during the LRV manufacturing process., these services include: a) project management assistance, b) design review and vehicle manufacturing first article inspection services, and c) prepare and perform post-delivery audit of rolling stock. In performing its monitoring work, Consultant shall not be responsible for Siemens’ manufacturing means, methods, techniques, or safety in connection with the project.

Scope of Work to be Performed by SANDAG and SANDAG Consultant:

The Consultant scope of work is attached herein as Exhibit A and SANDAG will administer Consultant contract and provide oversight during the performance period.

Any Additional Project-Specific Conditions:

N/A
Exhibit A – WSP/PB Contract #5007814 Task Order 3 Scope of Work
This project provides Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) procurement support services for the procurement of nine new MTS light rail vehicles. Services include: a) project management assistance; b) design review and vehicle manufacturing first article inspection services; and c) perform and prepare post-delivery Buy America audit of rolling stock.

### SANDAG EXPENDITURE PLAN ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET PHASE</th>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SANDAG</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OUTSIDE AGENCY EXPENDITURE PLAN ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET PHASE</th>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Outside Agency</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SANDAG &amp; Outside Agency</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Pass-Through</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans RE Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUNDING PLAN ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCE</th>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td>91200001 MTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 16, 2018

PROPOSED FY 2018 PROGRAM BUDGET AMENDMENT:
I-15 MANAGED LANES DYNAMIC SIGNAGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Introduction

The Interstate 15 (I-15) Express Lanes is a 20-mile, four lane, high-occupancy toll facility which opened to traffic in 2012. The I-15 Express Lanes give priority access to transit, carpools, vanpools, motorcycles, and certain clean-air vehicles at no cost. Excess capacity on these Express Lanes is available for people driving alone to travel for a fee through the FasTrak® program. The I-15 Express Lanes are managed to enable the people who use them to bypass congestion in the corridor. Access to Express Lanes is provided at numerous points along the route, and electronic signs post the cost for solo drivers. On-ramps to Express Lanes – such as direct access ramps – allow vehicles to safely drive onto them. The fee that solo drivers pay to use Express Lanes, through the FasTrak system, supports transit service along the I-15 corridor.

The I-15 Express Lanes are jointly operated by Caltrans, SANDAG, and the Metropolitan Transit System; the agencies work cooperatively to improve the overall I-15 corridor performance. In 2016, as a result of public outreach conducted by SANDAG, the joint agency management team identified an opportunity to improve the Express Lanes signage, and thereby improve the user experience and corridor performance. A capital project to upgrade the I-15 Express Lanes electronic toll message signage is included in the FY 2018 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and construction is scheduled to begin in February 2018. A budget amendment to add $118,000 is recommended to provide additional construction administration support.

Discussion

In 2016, SANDAG conducted an assessment of the existing I-15 Express Lanes FasTrak signs to determine the effectiveness of the information being displayed, and to identify possible design improvements. Through surveys and focus groups, opportunities were identified that could improve FasTrak users’ understanding of the expected toll for a particular trip; and that could increase users’ awareness that high-occupancy-vehicles can use the facility at no cost.
In 2016, SANDAG initiated a CIP to complete the design and construction of the improvements to the electronic toll message signs, and to bring the signs into conformity with current State and Federal standards. When the CIP project was originally established, the project was estimated to cost $1.35 million, which included an estimated $530,000 for the Design phase, which included the assessment work, plan preparation, and construction administration.

Proposed Budget Amendment

The proposed budget amendment would add $118,000 of I-15 Toll Reserves to fund additional construction administration support that was identified after the approval of the Final design plans, while the contractor was preparing the phasing plan for sign installation. The additional construction administration effort includes: review and approval of technical documentation and contractor submittals; additional review and oversight activities to support field acceptance testing; and additional effort to provide oversight of the installation contractor through project completion. The approval of the proposed budget amendment by the Transportation Committee would increase the Design phase to $648,000, bringing the total project cost to $1.47 million. The project is expected to be completed by June 2018.

RAY TRAYNOR
Director of Operations

Attachment: 1. Proposed Budget Amendment for CIP No. 1400302, I-15 Managed Lanes Dynamic Signage Improvement Project

Key Staff Contact: Ryan Ross, (619) 710-4006, ryan.ross@sandag.org
### Project Number:
1400302

**RTIP Number:** TBD

**Project Name:** I-15 Managed Lanes Dynamic Signage

**Corridor Director:**

**Project Manager:** Alex Estrella

**PM Phone Number:** (619) 699-1928

---

**Project Scope**

The project focuses on performing a baseline review of existing I-15 Managed Lanes (ML) signage and providing an assessment and evaluation of possible signage design improvements to improve the effectiveness of I-15 ML operations.

**Site Location**

Baseline review, assessment, and design plan improvements are complete. Work in FY 2018 included the construction and replacement of existing I-15 FasTrak® Signs. Project will close-out in FY 19.

**Project Limits**

I-15 corridor between SR 52 and SR 78.

---

**SANDAG Expenditure Plan ($000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Phase</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>FY 27</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SANDAG</td>
<td>$385</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Outside Agency Expenditure Plan ($000)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Phase</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>FY 27</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Outside Agency</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SANDAG &amp; Outside Agency</td>
<td>$385</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Plan ($000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>FY 27</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92140001 I-15 FasTrak® Revenues</td>
<td>$385</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

$1,085

$1,470

---

**Local**

- 92140001 I-15 FasTrak® Revenues: $385
- 92140001 I-15 FasTrak® Revenues: $385

**Total: $1,085**

---

**Pass-Through: $0**

**Caltrans RE Services: $0**

**Total: $1,470**
PROPOSED FY 2018 PROGRAM BUDGET AMENDMENT:
ELVIRA TO MORENA DOUBLE TRACK PROJECT

Introduction

The Elvira to Morena Double Track (EMDT) project constructs approximately 2.6 miles of second main track along the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor from just south of Balboa Avenue to a point north of State Route 52 as shown in Attachment 1. The EMDT project also includes relocation and improvement to water and sewer lines under and adjacent to the rail corridor on behalf of the City of San Diego.

Discussion

There are numerous City of San Diego sewer and water lines that cross the railroad rights-of-way within the EMDT and Mid-Coast Corridor Transit project footprint. Due to the difficulty in maintaining these facilities, the City has elected to construct additional systems outside the railroad right-of-way. As a betterment, the City of San Diego is fully funding these improvements through two wet utility agreements with SANDAG through Contract No. 5008004 for $3.958 million and Contract No. 5004566 for $9.130 million totaling $13.089 million. These contracts were originally developed with the City based on a preliminary cost estimate. The final negotiated price for these improvements was determined to be higher and the City agreed to fund the additional costs through Council action on September 12, 2017 (Attachments 2 and 3).

The current approved FY 2018 EMDT budget is $188.221 million. Staff is recommending accepting an additional $3.404 million of City funds for the City of San Diego Wet Utility Construction Contract, including $2.174 million for City of San Diego Wet Utility Construction Contract No. 5004566 Amendment No. 1 and $1.230 million for City of San Diego Wet Utility Construction Contract No. 5008004 Amendment No. 1 and incorporate the funding into the EMDT project budget (Attachment 4) for a revised total budget of $191.625 million.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2018 Program Budget, adding $3.404 million in funds from the City of San Diego to the Elvira to Morena Double Track project (Capital Improvement Program Project No. 1239811), to fully fund two wet utility agreements, in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 4.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments: 1. Location Exhibit for Elvira to Morena Double Track Project
2. City of San Diego Wet Utility Construction Contract No. 5004566 Amendment No. 1
3. City of San Diego Wet Utility Construction Contract No. 5008004 Amendment No. 1
4. Proposed Budget Amendment for CIP No. 1239811, Elvira to Morena Double Track

Key Staff Contact: Peter d’Ablaing, (619) 699-1906, peter.dabraing@sandag.org
AMENDMENT 1 TO SANDAG CONTRACT NUMBER 5004566
WET UTILITY REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AND
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
REGARDING THE ELVIRA TO MORENA DOUBLE TRACK PROJECT

This Amendment No. 1 to SANDAG Contract No. 5004566 concerns a Wet Utility Reimbursement Agreement by and between the San Diego Association of Governments (hereinafter referred to as “SANDAG”), 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, California, and the City of San Diego, hereinafter called “CITY”:

A. Under the original Wet Utility Reimbursement Agreement dated 09/22/2015, SANDAG shall relocate CITY’s water and sewer facilities as shown on SANDAG’s contract plans for the improvements related to the Elvira to Morena Double Track Project, which constructs an adjacent second mainline track and proposes to construct a universal crossover and new signal at CP Rose, hereinafter called “PROJECT”.

B. This Amendment No. 1 is to modify the scope of work for the water line designated as W48.2 to extend the line, include a bypass of the pressure reducing station adjacent to Balboa Avenue, revise facilities W37.6, W48.2, W55.2, and W58.1 from DIP to PVC, and revise the construction costs for all facilities based on the actual proposal from the contractor. Nothing in this Amendment 1 is intended to relieve the parties of their obligations to perform as required by the said agreement unless expressly stated herein.

C. This Amendment No.1 increases the Agreement value by $2,174,369 thus bringing the new Agreement value to $11,304,697.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is agreed as follows:

1. Section I of the Wet Utility Reimbursement Agreement under the heading “WORK TO BE DONE” shall be amended to instead read as follows:

   SANDAG shall relocate CITY’s water and sewer facilities as shown in Exhibit A-1 (“RELOCATION”) and in accordance with SANDAG’s plans for such relocation, which by this reference are made a part hereof.

2. Section V of the Wet Utility Reimbursement Agreement under the heading “PAYMENT OF WORK” shall be amended to instead read as follows:

   CITY shall be responsible for the cost of the relocation of sewer facilities as shown in Exhibit A-1 in the amount not to exceed $646,786, which consists of the sum of the CONSTRUCTION COST and SUPPLEMENTAL COST as set forth in Exhibit B-1, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, as well as the ROW and Street Fees. CONSTRUCTION COST is the actual reasonable third party construction cost incurred by SANDAG for the RELOCATION work, betterment cost pursuant to Article IV, if any, and any approved CHANGE ORDERS. SUPPLEMENTAL COST consists of project management, design, plan review, construction management, and related costs incurred by SANDAG and shall be equal to twenty-seven percent (27%) of the CONSTRUCTION COST. ROW and Street Fees shall be eligible for direct cost reimbursement.

   CITY shall be responsible for the cost of the relocation of water facilities as shown in Exhibit A-1 in the amount not to exceed $10,657,911, which consists of the sum of the CONSTRUCTION COST and SUPPLEMENTAL COST as set forth in Exhibit B-1, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by
reference, as well as the ROW and Street Fees. CONSTRUCTION COST is the actual reasonable third party construction cost incurred by SANDAG for the RELOCATION work, betterment cost pursuant to Article IV, if any, and any approved CHANGE ORDERS. SUPPLEMENTAL COST consists of project management, design, plan review, construction management, and related costs incurred by SANDAG and shall be equal to twenty-seven percent (27%) of the CONSTRUCTION COST. ROW and Street Fees shall be eligible for direct cost reimbursement.

3. DELETE Exhibit A in its entirety and REPLACE with Exhibit A-1.

4. DELETE Exhibit B (CONSTRUCTION COST and SUPPLEMENTAL COST) in its entirety and REPLACE with Exhibit B-1 (CONSTRUCTION COST and SUPPLEMENTAL COST).

5. All other provisions of said Wet Utility Reimbursement Agreement not amended herein, shall remain in full force and effect. Any modification to this agreement shall be made by written amendment and agreed upon by both parties.

6. This Amendment No. 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 on the date of the last Party to sign.

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION
OF GOVERNMENTS

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

DATE:____________________

APPROVED AS TO SUFFICIENCY
OF FORM AND LEGALITY:

Office of the General Counsel

DATE:____________________

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Cindy Crocker
Principal Contracts Specialist
Public Works Contracts

DATE:10/19/17

APPROVED AS TO SUFFICIENCY OF FORM:

Deputy City Attorney
Christine Leone

DATE:10/20/17
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## Exhibit B-1 - CONSTRUCTION COST AND SUPPLEMENTAL COST (Elvira to Morena Double Track Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>System Description</th>
<th>Basis of Estimate</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Add Interior Weld</th>
<th>Reduction from Conv. From DIP to PVC</th>
<th>Updated Construction Cost</th>
<th>Construction Contingency (10%)</th>
<th>27% of Construction Cost for SANDAG Project Management, Design, Plan Review, Construction Management (Excludes Contingency)</th>
<th>ROW Fees</th>
<th>Street Fees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>S50.1</td>
<td>8&quot; PVC in 30&quot; WSP Casing</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$391,878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$391,878</td>
<td>$105,807</td>
<td>$98,686</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,227</td>
<td>$635,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,227</td>
<td>$11,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$546,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>System Description</th>
<th>Basis of Estimate</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Add Interior Weld</th>
<th>Reduction from Conv. From DIP to PVC</th>
<th>Updated Construction Cost</th>
<th>Construction Contingency (10%)</th>
<th>27% of Construction Cost for SANDAG Project Management, Design, Plan Review, Construction Management (Excludes Contingency)</th>
<th>ROW or Street Fees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water W37.1</td>
<td>12&quot; PVC</td>
<td>Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) from Contractor</td>
<td>$1,014,498</td>
<td>$1,014,498</td>
<td>$101,450</td>
<td>$273,935</td>
<td>$1,389,636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W37.4</td>
<td>10&quot; &amp; 36&quot; CMP</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$2,531,458</td>
<td>$2,638,323</td>
<td>$263,832</td>
<td>$712,347</td>
<td>$3,614,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W37.5</td>
<td>12&quot; DIP</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$374,365</td>
<td>$374,365</td>
<td>$37,437</td>
<td>$101,079</td>
<td>$512,481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W37.6</td>
<td>12&quot; PVC</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$481,657</td>
<td>$481,657</td>
<td>$45,654</td>
<td>$123,266</td>
<td>$625,466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W37.7</td>
<td>12&quot; CMP&amp;CS</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$40,476</td>
<td>$40,476</td>
<td>$4,048</td>
<td>$10,925</td>
<td>$55,453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W37.8</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$281,929</td>
<td>$281,929</td>
<td>$28,193</td>
<td>$76,121</td>
<td>$386,243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W48.1</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
<td>$6,130</td>
<td>$31,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W48.2</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$999,752</td>
<td>$999,752</td>
<td>$94,188</td>
<td>$254,306</td>
<td>$1,290,977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W49.1</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
<td>$6,130</td>
<td>$31,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W51.1</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
<td>$6,130</td>
<td>$31,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W52.1</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
<td>$6,130</td>
<td>$31,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W55.1</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
<td>$6,130</td>
<td>$31,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W55.2</td>
<td>12&quot; PVC</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$3,001,535</td>
<td>$3,001,535</td>
<td>$296,746</td>
<td>$1,302,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W56.1</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$22,703</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
<td>$6,130</td>
<td>$31,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water W58.1</td>
<td>12&quot; PVC</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$566,317</td>
<td>$566,317</td>
<td>$54,992</td>
<td>$148,479</td>
<td>$43,605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Extension of W48.3</td>
<td>12&quot; PVC</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$24,300</td>
<td>$123,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Balboa Bypass</td>
<td>Bypass of PRS at Balboa Draft OPCP</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$37,800</td>
<td>$191,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water PRS near Costco</td>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Funded by MCTC</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>System Description</th>
<th>Basis of Estimate</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Add Interior Weld</th>
<th>Reduction from Conv. From DIP to PVC</th>
<th>Updated Construction Cost</th>
<th>Construction Contingency (10%)</th>
<th>27% of Construction Cost for SANDAG Project Management, Design, Plan Review, Construction Management (Excludes Contingency)</th>
<th>ROW Fees</th>
<th>Street Fees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water PRS near Costco</td>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Funded by MCTC</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: SANDAG Project Management, Design, Plan Review, Construction Management (Excludes Contingency)</th>
<th>ROW Fees</th>
<th>Street Fees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Street Fees</td>
<td>$11,227</td>
<td>$11,227</td>
<td>$635,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sewer</td>
<td>$11,227</td>
<td>$11,227</td>
<td>$546,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sewer and Water: $11,304,697
This Amendment No. 1 to SANDAG Contract No. 5008004 concerns a Wet Utility Reimbursement Agreement by and between the San Diego Association of Governments (hereinafter referred to as “SANDAG”), 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, California, and the City of San Diego, hereinafter called “CITY”.

A. Under the original Wet Utility Reimbursement Agreement dated 09/22/2015, SANDAG shall relocate CITY’s water and sewer facilities as shown on SANDAG’s contract plans for the improvements related to the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, which extends the Trolley Blue Line from the Santa Fe Depot in Downtown San Diego to the University Towne Centre (UTC) Transit Center in University City, hereinafter called “PROJECT”.

B. This Amendment No. 1 is to modify the scope of work for the False Bay Trunk sewer from one to two facilities (Knoxville and Littlefield) and the construction costs for all facilities based on the actual proposal from the contractor. Nothing in this Amendment 1 is intended to relieve the parties of their obligations to perform as required by the said agreement unless expressly stated herein.

C. This Amendment No.1 increases the Agreement value by $1,230,129.12 thus bringing the new Agreement value to $5,189,037.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is agreed as follows:

1. Section I of the Wet Utility Reimbursement Agreement under the heading “WORK TO BE DONE” shall be amended to instead read as follows:

   SANDAG shall relocate CITY’s water and sewer facilities as shown in Exhibit A (“RELOCATION”) and SANDAG’s plans for such relocation, which by this reference are made a part hereof. In addition, SANDAG shall construct the CITY’s W21.1 (Anna Ave), False Bay Trunk Sewer (Knoxville) and False Bay Trunk Sewer (Littlefield) as shown on the CITY’s plans and as indicated in Exhibit A-1 (“RELOCATION”), which by this reference are made a part hereof.

   CITY hereby acknowledges review of SANDAG’s plans for the RELOCATION and agrees to the construction in the manner proposed. SANDAG hereby acknowledges receipt of CITY’s plans for the construction of W21.1 (Anna Ave), False Bay Trunk Sewer (Knoxville) and False Bay Trunk Sewer (Littlefield) and agrees to construction in the manner proposed.

2. Section V of the Wet Utility Reimbursement Agreement under the heading “PAYMENT OF WORK” shall be amended to instead read as follows:

   CITY shall be responsible for the cost of the relocation of water facilities as shown in Exhibit A in the amount not to exceed $757,741, which consists of the sum of the CONSTRUCTION COST and SUPPLEMENTAL COST as set forth in Exhibit B-1, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and ROW and Street fees. CONSTRUCTION COST is the actual reasonable third party construction cost incurred by SANDAG for the RELOCATION work, betterment cost pursuant to Article IV, if any, and any approved CHANGE ORDERS. SUPPLEMENTAL COST consists of project management,
design, plan review, construction management, and related costs incurred by SANDAG and shall be equal to twenty-seven percent (27%) of the CONSTRUCTION COST. ROW and Street Fees shall be eligible for reimbursement at cost.

CITY shall be responsible for the cost of the relocation of sewer facilities as shown in Exhibit A in the amount not to exceed $1,377,593, which consists of the sum of the CONSTRUCTION COST and SUPPLEMENTAL COST as set forth in Exhibit B-1, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and ROW and Street fees. CONSTRUCTION COST is the actual reasonable third party construction cost incurred by SANDAG for the RELOCATION work, betterment cost pursuant to Article IV, if any, and any approved CHANGE ORDERS. SUPPLEMENTAL COST consists of project management, design, plan review, construction management, and related costs incurred by SANDAG and shall be equal to twenty-seven percent (27%) of the CONSTRUCTION COST. ROW and Street Fees shall be eligible for reimbursement at cost.

CITY shall be responsible for the cost of the construction of the FALSE BAY TRUNK SEWER facilities as shown in Exhibit A-1 in the amount not to exceed $3,053,703, which consists of the sum of the CONSTRUCTION COST and SUPPLEMENTAL COST as set forth in Exhibit B-1, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and ROW and Street fees. CONSTRUCTION COST is the actual reasonable third party construction cost incurred by SANDAG for the RELOCATION work, betterment cost pursuant to Article IV, if any, and any approved CHANGE ORDERS. SUPPLEMENTAL COST consists of project management, construction management, and related costs incurred by SANDAG and shall be equal to seventeen percent (17%) of the CONSTRUCTION COST. ROW and Street Fees shall be eligible for reimbursement at cost.

3. Exhibit A-1 (RELOCATION) is now ADDED to Exhibit A (RELOCATION).

4. DELETE Exhibit B (CONSTRUCTION COST and SUPPLEMENTAL COST) in its entirety and REPLACE with Exhibit B-1 (CONSTRUCTION COST and SUPPLEMENTAL COST).

5. SANDAG agrees to accept the City’s plans and specifications for W21.1 (Anna Ave) and FALSE BAY TRUNK SEWER as is. The City agrees they are responsible for the sufficiency of the design provided by their consultants.

6. The City agrees to make their consultants available for Design Support During Construction (DSDC).

7. The City agrees to indemnify SANDAG as to the safety and sufficiency of the designed W21.1 (Anna Ave) and False Bay Trunk Sewer (Knoxville) and False Bay Trunk Sewer (Littlefield).

8. All other provisions of said Wet Utility Reimbursement Agreement not amended herein, shall remain in full force and effect. Any modification to this agreement shall be made by written amendment and agreed upon by both parties.

9. This Amendment No. 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 on the date of the last Party to sign.
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION
OF GOVERNMENTS

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

DATE: ________________

APPROVED AS TO SUFFICIENCY
OF FORM AND LEGALITY:

Office of the General Counsel

DATE: ________________

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Cindy Crocker
Principal Contracts Specialist
Public Works Contracts

DATE: 12/19/17

APPROVED AS TO SUFFICIENCY
OF FORM:

Deputy City Attorney
Christine Leone

DATE: 12/20/17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>System Description</th>
<th>Basis of Estimate</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Construction Contingency (10%)</th>
<th>27% of Construction Cost for SANDAG Project Management, Design, Plan Review, and Construction Management (Excludes Contingency)</th>
<th>ROW COSTS</th>
<th>STREET FEE COSTS</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>S21.1</td>
<td>15&quot; Sewer, Extend Cap Encasement over Exit Cradle (2EA)</td>
<td>Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) from Contractor</td>
<td>$81,718</td>
<td>$8,172</td>
<td>$22,064</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>$117,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>S23.1</td>
<td>Extend 24&quot; Steel Casing</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$115,711</td>
<td>$11,571</td>
<td>$31,242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$158,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>S35.1</td>
<td>Abandon 8&quot; Sewer</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$39,541</td>
<td>$3,954</td>
<td>$10,676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$54,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>S60.1</td>
<td>Replace 36&quot; Sewer in-place with 18&quot; Sewer</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$681,973</td>
<td>$68,197</td>
<td>$184,133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$934,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>S62.1</td>
<td>Abandon 21&quot; Sewer</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$80,513</td>
<td>$8,051</td>
<td>$21,739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$110,303</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Street Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,539</td>
<td>$2,539</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,977,593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>System Description</th>
<th>Basis of Estimate</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Construction Contingency (10%)</th>
<th>17% of Construction Cost for SANDAG Project Management, Design, Plan Review, and Construction Management (Excludes Contingency)</th>
<th>ROW COSTS</th>
<th>STREET FEE COSTS</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>False Bay Trunk Sewer (Knoxville)</td>
<td>18&quot; Sewer</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$1,179,342</td>
<td>$117,934</td>
<td>$200,488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,497,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>False Bay Trunk Sewer (Littlefield)</td>
<td>48&quot; Steel Casing for Sewer</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$1,220,717</td>
<td>$122,072</td>
<td>$207,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,550,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Street Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,629</td>
<td>$5,629</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,053,703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>System Description</th>
<th>Basis of Estimate</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Construction Contingency (10%)</th>
<th>27% of Construction Cost for SANDAG Project Management, Design, Plan Review, and Construction Management (Excludes Contingency)</th>
<th>ROW COSTS</th>
<th>STREET FEE COSTS</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>W21.1</td>
<td>[ANNA AVE] 12&quot; Water System</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$310,726</td>
<td>$31,073</td>
<td>$83,896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$425,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>W23.1</td>
<td>10&quot; Water System</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$115,684</td>
<td>$11,568</td>
<td>$31,235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$158,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>W35.1</td>
<td>8&quot; Water System</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$70,766</td>
<td>$7,077</td>
<td>$19,107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$96,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>W37.2</td>
<td>Abandon 20&quot; Water</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$32,334</td>
<td>$3,233</td>
<td>$8,730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>W37.3</td>
<td>Abandon 12&quot; Water</td>
<td>GMP from Contractor</td>
<td>$22,565</td>
<td>$2,256</td>
<td>$6,091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Street Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,397</td>
<td>$1,397</td>
<td></td>
<td>$757,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total General Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,189,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAG1201431
## FY 18 Capital Budget Amendment in '000's

**Project Number:** 123801
**RTIP Number:** SAN132
**Project Name:** Elvira to Morena Double Track

### Project Scope
- Convert 2.6 miles of single-track to double track and install new signals. Construct new replacement bridges at SRP 208, 208A, 208B, 208C, and 208D. Construct new water main facility for City of San Diego between Friars Road and SR 52.

### Site Location
- SANDAG
- CALTRANS

### Progress to Date
- Construction is 30 percent complete.

### Five-Year Spending Plan (2018-2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>DELAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>$2,751</td>
<td>$2,621</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,225</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>$1,402</td>
<td>$1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Support</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Capital</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Pass-Through</td>
<td>$45,738</td>
<td>$4,783</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Milestones
- Draft Environmental Document: Mar-17
- Final Environmental Document: Mar-17
- Tentative Project Limits: Mar-17
- Final Project Limitation: Mar-17
- Draft Construction: Mar-17
- Design for Public: Jul-20
- Environmental Master Plan: Jul-20

### Project Costs
- $188,221
- $52,376
- $9,920
- $115
- $51,419
- $27,068
- $50
- $45,738
- $170
- $0
- $188,221
- $6,200

### Funding Plan (2018-2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCE</th>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>DELAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$27,988</td>
<td>$2,080</td>
<td>$2,080</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-PRIII Transfer</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-MC AC</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$2,562</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,562</td>
<td>$2,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$5,718</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,718</td>
<td>$5,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total
- FY 21: $45,738
- FY 22: $4,783
- FY 23: $0
- FY 24: $0
- FY 25: $0
- FY 26: $0
- Delay: $0

### Attachment
1. Feel free to insert any relevant attachments here.
**TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**FEBRUARY 16, 2018**

ACTION REQUESTED: RECOMMEND

**FY 2019 – FY 2023 TransNet AND TRANSIT RELATED REVENUES**

**Introduction**

The transit operators within the San Diego region receive federal, state, and local revenues to support both ongoing operations and capital projects. SANDAG is responsible for the apportionment of these various funds to the transit operators and local agencies. Each year, SANDAG provides an estimate for the upcoming fiscal year, as well as a projection for the next four fiscal years to enable the transit and local agencies to plan for capital projects and determine operating subsidies.

This report provides the FY 2019 - FY 2023 revenue estimates for the Transportation Development Act (TDA), TransNet, and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula programs, along with an overview of the forecast methodology used in projecting the estimates. A summary of the estimates for each revenue source is below. Details can be found in Attachments 1-4. The approach to develop future year estimates for the two sales tax based programs is detailed in Attachment 5: Forecast Methodology for TDA and TransNet. Additional information for the fund types is detailed in Attachment 6: Funding Programs.

**Discussion**

**Transportation Development Act**

The TDA formula program provides one-quarter percent of the state sales tax for operating and capital support of public transportation systems and non-motorized transportation projects like bicycle and pedestrian projects. SANDAG, as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency, is responsible for the allocation of TDA funds to the region’s 18 cities, County of San Diego, and transit operators.

The San Diego County Auditor and Controller office is required by state law to provide an estimated apportionment for the upcoming fiscal year before February 1 of each year. The apportionment is developed in consultation with SANDAG staff and the transit operators and is based on sales tax receipts as well as projections. The FY 2019 apportionment is estimated to be about $147.8 million and reflects an increase of approximately $3.2 million over the FY 2018 apportionment. The FY 2019 to FY 2023 estimates are shown in Attachment 1.

**Recommendation**

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the FY 2019 – FY 2023 Transportation Development Act, TransNet, and Federal Transit Administration estimates and apportionments.
**TransNet**

The TransNet 40-year half-cent sales tax provides funding for major transportation projects in the region based on specific distributions outlined in the TransNet Ordinance. Annual estimates are developed by SANDAG based on actual sales tax receipts and the anticipated growth rate.

For FY 2019, approximately $300.9 million is estimated to be available for the entire TransNet program, an increase of about $8.8 million over the 2018 estimate of approximately $292 million, of which approximately $48 million is available for transit purposes. The estimate for FY 2019 - FY 2023 revenues for the entire program is shown in Attachment 2. The FY 2019 - FY 2023 estimates for the Transit System Improvements Program are included in Attachment 3. The TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee is scheduled to review the estimates and methodology at its meeting on February 14, 2018.

**Federal Transit Administration Formula Programs**

The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act was signed into law on December 4, 2015, and includes several programs that provide formula funding for transit purposes. SANDAG, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, is responsible for the distribution of FTA formula funds in the region.

While the FAST Act, which covers the period FY 2016 - FY 2020, includes a planned increase of approximately 2 percent per year for FTA formula programs, the apportionment is subject to annual congressional budgetary action. The FTA has not released apportionment estimates for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2018 as of the writing of this report. For planning purposes, the FFY 2018 FTA funds in the report are based on final FFY 2017 apportionments and the planned 2 percent growth rate. For FFY 2019 and beyond, revenues in these formula programs are assumed to be flat. In FY 2017 the full apportionment was not released until late in the year, resulting in a carryover of FY 2017 funds for this update. Attachment 4 provides the 2017 carryover amount and the five-year estimates.

**State Transit Assistance**

The funding for the State Transit Assistance (STA) program comes from sales tax generated from diesel fuel. Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) includes additional revenues for transit infrastructure repair and service improvements through a new program known as the State of Good Repair (SGR) program. The SANDAG area, as defined under the STA and SGR programs, consists of the area outside of the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) area of jurisdiction. SANDAG, as the eligible recipient of STA and STA SGR funds, submits claims on behalf of the North County Transit District (NCTD) as part of the annual TDA/STA claims process.

The proposed FY 2018-2019 California Budget includes $554 million in STA funding; of that amount, the San Diego region is estimated to receive $33.2 million ($9.2 million to NCTD and $24 million to MTS) in FY 2019. The proposed state budget includes $105 million in SGR funding; of that amount, $6.3 million is expected to be available to the San Diego region ($1.7 million to NCTD and $4.6 million to MTS). The FY 2019 allocations are anticipated to be released in November 2018.
Next Steps

Pending action by the Transportation Committee, the Board of Directors is scheduled to review the FY 2019 - FY 2023 TDA, TransNet, and FTA estimates and apportionments at its February 23, 2018, meeting. Upon approval by the Board of Directors, the FY 2019 - FY 2023 estimates and apportionments will be provided to the transit operators for their use in budget development.

JOSÉ A. NUNCIO
TransNet Department Director

2. TransNet Program – Estimates for FY 2019 - FY 2023
5. Forecast Methodology for TDA and TransNet Forecasts
6. Funding Programs

Key Staff Contacts: Dawn Vettese, (619) 595-5346, dawn.vettese@sandag.org
Ray Major, (619) 595-5668, ray.major@sandag.org
## Transportation Development Act

### FY 2019 Apportionment and FY 2020 - FY 2023 Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2019 Total Apportionment</th>
<th>FY2020 Estimate ($000s)</th>
<th>FY2021 Estimate ($000s)</th>
<th>FY2022 Estimate ($000s)</th>
<th>FY2023 Estimate ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$147,814,661</td>
<td>$153,121</td>
<td>$158,741</td>
<td>$164,582</td>
<td>$170,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less County Auditor Expenses (PUC 99233.1)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less SANDAG Administration (PUC 99233.1)</td>
<td>(724,560)</td>
<td>(539)</td>
<td>(559)</td>
<td>(760)</td>
<td>(573)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 3% Planning Funds (PUC 99233.2)</td>
<td>(4,411,203)</td>
<td>(4,576)</td>
<td>(4,744)</td>
<td>(4,913)</td>
<td>(5,096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 2% Bicycle/Pedestrian Funds (PUC 99233.3)</td>
<td>(2,852,578)</td>
<td>(2,959)</td>
<td>(3,068)</td>
<td>(3,177)</td>
<td>(3,295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 5% Community Transit Service (PUC 99233.7)</td>
<td>(6,991,316)</td>
<td>(7,252)</td>
<td>(7,519)</td>
<td>(7,787)</td>
<td>(8,076)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$132,785,004</strong></td>
<td><strong>$137,744</strong></td>
<td><strong>$142,799</strong></td>
<td><strong>$147,892</strong></td>
<td><strong>$153,397</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Available for MTS | $97,184,026               | $100,817                 | $104,525                 | $108,261                 | $112,297                 |
| Less Regional Planning/Capital Projects | (209,227)                | (213)                    | (213)                    | (213)                    | (213)                    |
| Less Transferred Functions | (1,901,494)             | (1,972)                  | (2,045)                  | (2,118)                  | (2,197)                  |
| Total Community Transit Service | $4,872,057              | $5,054                   | $5,239                   | $5,426                   | $5,628                   |

| Total Available to Claim | $39,206,218              | $41,043                  | $42,693                  | $44,216                  | $45,861                  |

| Total Available for SANDAG | $8,382,012               | $8,106                   | $8,252                   | $8,720                   | $8,821                   |
| Less Regional Planning/Capital Projects | (702,186)               | 352                      | 213                      | 213                      | 213                      |
| Transfered Functions | 2,544,063             | 2,639                    | 2,736                    | 2,834                    | 2,939                    |
| SANDAG Administrative Expenses | 724,560                | 539                      | 559                      | 760                      | 573                      |
| 3% Planning Funds | 4,411,203              | 4,576                    | 4,744                    | 4,913                    | 5,096                    |
| Prior Year Carryover | **Total Available to Claim** | $139,826               | $145                     | $150                     | $156                     | $162                     |

### Notes:

1. The County Auditor provided the apportionment for FY 2019. The projected estimates for FY 2020 to FY 2023 are based on the growth rate in retail sales as forecasted by SANDAG and excludes interest and prior year excess funds.

2. Appportionment distribution is based on the population estimates published by the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates as of January 2017 - approximately 71% for MTS and 29% for NCTD.

3. The SANDAG Administration cost rises in FY 2019 & FY 2022 disproportionately due to costs associated with the triennial performance audit. All other annual increases in SANDAG administrative share are consistent with the estimated growth in the TDA.

4. Represents the local match for federally funded regional planning and transit capital development projects identified in the initial draft FY 2019 transit CIP as provided by MTS and NCTD. The projects funded are scheduled to be included as part of the FY 2019 Capital Improvement Program scheduled for Transportation Committee/Board action at their March meetings. As a result, this amount is subject to change.

5. Based on Addendums No. 3 and No. 4 to the Master Memorandum of Understanding between MTS, NCTD, and SANDAG. For NCTD, 26.09% of this share is transferred back to NCTD to be used for TDA-eligible purposes.

*Totals may not add up due to rounding

---

1. The FY 2019 estimate is based on the population estimates published by the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates as of January 2017.
2. The FY 2019 estimate is based on the population estimates published by the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates as of January 2017.
3. The SNDAG Administration cost rises in FY 2019 & FY 2022 disproportionately due to costs associated with the triennial performance audit. All other annual increases in SNDAG administrative share are consistent with the estimated growth in the TDA.
4. Represents the local match for federally funded regional planning and transit capital development projects identified in the initial draft FY 2019 transit CIP as provided by MTS and NCTD. The projects funded are scheduled to be included as part of the FY 2019 Capital Improvement Program scheduled for Transportation Committee/Board action at their March meetings. As a result, this amount is subject to change.
5. Based on Addendums No. 3 and No. 4 to the Master Memorandum of Understanding between MTS, NCTD, and SANDAG. For NCTD, 26.09% of this share is transferred back to NCTD to be used for TDA-eligible purposes.

---

*attachement 1*
### TransNet Program

Estimates for FY 2019 - FY 2023 (in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TransNet Program Revenues</th>
<th>Approved FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Estimate**</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Estimate**</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Estimate**</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Estimate**</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Estimate**</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### TransNet Program Allocations

| Administrative Allocations¹ | $2,921 | $3,009 | $3,117 | $3,231 | $3,350 | $3,471 |
| Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee² | $395 | $399 | $409 | $419 | $433 | $443 |
| Bike, Pedestrian & Neighborhood Safety³ | $5,843 | $6,018 | $6,234 | $6,463 | $6,701 | $6,941 |
| Total off-the-top Programs | $9,159 | $9,426 | $9,760 | $10,113 | $10,484 | $10,855 |

**Net Available for Subprograms**

| $282,974 | $291,471 | $301,939 | $313,025 | $324,546 | $336,203 | $336,203 |

### Program Allocations*

| Major Corridors Program⁴ | $119,981 | $123,584 | $128,022 | $132,722 | $137,607 | $142,550 |
| New BRT/Rail Operations⁵ | $22,921 | $23,609 | $24,457 | $25,355 | $26,288 | $27,232 |
| Transit System Improvements⁶ | $46,691 | $48,093 | $49,820 | $51,649 | $53,550 | $55,473 |
| Local System Improvement⁷ | $93,381 | $96,185 | $99,640 | $103,298 | $107,100 | $110,947 |

**Total Program Allocations**

| $282,974 | $291,471 | $301,939 | $313,025 | $324,546 | $336,203 | $336,203 |

*Totals may not add up due to rounding

**Low and High reflect +/- 5% of estimate

The TransNet Extension Ordinance established the rules for the allocation of all Commission revenues. Commission funds are allocated according to the following priorities:

1. Up to 1% of the annual revenues shall be allocated for administrative expenses, which includes Commission/Board expenses, administrative reserve.
2. The ITOC allocation is based on the annual increase in CPI beginning with FY 2002, using $250,000 as the starting base.
3. Total of 2% shall be allocated for bicycle facilities.
4. 42.4% of the total revenues less off the top programs shall be allocated for Major Corridor projects which include transportation mitigation under the Environmental Mitigation program (EMP) and any finance charges incurred.
5. 8.1% of the total revenues less off the top programs shall be allocated to operate new rail or bus rapid transit (BRT) services.
6. 16.5% of the total revenues less off the top programs shall be allocated for purposes of public transit services including providing for senior and American with Disabilities Act (ADA)-related services.
7. 33% of total revenues less off the top programs shall be allocated for local street improvement services, which includes roadway projects, as well as local EMP and smart growth incentive programs.
### TransNet Revenue Forecast - Transit System Improvements Program

Estimates for FY 2019 - FY 2023 (in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2019 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2020 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2021 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2022 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2023 (Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available For Transit Purposes</strong>&lt;sup&gt;1,2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$46,691</td>
<td>$48,093</td>
<td>$49,820</td>
<td>$51,649</td>
<td>$53,550</td>
<td>$55,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 2.5% for ADA-related Services</td>
<td>($1,167)</td>
<td>($1,202)</td>
<td>($1,245)</td>
<td>($1,291)</td>
<td>($1,339)</td>
<td>($1,387)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 3.25% for Senior Services</td>
<td>($1,517)</td>
<td>($1,563)</td>
<td>($1,619)</td>
<td>($1,679)</td>
<td>($1,740)</td>
<td>($1,803)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,007</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,327</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46,955</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,679</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,471</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52,284</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MTS Projects And Services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2019 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2020 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2021 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2022 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2023 (Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service Improvements (Operations and Supporting Capital)</td>
<td>$31,293</td>
<td>$32,232</td>
<td>$33,390</td>
<td>$34,616</td>
<td>$35,890</td>
<td>$37,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Services</td>
<td>$830</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$886</td>
<td>$918</td>
<td>$952</td>
<td>$986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NCTD Projects And Services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2019 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2020 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2021 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2022 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2023 (Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service Improvements (Operations and Supporting Capital)</td>
<td>$12,714</td>
<td>$13,095</td>
<td>$13,565</td>
<td>$14,063</td>
<td>$14,581</td>
<td>$15,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Services</td>
<td>$337</td>
<td>$347</td>
<td>$359</td>
<td>$373</td>
<td>$387</td>
<td>$401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Discretionary Programs<sup>3</sup>:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2019 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2020 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2021 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2022 (Estimate)</th>
<th>FY 2023 (Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Grant Program for Senior Transportation Services</td>
<td>$1,517</td>
<td>$1,563</td>
<td>$1,619</td>
<td>$1,679</td>
<td>$1,740</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals may not add up due to rounding

---

1. The Transit System Services Improvements share is 16.5% of net available revenues. After deducting for ADA and Senior Services, the balance is available for operations and miscellaneous capital projects by the transit agencies.
2. Distribution between the two agencies is based on Jan. 2017 population
3. The funds are allocated via a Call for Projects process by SANDAG.

Other Notes:

A. The estimated revenues are based on growth rate in taxable sales as forecasted by SANDAG and excludes interest and prior year excess funds.
B. Distribution of revenue estimates are based on the 2004 Proposition A Extension: San Diego Transportation Improvement Program and Expenditure Plan.
### Federal Transit Administration Formula Programs

#### FY 2019 Apportionment and Estimates from FY 2020 - FY 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020 ($000s)</th>
<th>FY 2021 ($000s)</th>
<th>FY 2022 ($000s)</th>
<th>FY 2023 ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>$1,286,915</td>
<td>$45,961,962</td>
<td>$0 ($836,907)</td>
<td>$46,881 $0 ($854)</td>
<td>$46,881 $0 ($854)</td>
<td>$46,881 $0 ($854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$551,535</td>
<td>$19,697,984</td>
<td>($1,971,831) N/A</td>
<td>$20,092 ($555) N/A</td>
<td>$20,092 $0 N/A</td>
<td>$20,092 $0 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG (Vanpool Program)</td>
<td>$4,080,000</td>
<td>N/A $836,907</td>
<td>$4,162 N/A $854</td>
<td>$4,162 N/A $854</td>
<td>$4,162 N/A $854</td>
<td>$4,162 N/A $854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,838,450</td>
<td>$69,739,946</td>
<td>$0 $0 $0</td>
<td>$71,135 $0 $0</td>
<td>$71,135 $0 $0</td>
<td>$71,135 $0 $0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               |         |         |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| **Section 5337 State of Good Repair/ High Intensity** |         |         |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| MTS           | $242,499 | $27,678,398 | $0 N/A         | $28,232 $0 N/A | $28,232 $0 N/A | $28,232 $0 N/A |
| NCTD          | $99,603 | $11,368,434 | $0 N/A         | $11,596 $0 N/A | $11,596 $0 N/A | $11,596 $0 N/A |
| **Total**     | $342,102 | $39,046,832 | $0 N/A         | $39,828 $0 N/A | $39,828 $0 N/A | $39,828 $0 N/A |

|               |         |         |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| **Section 5339 Bus/Bus Facilities** |         |         |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| MTS           | $199,078 | $3,754,240 | $0 N/A         | $3,829 $0 N/A | $3,829 $0 N/A | $3,829 $0 N/A |
| NCTD          | $85,320 | $1,608,963 | $0 N/A         | $1,641 $0 N/A | $1,641 $0 N/A | $1,641 $0 N/A |
| **Total**     | $284,398 | $5,363,203 | $0 N/A         | $5,470 $0 N/A | $5,470 $0 N/A | $5,470 $0 N/A |

---

1. The Federal Register (FR) provides the FTA apportionment based on the Further Continuing and Security Assistance Appropriations Act. For FY 2019 the FR apportionment notification has not yet been published; therefore, the FY 2019 estimate is based on the actual apportionment received for FY 2018. The FAST Act increases the funding two percent per year through FY 2020 which is reflected in the outyear’s estimate except FY 2021 - FY 2023 which is outside of the last year of the FAST Act.

2. SANDAG and transit agencies have agreed to fully fund the rideshare portion of the regional Transportation Demand Management program in recognition of the vanpool program’s contribution to the funding level apportioned to the region. Prior year is reconciled with next year’s estimate based on consultation with the transit agencies.

3. Regional Capital Projects refer to projects and associated funding transferred to SANDAG to implement on behalf of MTS and NCTD based on the draft FY 2019 MTS/NCTD Capital budget. The specific projects and funding recommendation is scheduled to be presented to the Transportation Committee/Board of Directors as part of the FY 2019 Transit Capital Improvement Program at their respective meetings in March, and therefore is subject to change.

**Note:** SANDAG share is based on the estimated costs to operate the regional vanpool program and its estimated increase in future years. The balance of 5307 funds are allocated 70% to MTS and 30% to NCTD. The same 70/30 split applies to the 5337 and 5339 funds (SANDAG does not share in these programs).
Forecast Methodology for Transportation Development Act and TransNet Forecasts

Historically, SANDAG has used certain economic inputs derived from its Demographic and Economic Forecasting Model (DEFM) for its TransNet and Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenue forecasts; revenues for TransNet and TDA calculated by this method are used in the Plan of Finance, which details the project costs and funding available from every revenue source, of which TransNet and TDA are only a part. SANDAG is no longer using the DEFM model; the revenue forecasting methodology instead is in the process of being updated as part of the FY 2018 budgeted work effort. Therefore, a new forecasting methodology independent of DEFM has been developed for the revenue forecast included in this report.

The near-term portion of this forecast uses the California State Board of Equalization sales tax revenue allocation formula, as well as quarterly factors such as year-to-date sales tax collections, the forecast provided by SANDAG sales tax revenue consultant MuniServices, and the general economic conditions.

Beyond FY 2019, the TransNet and TDA revenue forecasts are based on the growth rate in taxable retail sales. The growth rate included here was arrived at using three variables: (1) the population forecast from the California Department of Finance; (2) a consensus of three independent national forecasts of real rates of growth in per-capita retail sales (nationally recognized forecasts by IHS Global Insight, Moody’s, and Woods & Poole); and (3) the consensus projected inflation rates from the same independent sources. These variables are used to calibrate the forecast and produce the long-term estimates.

It is extremely challenging to forecast sales tax based revenues over long periods of time as taxable retail sales are by nature volatile and are correlated with economic cycles. Since 1990, the region has experienced tax collection changes in rate of collection between -9.2 percent and +18.8 percent, with an average growth rate of 4.3 percent per year. Therefore, ranges of +/-5 percent are included in the TransNet revenue forecast, as shown in Attachment 2.

Expected Trends

The United States economy’s growth in 2017 picked up from 2016. The nation’s total value of goods and services produced, Gross Domestic Product, rose at an annual rate of 3.3 percent during the third quarter of 2017, following second quarter growth of 3.1 percent, and first quarter growth of 1.2 percent. The Federal Open Market Committee (Fed) increased their full-year growth estimate to 2.5 percent, a marked improvement from the 1.6 percent growth achieved in 2016, and allowing them to raise the key Federal Funds Rate to 1.5 percent at their December meeting.

The faster economic growth has been widespread, with surprisingly strong international gains and robust global trade and investment, according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Record stock prices, increased consumer confidence, lower unemployment, and slightly higher wages have materialized since the 2016 United States presidential election. The Fed is projecting a continued rate of 2.5 percent economic growth in 2018.

---

1 State law requires that SANDAG be within plus/minus 1.5 percent of the county-level population forecast released by the California Department of Finance.
Locally, the increase in jobs has outpaced the improved national rate. The San Diego region recorded 17,500 new jobs in the last 12 months, with the local unemployment rate falling to an exceptional low of 3.7 percent in October, below even the low national level of 4.1 percent. And while wage growth has been sluggish during the recovery, wages are starting to trend upwards, with 2.5 percent annual growth reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in December.

While the economy looks stronger than in recent years, volatility, as well as some potential structural changes, are affecting consumer spending habits. Locally, taxable retail sales over the last four quarters (September 2016 – September 2017) increased 3.8 percent, which is strong, but below the 4.2 percent California average. The trend away from brick-and-mortar retail to online, as well as spending shifts toward non-taxable items, have been a drag on local retail sales. However, in light of the decline in the unemployment rate, increase in labor force, and small uptick in wages since last year, taxable sales could be expected to remain steady as consumer confidence and economic status improve.

In summary, although the current growth in FY 2018 collections to date is at 3.2 percent, staff has applied a growth rate of 3 percent for FY 2019, which aligns with the “most-likely” revenue scenario from SANDAG consultant MuniServices.

Collection of TransNet Extension Ordinance revenues started in FY 2009. The table below shows actual and projected TransNet revenues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 (Actual)</td>
<td>$221.0M</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (Actual)</td>
<td>$204.2M</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 (Actual)</td>
<td>$221.3M</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (Actual)</td>
<td>$236.9M</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (Actual)</td>
<td>$247.2M</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (Actual)</td>
<td>$260.1M</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (Actual)</td>
<td>$268.8M</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (Actual)</td>
<td>$275.5M</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (Actual)</td>
<td>$284.5M</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (Estimate)</td>
<td>$292.1M</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 (Estimate)</td>
<td>$300.9M</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 (Estimate)</td>
<td>$311.7M</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 (Estimate)</td>
<td>$323.1M</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 (Estimate)</td>
<td>$335.0M</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Programs

Transportation Development Act

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) program is the major funding source that supports the region’s public transit operators and nonmotorized transportation projects like bicycle and pedestrian projects. TDA comes from a quarter of a percent of state sales tax assessed in the region. SANDAG, as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, is responsible for the allocation of the apportionment of TDA funds each year in conformance with state statute. The transit operators and other member agencies submit their annual TDA claims based on the annual apportionment and in compliance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 027: TDA Administration Policy.

Pursuant to state statute, the County of San Diego Auditor and Controller office has the responsibility for providing the TDA apportionment for the upcoming fiscal year. The County Auditor develops the apportionment in consultation with SANDAG staff and with the transit operators, based on actual sales tax receipts and projections. The annual apportionment determines the amount of funds available to each agency to claim. SANDAG is required to notify prospective claimants of the apportionment by March 1, necessitating action by the Board of Directors in February each year.

The legislative priorities established by state law include certain categories for which TDA funds are taken “off the top.” These include the allocation to SANDAG for various planning, programming, and administrative-related expenses, funding of bike and pedestrian facilities, and support of community transit services. In addition, the County Auditor receives an allocation based on estimates of its costs to administer the TDA program. The remaining apportionment, along with any prior year carryover funds, is available to be claimed by North County Transit District (NCTD) and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). The balance of current year funds is allocated based upon the population of the service area served by the two transit agencies.

Pursuant to provisions of Senate Bill 1703 (Peace, 2002) and as agreed to by MTS, NCTD, and SANDAG, regional transit capital projects are implemented by SANDAG with funding transferred from both MTS and NCTD. The transit agencies may choose to transfer a portion of their TDA share for purposes of matching federal formula funds for the capital projects to be implemented by SANDAG on behalf of MTS or NCTD. Transfers of federal funds and/or TDA as the match are based on the draft five-year transit Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The final list of projects and associated funding will be included with the transit CIP scheduled for Transportation Committee and Board of Directors action in March of each year. An additional apportionment to SANDAG covers those indirect administrative functions not directly funded by projects. The calculation for the cost of these administrative functions was memorialized in Addenda Nos. 3 and 4 to the Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD.

TransNet

The TransNet Extension, the 40-year half-cent sales tax transportation funding measure approved by the voters in 2004 became effective in FY 2009. TransNet provides funding for major transportation projects in the region. After deducting costs associated with administrative expenses, the operation of the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), and the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety program, the TransNet program is divided into Major Corridor (42.4%), New Bus Rapid Transit/Rail Operations (8.1%), Local System Improvements (33%), and Transit System Improvements (16.5%).
Within the Transit System Improvements, services provided pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) and subsidies for seniors have specific earmarks (2.5% and 3.25%, respectively). The remaining revenues can be used by the transit agencies for operating or miscellaneous capital purposes. Similar to TDA, the transit share between NCTD and MTS is allocated based upon the respective population of the two transit agencies’ service areas.

ITOC reviews the TransNet estimates for the entire program at its February meeting each year. Any significant comments would be presented to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors.

**Federal Transit Administration Formula Programs**

**Section 5307:** Federal Transit Administration 49 USC Section 5307 provides for transit capital and operating assistance in urbanized areas and for transportation-related planning. For areas with populations of 200,000 and more, such as San Diego County, the formula is based on a combination of bus/vanpool revenue vehicle miles, bus/vanpool passenger miles, fixed guideway revenue vehicle miles, and fixed guideway route miles, as well as population and population density. Eligible activities under this program include planning, engineering design, and an evaluation of transit projects and other technical transportation-related studies; capital investments in bus and bus-related activities; construction of maintenance and passenger facilities; and capital investments in new and existing fixed guideway systems, including rolling stock, overhaul and rebuilding of vehicles, track, signals, communications, and computer hardware and software. Preventive maintenance and some ADA complementary paratransit service, while recorded as operating expenditures, are considered capital costs for purposes of eligibility.

The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act includes a provision that requires the transit agencies to maintain equipment and facilities in accordance with the transit asset management plan and that transit agencies are no longer required to expend one percent for associated transit improvements. These requirements did not substantively impact how SANDAG or the transit agencies use this program.

**Section 5337:** This State of Good Repair (SGR) program provides funding to transit agencies that operate rail fixed-guideway and high-intensity motorbus systems for the maintenance, replacement, and rehabilitation of capital assets, along with the development and implementation of transit asset management plans. This program reflects a commitment to ensuring that public transit operates safely, efficiently, reliably, and sustainably so that communities can offer balanced transportation choices that help to improve mobility, reduce congestion, and encourage economic development. Eligible activities include projects that maintain, rehabilitate and replace capital assets as well as projects that implement transit asset management plans. The FAST Act clarified that high-intensity motorbus tier funds can only be used for vehicle SGR costs and not for roadway SGR repair costs.

**Section 5339:** The FAST Act provides both formula and discretionary program for this section as developed under Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act. There is also a sub-program that provides competitive grants for Bus and Bus Facility projects that support Low and Zero-Emission vehicles. The purpose of both formula and competitive programs is to provide capital funding to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities.
As stated above, the Section 5307 program is based on number of factors including data from the vanpool program. Over the years, the regional vanpool program has contributed substantially to the overall funding that comes to the region. In recognition of its contribution, the transit agencies have agreed to update the funding level to fully fund the regional vanpool program from the total apportionment based on prior year actual expenditure. After deducting for the cost of the vanpool program, Section 5307 funds are allocated 70 percent for MTS and 30 percent for NCTD. The same 70/30 formula was used to allocate the Sections 5337 and 5339 between MTS and NCTD. SANDAG does not directly receive funds from either Section 5337 or Section 5339.

**State Transit Assistance**

Since its creation in 1971, the State Transit Assistance (STA) program has been an ongoing source of state funding for capital and operating support for public transit agencies. STA is fully funded by the sales tax on diesel, and can be used for operating and capital purposes. Assembly Bill 1113 (AB 1113) (Bloom, 2017), revised provisions governing the STA program and defines STA-eligible operators eligible to receive allocations under the program. The San Diego region is split between SANDAG and MTS with the SANDAG funds claimed on behalf of NCTD. Funds are allocated based upon the respective population of the two transit agencies’ service areas.

Current statute requires transit agencies to meet certain criteria related to operating efficiencies in order to use the STA funds for operations. Senate Bill 508 (2015) revised this requirement wherein if a transit agency failed to meet the operating criteria, the allocation would be reduced by the same percentage in which the efficiency standards were not met. SB 508 further reduced the criteria burden by excluding number of cost factors such as pension and health coverage.

Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) (Chapter 5, Statues of 2017), signed by the Governor on April 28, 2017, augmented STA funding and created the SGR program within the STA Account. The SGR program provides additional revenues for transit infrastructure repair and service improvements. These funds are to be made available for eligible transit maintenance, rehabilitation and capital projects consistent with objectives of SB 1.
HOWARD AVENUE SEGMENT OF THE HOWARD – ORANGE BIKEWAY:
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT EXEMPTION

Transportation Committee Item 4 | February 16, 2018

POLICY SUPPORT

• Regional Bike Plan and Bike EAP

• City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan

• Climate Action Plan and Vision Zero
HOWARD AVENUE SEGMENT

• City of San Diego, North Park community, from Park Boulevard to Interstate 805

PROJECT GOALS

• Enhance neighborhood connectivity
• Make streets safer for all
• Promote active and healthy communities
• Help implement 2016 North Park Community Plan
HOWARD AVENUE SEGMENT IMPROVEMENTS

BEND-OUT

PUBLIC OUTREACH

NORTH PARK | MID-CITY BIKEWAYS

- Eight community workshops
- More than 100 presentations to stakeholder and planning groups
- 37 agency coordination meetings

HOWARD-ORANGE BIKEWAY

- July 27, 2017 open house and public hearing
CEQA COMPLIANCE

• Covered by three CEQA exemptions
  – Two Categorical Exemptions
    • Class 1. Existing Facilities
    • Class 4. Minor Alterations to Land
  – One Statutory Exemption
    • Restriping for Bicycle Lanes in Urbanized Areas

CATEGORICAL EXEMPTIONS

• Class 1 and Class 4 cover alterations to existing city streets, curbs, intersections, and related facilities, and creation of bike lanes on existing rights-of-way
  – Painted bike lanes, neighborhood traffic circles, raised crosswalks, curb bend-outs, and other painted markings
• Project has negligible or no expansion of existing uses (Class 1)
• Project does not trigger any exceptions to use of categorical exemption (Class 4)
CEQA

STATUTORY EXEMPTION

• The “Restriping for Bicycle Lanes in Urbanized Areas” statutory exemption covers re-striping for bike lanes consistent with the City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan

• Staff completed actions required to use the exemption:
  – Published a Traffic and Safety Impact Assessment on July 12, 2017
  – Held a noticed public hearing to accept public comments on July 27, 2017
  – Prepared written responses to public comments

CEQA

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

• 39 individuals/organizations provided comments
• A majority of comments expressed support for the project
• Attachment 4 includes written “master responses” to common themes
  1. On-Street Parking
  2. Project Features
  3. Proposed Project Design in City Heights
**NEXT STEPS**

- Pending approval of the CEQA exemption, staff would move forward with final design
- Schedule
  - Ready to advertise in November 2019
  - Construction to begin in March 2020
  - Open to public in March 2021

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the California Environmental Quality Act exemption for the Howard Avenue Segment of the Howard – Orange Bikeway Project (Attachment 1).
Proposed FY 2018 Program Budget Amendment: I-15 Managed Lanes Dynamic Signage Improvement Project

Transportation Committee Item 6 | February 16, 2018

I-15 Express Lanes Electronic Dynamic Signs

Existing Sign

New Sign to be Installed
Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve an amendment to the FY 2018 Program Budget, adding $118,000 in Interstate 15 (I-15) Toll Reserves to the I-15 Managed Lanes Dynamic Signage Improvement project (Capital Improvement Program Project No. 1400302), for additional construction administration support, in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 1.
$350M Transit Related Revenues

FY 2019 Available Revenues

- $114M (33% Local, 56% State, 11% Federal)
- $196M
- $40M

FY 2019 Revenue Distribution

- $235M
- $20M (MTS)
- $94M (NCTD)
- $6M (Other)
- $114M (Local)
- $40M (State)
- $114M (Federal)
Growth in *TransNet* Revenues

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the FY 2019 – FY 2023 Transportation Development Act, *TransNet*, and Federal Transit Administration estimates and apportionments.