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Agenda Highlights

• First Reading of Proposed Amendments to The Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and TransNet Ordinance
• Annual Review and Proposed Amendments to Board Policies and Bylaws
• Data Science and Big Data

Please silence all electronic devices during the meeting

You can listen to the Board of Directors meeting by visiting our website at sandag.org

Message from the Clerk

In compliance with Government Code §54952.3, the Clerk hereby announces that the compensation for legislative body members attending the following simultaneous or serial meetings is: Executive Committee (EC) $100, Board of Directors (BOD) $150, and Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) $100. Compensation rates for the EC and BOD are set pursuant to the SANDAG Bylaws, and the compensation rate for the RTC is set pursuant to state law.

Mission Statement

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

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Please complete a Request to Comment form located in the lobby. Members of the public may address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Board may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Both agenda and non-agenda comments should be sent to the Clerk of the Board via clerk@sandag.org. Please include the meeting date, agenda item, your name, and your organization. Any comments, handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the meeting should be received by the Clerk no later than 5 p.m. two working days prior to the meeting. All public comments and materials received by the deadline become part of the official public record and will be provided to the members for their review at the 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 sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for email notifications at sandag.org/subscribe.

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.
Board of Directors
January 25, 2019

Item No. | Recommendation
--- | ---
+1. | Approval of Meeting Minutes
+1A. Board of Directors Policy Meeting Minutes – December 7, 2018
+1B. Board of Directors Business Meeting Minutes – December 21, 2018

2. Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments

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

3. Executive Director’s Report (Hasan Ikhrata)

The Executive Director will provide an update on key programs, projects, and agency initiatives.

Consent

+4. Policy Advisory Committee Actions (Victoria Stackwick)

The Board of Directors is asked to ratify the delegated actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committees.

+5. 2019 Performance Management Rule 1 Safety Target Setting (Rachel Kennedy)

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve supporting the 2019 statewide safety targets established by Caltrans, in accordance with the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act.

+6. Regional Monitoring Report (Seth Litchney)

The Board of Directors is asked to accept the Regional Monitoring Report.

+7 Executive Director Delegated Actions (André Douzdjian)*

In accordance with various SANDAG Board Policies, this report summarizes delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board Business meeting.
8. **Meetings and Events Attended on Behalf of SANDAG**  
*(Victoria Stackwick)*

Board members will provide brief verbal reports on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board Business meeting.

### Reports

**+9. First Reading of Proposed Amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and TransNet Ordinance** *(Mayor Jim Desmond, Transportation Committee Chair; Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer, Metropolitan Transit District; Matt Tucker, Executive Director, North County Transit District; Brian Lane)*

The Board of Directors is asked to:

1. conduct the first reading of amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance, by reading the title and waiving full recitation of the ordinance for this and all future readings; and
2. acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), conduct the first reading of RTC Ordinance No. CO-19-01, related to fare changes, by reading the title and waiving full recitation of the ordinance for this and all future readings.

**+10. Annual Review and Proposed Amendments to Board Policies and Bylaws** *(Mayor Serge Dedina; John Kirk)*

The Executive Committee recommends that the Board of Directors:

1. approve the proposed amendments to the SANDAG Bylaws and Board Policies; and
2. renew its annual delegation of authority to the Executive Director pursuant to Board Policy No. 003: Investment Policy, and approval of Board Policy No. 032: San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission Interest Rate Swap Policy.

**+11. Proposed FY 2019 Program Budget Amendment: Airport Development Planning** *(Coleen Clementson)*

The Board of Directors is asked to approve an amendment to the FY 2019 Program Budget, allocating $1 million in Contingency Reserve funds and $152,000 in Transportation Development Act funds to Overall Work Program Element No. 3101500: Airport Development Planning for consulting services and staffing.

**+12. Data Science and Big Data** *(Ray Major)*

Staff will provide an overview of a regional data initiative proposed to be included in the FY 2020 Program Budget.
13. **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.

14. **Upcoming Meetings**

The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 8, 2019, at 10 a.m. The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 22, 2019, at 9 a.m.

15. **Adjournment**

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

* next to an agenda item indicates that the Board of Directors also is acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission for that item
December 7, 2018 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Steve Vaus (Poway) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 10 a.m.

1. Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments

Vice Chair Vaus welcomed Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director. Mr. Ikhrata expressed his appreciation for SANDAG Board leadership and stated he is looking forward to working with them and SANDAG staff.

Vice Chair Vaus stated that three SANDAG project teams won Circulate San Diego Momentum Awards in October. The State Route 15 (SR-15) Mid-City Centerline Rapid Transit Stations won an innovation award for building the region’s first freeway level transit stations. The SR-15 Commuter Bikeway also won the innovation award; the Bikeway connects Mid-City with Mission Valley. Finally, the South Bay Rapid Project won Circulate San Diego’s Connectivity Project Award.

Chair’s Report

2. Connectivity to San Diego County International Airport (Approve)

The Board of Directors was asked to approve the creation of a subcommittee to identify future transportation solutions for improved connectivity to the San Diego County International Airport.

Matt Harris, San Diego County Airport Authority, spoke in support of this item.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Minto, and a second by Councilmember Alessio, the Board of Directors approved the creation of a subcommittee to identify future transportation solutions for improved connectivity to the San Diego County International Airport. Yes: Vice Chair Vaus, Mayor Matt Hall (Carlsbad), Mayor Mary Salas (Chula Vista), Mayor Richard Bailey (Coronado), Councilmember Steve Goble (El Cajon), Mayor Catherine Blakespear (Encinitas), Mayor Sam Abed (Escondido), Mayor Serge Dedina (Imperial Beach), Councilmember Kristine Alessio (La Mesa), Mayor Raquel Vasquez (Lemon Grove), Mayor Ron Morrison (National City), Councilmember Jack Feller (Oceanside), Councilmember Lorie Zapf (City of San Diego), Mayor Jim Desmond (San Marcos), Mayor John Minto (Santee), Mayor David Zito (Solana Beach), Mayor Judy Ritter (Vista), and Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego). No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Del Mar.

Reports

3. Plan of Excellence (Information)

Cindy Burke, Applied Research Division Director; Melissa Coffelt, Human Resources Manager; David Hicks, Communications Director; John Kirk, General Counsel; and José Nuncio, TransNet Department Director, presented an update on the implementation of the Plan of Excellence.

Action: This item was presented for information.

Vice Chair Vaus adjourned to closed session at 10 a.m.
4. Closed Session: Conference with Legal Counsel Regarding Potential Initiation of Litigation Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(4) (One Potential Case)

The Board of Directors was briefed on the potential initiation of a test claim proceeding with the California Commission on State Mandates regarding unfunded agency costs imposed by the implementation of Assembly Bill 805 (Gonzalez, 2018) (AB 805).

Vice Chair Vaus reconvened open session at 11:02 a.m.

Mr. Kirk reported the noted action and vote.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Desmond, and a second by Mayor Blakespear, the Board of Directors directed General Counsel to not pursue the initiation of litigation related to the reimbursement of unfunded mandate claims related to AB 805. Yes: Vice Chair Vaus, Mayor Hall, Mayor Salas, Mayor Blakespear, Mayor Abed, Mayor Dedina, Councilmember Alessio, Mayor Vasquez, Mayor Morrison, Councilmember Feller, Councilmember Zapf, Mayor Desmond, Mayor Minto, Mayor Zito, Mayor Ritter, and Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego). No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Coronado, Del Mar, and El Cajon.

5. Continued Public Comments

There were no continued public comments.

6. Upcoming Meetings

The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 21, 2018, at 9 a.m. Please note, this meeting is scheduled for the third Friday of the month due to the holiday schedule.

7. Adjournment

Vice Chair Vaus adjourned the meeting at 11:03 a.m.
## Confirmed Attendance at SANDAG Board of Directors Meeting

December 7, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Attended Open Session</th>
<th>Attended Closed Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Mary Salas (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Richard Bailey (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Terry Sinnott, Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Steve Goble (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Catherine Blakespear (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Serge Dedina (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Kristine Alessio (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Racquel Vasquez (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller (2nd. Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Steve Vaus (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Lorie Zapf (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Myrtle Cole (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jim Desmond (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>John Minto (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>David Zito (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Bill Horn (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Ron Roberts (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Cory Binns (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>Mona Rios (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>Rebecca Jones (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Sup. John Renison (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Defense</td>
<td>Joe Stuyvesant (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of San Diego</td>
<td>Garry Bonelli (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Mark Muir (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Marcela Celorio (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Cody Martinez (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 21, 2018, Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Steve Vaus (Poway) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:02 a.m.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approve)

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Kristine Alessio (La Mesa), and a second by Mayor John Minto (Santee), the Board of Directors approved the minutes from its November 16, 2018, Board Business meeting. Yes: Vice Chair Vaus, Mayor Matt Hall (Carlsbad), Mayor Mary Salas (Chula Vista), Mayor Richard Bailey (Coronado), Mayor Bill Wells (El Cajon), Mayor Paul McNamara (Escondido), Councilmember Mark West (Imperial Beach), Councilmember Alessio, Mayor Racquel Vasquez (Lemon Grove), Mayor Alejandra Sotelo-Solis (National City), Mayor Kevin Faulconer (City of San Diego), Mayor Rebecca Jones (San Marcos), Mayor Minto, Mayor David Zito (Solana Beach), Mayor Judy Ritter (Vista), and Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego). No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Encinitas and Oceanside.

2. Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments

Martha Welch, a member of the public, spoke about various regional issues.

Katheryn Rhodes, a member of the public, spoke about various seismic and fault line concerns.

Mayor Wells provided an update on the Independent Performance Auditor Recruitment.

Vice Chair Vaus welcomed new primary Board members.

3. Executive Director’s Report

Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director, provided an update on key programs, projects, and agency initiatives.

Consent

4. Actions from Policy Advisory Committees, Including California Environmental Quality Act Exemption (Approve)

The Board of Directors was asked to ratify the actions of the Policy Advisory Committees, including a California Environmental Quality Act exemption for the Border to Bayshore Bikeway project.

5. Approval of Professional Services Solicitation (Approve)

The Board of Directors was asked to authorize the Executive Director to conduct a solicitation for iCommute services.

6. FY 2018 Transportation Development Act Audit Extension Requests (Approve)

The Board of Directors was asked to approve Transportation Development Act audit extension requests for the cities of Chula Vista, Coronado, La Mesa, National City, and Solana Beach until March 27, 2019, as permitted by the California Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations.
7. Executive Director Delegated Actions (Information)

In accordance with various SANDAG Board Policies, this report summarized delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board Business meeting.

8. Meetings and Events Attended on Behalf of SANDAG (Information)

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

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Minto, and a second by Supervisor Horn, the Board of Directors approved Consent Item Nos. 4 through 8. Yes: Vice Chair Vaus, Mayor Hall, Mayor Salas, Mayor Bailey, Mayor Wells, Mayor McNamara, Councilmember West, Councilmember Alessio, Mayor Vasquez, Mayor Sotelo-Solis, Mayor Faulconer, Mayor Jones, Mayor Minto, Mayor Zito, Mayor Ritter, and Supervisor Horn. No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Encinitas and Oceanside.

Chair’s Reports

9. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee (Approve)

Vice Chair Vaus presented the item.

Ms. Welch spoke in support of the item.

Ms. Rhodes spoke about concerns related to affordable housing.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Sotelo-Solis, and a second by Mayor Wells, the Board of Directors approved the membership list and charter for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee.

Yes: Vice Chair Vaus, Mayor Hall, Mayor Salas, Mayor Bailey, Mayor Wells, Mayor McNamara, Councilmember West, Councilmember Alessio, Mayor Vasquez, Mayor Sotelo-Solis, Mayor Faulconer, Mayor Jones, Mayor Minto, Mayor Zito, Mayor Ritter, and Supervisor Horn. No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Encinitas and Oceanside.

10. Airport Connectivity Subcommittee (Approve)

Vice Chair Vaus presented the item.

Gretchen Newsom, IBEW 569, spoke in support of the item.

Ms. Rhodes spoke about concerns related to funding solutions excluded from the draft charter.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Faulconer, and a second by Mayor Minto, the Board of Directors approved: (1) the membership list and charter for the Airport Connectivity Subcommittee; and (2) the use of up to $1 million from the Contingency Reserve for Subcommittee-related expenses. Yes: Vice Chair Vaus, Mayor Hall, Mayor Salas, Mayor Bailey, Mayor Wells, Mayor Catherine Blakespear (Encinitas), Mayor McNamara, Councilmember West, Councilmember Alessio, Mayor Vasquez, Mayor Sotelo-Solis, Mayor Faulconer, Mayor Jones, Mayor Minto, Mayor Zito, Mayor Ritter, and Supervisor Horn. No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Oceanside.

Reports


Chris Kluth, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item.

Councilmember Chris Ward (City of San Diego) spoke in support of the item.

Benjamin Nicholls, Hillcrest Business Association, spoke in support of the item.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Faulconer, and a second by Council President Georgette Gomez (City of San Diego), the Board of Directors approved an amendment to the FY 2019 Program Budget, accepting $2.2 million from the City of San Diego to fund the design and construction of the Normal Street Promenade.
as part of the Eastern Hillcrest Bikeways (Capital Improvement Program Project No. 1223083).
Yes: Vice Chair Vaus, Mayor Hall, Mayor Salas, Mayor Bailey, Mayor Wells, Mayor Blakespear, Mayor McNamara, Councilmember West, Councilmember Alessio, Mayor Vasquez, Mayor Sotelo-Solis, Mayor Faulconer, Mayor Jones, Mayor Minto, Mayor Zito, Mayor Ritter, and Supervisor Horn. No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Oceanside.

12. SANDAG Regional Electric Vehicle Charging Program (Information)
Susan Freedman, Senior Regional Planner, presented an update on development of the SANDAG Regional Electric Vehicle Charging Program.
Ms. Newsom spoke in support of the item.
Action: This item was presented for information.

13. Continued Public Comments
Vice Chair Vaus recognized Supervisor Horn and Supervisor Ron Roberts for their years of service.

14. Upcoming Meetings
The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 11, 2019, at 10 a.m. The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 25, 2019, at 9 a.m.

15. Adjournment
Vice Chair Vaus adjourned the meeting at 10:18 a.m.
### Confirmed Attendance at SANDAG Board of Directors Meeting

**December 21, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Attended Open Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Mary Salas (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Richard Bailey (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Ellie Haviland (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Bill Wells (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Catherine Blakespear (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Paul McNamara (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Serge Dedina (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Kristine Alessio (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Racquel Vasquez (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Alejandra Sotelo-Solis (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jerry Kern (1st. Alt.)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Steve Vaus (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Kevin Faulconer (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Georgette Gomez (2nd Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Rebecca Jones (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>John Minto (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>David Zito (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Bill Horn (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Ron Roberts (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Cory Binns (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>Mona Rios (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>Jewel Edson (2nd Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Sup. John Renison (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Defense</td>
<td>Joe Stuyvesant (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of San Diego</td>
<td>Garry Bonelli (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Marcela Celorio (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Cody Martinez (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Advisory Committee Actions

Overview
Board Policy No. 001: Allocation of Responsibilities, delegates certain responsibilities to the Policy Advisory Committees to allow SANDAG to effectively address key public policy and funding responsibilities. All items delegated to the Policy Advisory Committees are subject to Board ratification.

The Policy Advisory Committees took the following delegated actions since the last Board of Directors Business meeting.

Transportation Committee: January 4, 2019
No actions.

Executive Committee: January 11, 2019
Approved draft agendas for the January 25, 2019, Board Business meeting, and the February 8, 2019, Board Policy meeting, as amended.

Audit Committee: January 11, 2019
No actions.

Transportation Committee: January 18, 2019
Adopted Resolution No. 2019-11, approving Amendment No. 1 to the 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director
Key Staff Contact: Victoria Stackwick, (619) 699-6926, victoria.stackwick@sandag.org

Action Requested: Approve
The Board of Directors is asked to ratify the delegated actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committees.
2019 Performance Management Rule 1 Safety Target Setting

Overview

Since 2015, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has issued a number of Final Rules that establish performance requirements for states and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). Performance Management Rule 1 (PM 1) focuses on transportation safety on all public roads regardless of ownership or maintenance responsibility.

State departments of transportation are required to set PM 1 targets by August 31 of each year for the subsequent calendar year. MPOs have 180 days from that date to either establish regional targets or agree to support the state targets. For 2018, the Board of Directors elected to support the statewide targets and at its January 4, 2019, meeting, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors do the same for 2019.

Key Considerations

Caltrans developed its 2019 PM 1 statewide targets to include aspirational goals related to decreasing fatalities and serious injuries consistent with the 2015 Strategic Highway Safety Plan1.

San Diego County is approximately 8.4 percent of the state population; and approximately 8.4 percent of the crash fatalities-serious injuries in California occur in San Diego County (it is a little lower for some categories of incidents and slightly higher for others). This holds true for vehicle miles travelled (VMT) as well. Fatality and serious injury crash statistics for the SANDAG region also track closely with statewide trends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2018 Statewide Targets</th>
<th>2019 Statewide Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>3,590.8</td>
<td>3,445.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities (per 100 million VMT)</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>12,823.4</td>
<td>12,688.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100 million VMT)</td>
<td>3.831</td>
<td>3.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>4271.1</td>
<td>3,949.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overview of the source and calculation of each of the proposed targets is provided in Attachment 1.

Next Steps

1 The Strategic Highway Safety Plan is the principal statewide traffic safety planning document.
Pending Board action, staff will provide documentation of the Board’s action to Caltrans prior to the February 27, 2019, target setting deadline. Caltrans and SANDG will have the option to set new safety targets each year; staff will continue to collaborate with Caltrans and other MPO staff on future target setting efforts.

Programming efforts that support the targets are summarized in Appendix H of the 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program and progress toward the targets will be reported on as part of San Diego Forward: The 2019–2050 Regional Plan.

Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director
Key Staff Contact: Rachel Kennedy, (619) 699-1929, rachel.kennedy@sandag.org
Attachment: 1. Performance Management Rule 1: Performance Measure Methodology
### PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT RULE 1: PERFORMANCE MEASURE METHODOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>Five year rolling average</td>
<td>• Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles</td>
<td>Five year rolling average of annual fatality rate</td>
<td>• FARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>Five year rolling average</td>
<td>• Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT</td>
<td>Five year rolling average of annual serious injury rate</td>
<td>• SWITRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HPMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries</td>
<td>Five year rolling average of the annual sum of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries</td>
<td>• FARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SWITRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Monitoring Report

Overview

Chapter 5 of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (2015 Regional Plan) describes how SANDAG will use 23 performance indicators as a tool to track the region’s progress in meeting the goals and policy objectives of the 2015 Regional Plan. The 2018 Regional Monitoring Report provides data for each indicator to help gauge the region’s progress toward healthy environment and communities, innovative mobility planning, and a vibrant economy. Regional Monitoring reports are prepared every four years. The list of indicators is revised periodically as new plans are adopted to reflect indicators included in those plans.

The Draft Regional Plan Monitoring Report was released on December 7, 2018, for a 21-day public review period. The report was presented to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and the Independent Tax Payer Oversight Committee. No public comments or proposed revisions were received.

Key Considerations

The 2018 Regional Monitoring Report (sandag.org/2018MonitoringReport) follows a similar format to the 2012-2013 Biennial Performance Monitoring Report (sandag.org/2012-2013biennialperformance). It sets forth results for the most recent data (which in most cases is calendar year 2017) and describes the data relative to trends observed in previous years.

According to the 2018 Regional Monitoring Report, several indicators in the region appear to be moving in the right direction, and others need improvement.

Moving in the right direction:

- The region’s water supply has become more diverse and less dependent on imported water
- More housing units and jobs are located within Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
- Use of renewable energy continues to increase
- The regional poverty rate and crime rate continues to decrease
- Border wait times have decreased while border crossing volumes have increased
- Electric vehicle ownership has increased from 1,173 in 2011 to 20,284 in 2016

Areas for improvement:

- The annual income needed to afford fair market rent has steadily increased
- After several years of increases, transit ridership decreased in 2016 and 2017
- Air quality (smog) has not improved since 2013

Fiscal Impact:

Efforts to collect information for the Regional Monitoring Report were funded through Overall Work Program No. 3102000 in the FY 2019 Program Budget.

Schedule/Scope Impact:

The 2018 Regional Monitoring Report was available for 21-day public review, which concluded on December 28, 2018.

Action Requested: Accept

The Board of Directors is asked to accept the Regional Monitoring Report.

Item: 6

Board of Directors

January 25, 2019
Next Steps

Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director
Key Staff Contact: Seth Litchney, (619) 699-1943, seth.litchney@sandag.org
Executive Director Delegated Actions

Overview
Various Board Policies require the Executive Director to report certain actions to the Board of Directors on a monthly basis or upon taking specified actions.

Delegated Actions

**Investment Transactions**: Board Policy No. 003: Investment Policy, states that a monthly report of all investment transactions shall be submitted to the Board. Attachment 1 contains the reportable investment transactions for November 2018.

**Legal Matters**: Board Policy No. 008; Legal Matters, authorizes the Executive Director to take action on claims filed against SANDAG.

- On December 17, 2018, the Claim of State Farm Insurance was rejected by the Chief Deputy Executive Director. State Farm Insurance claimed unspecified damages for loss of income and property damage to its insured, located at 4907 Morena Boulevard, Suite 1413, San Diego, CA. The claim alleged that SANDAG construction, presumably related to the Mid-Coast Trolley Extension or Elvira to Morena Double Track project, had damaged water lines, causing damage to its insured’s property. Upon investigation of the Claim it was determined that no work had been done by SANDAG or its contractors on any water lines near the insured’s property near the date of the incident.

- On December 21, 2018, the Claim of Norma Estrada was rejected by the Chief Deputy Executive Director. Ms. Estrada claimed $9,234.33 in damages after her windshield was allegedly damaged by a rock kicked up by a street sweeper operated by Caltrans on the South Bay Expressway. Ms. Estrada’s claim was forwarded to Caltrans for its consideration.

- On December 21, 2018, the Claim of Bruno Colonna was rejected by the Chief Deputy Executive Director. Mr. Colonna claimed approximately $500 in damages after his vehicle allegedly struck a torn tire in the roadway of the South Bay Expressway. Upon investigation of the claim, it was determined that SANDAG was not liable for the alleged damages.

Board Policy No. 008 also authorizes the Office of General Counsel or outside counsel to file documents and make appearances on behalf of SANDAG in court proceedings.

- In the consolidated matter of Anna Avenue Associates, LLC, et al. v. SANDAG, et al., (Superior Court Case No. 2018-0000231), the following actions were taken by Best Best & Krieger on behalf of SANDAG:

---

**Highlights:**
Eight securities were purchased in November with various maturity dates, for a total of $34.1 million, and are expected to yield a return of 2.81 percent.

Nineteen securities reached maturity in November for a total of $47.3 million, and one security was sold at $3 million, providing approximately $50.3 million of liquidity to SANDAG.

Action Requested: Information
In accordance with various SANDAG Board Policies, this report summarizes delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board Business meeting.
o On or about December 10, 2018, filed a Motion for Legal Ruling related to storm water discharge and supporting documents

o On or about December 17, 2018, filed an Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause for Preliminary Injunction Against Anna Avenue Associates et al. and supporting documents, and appeared on December 19, 2018, at the hearing on the Ex Parte Application

o On December 28, 2018, filed a supplemental pleading for Preliminary Injunction

o On January 7, 2019, filed a Reply to Opposition to SANDAG’s Motion for Legal Ruling

o On January 8, 2019, filed a Reply to Opposition to SANDAG’s Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause for Preliminary Injunction

o On January 10, 2019, appeared at a hearing on SANDAG’s Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause for Preliminary Injunction Against Anna Avenue Associates et al.

- In the matter of SANDAG v. Costa Verde Hotel, LLC (Superior Court Case No. 2018-00030194), the following actions were taken by Nossaman on behalf of SANDAG:
  o On December 12, 2018, appeared at an Ex Parte Hearing regarding the Stipulation for Order for the Withdrawal of Funds
  o On December 17, 2018, filed a Proof of Service as to defendant Time Warner Entertainment – Advance/Newhouse Partnership dba Time Warner Cable LLC

- On December 31, 2018, Nossaman filed, on behalf of SANDAG, an Application for Entry of First Amended Interlocutory Judgment After Default Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 585(d), in the matter of SANDAG v. Colony La Paz Condominium Association (Superior Court Case No. 2016-00030407)

- On January 11, 2019, Bremer Whyte appeared on behalf of SANDAG at a Case Management Conference in the matter of Jessica Zhou v. The Regents of the University of California (Superior Court Case No. 2018-00022180)

**Budget Modifications:** Board Policy No. 017: Delegation of Authority authorizes the Executive Director to enter into agreements currently not incorporated in the budget, and to make other budget modifications in an amount up to $100,000 per transaction so long as the overall budget remains in balance. Attachment 2 contains the action for December 2018.

**Right-of-Way:** Board Policy No. 017 authorizes the Executive Director to execute all right-of-way property transfer documents, including rights of entry, licenses, leases, deeds, easements, escrow instructions, and certificates of acceptance. The list below reflects the approved document for this reporting period.

- Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project – Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Project No. 1257001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Nature of Activity (4.3)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5965 and 5975 Santa Fe Street, San Diego, CA; SANDAG lease to Associated Microbreweries LTD</td>
<td>Standard Industrial / Commercial Multi-Tenant Lease</td>
<td>12/13/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Just Compensation:** Board Policy No. 017 authorizes the Executive Director to establish an offer of just compensation for the purchase of real property based on specified conditions. Consistent with Board Policy, the following offer was made.

- Downtown Multiuse and Bus Stopover Facility Project – CIP Project No. 1201514

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Nature of Activity (4.4)</th>
<th>Appraisal Amount</th>
<th>Offer Date &amp; Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no street address), southwest corner of Union Street and A Street, San Diego, CA 92101; Stahlman Family Properties, LLC</td>
<td>Agreement of Purchase and Sale; Joint Escrow Instructions</td>
<td>$8,650,000</td>
<td>12/11/18, $8,650,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Relief:** Board Policy No. 024: Procurement and Contracting – Construction Policy, authorizes the Executive Director to grant relief from maintenance and responsibility for major construction projects (as permitted according to the contract) and requires all contract relief over $25,000 be reported to the Board.

In a letter dated December 20, 2018, Granite Construction Company was granted Relief from Maintenance and Responsibility for the State Route 15 Mid-City Bus Rapid Transit Project – Effective November 5, 2018 (CIP Project Nos. 1201507 and 1240001, Contract No. 5007000). The contract value was $38,330,752.53.

**Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director**

Key Staff Contact: André Douzdjian, (619) 699-6931, andre.douzdjian@sandag.org
Attachment: 1. November 2018 Investment Securities Transactions Activity
2. December 2018 Budget Transfers and Amendments
## MONTHLY ACTIVITY FOR INVESTMENT SECURITIES TRANSACTIONS FOR NOVEMBER 1 THROUGH NOVEMBER 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction Date</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Original Cost</th>
<th>Yield to Maturity at Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUGHT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09/2018</td>
<td>03/13/2020</td>
<td>AMERICAN HONDA</td>
<td>$2,400,000.00</td>
<td>$2,366,640.00</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2018</td>
<td>07/15/2020</td>
<td>USA TREASURY</td>
<td>3,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,935,791.30</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2018</td>
<td>02/28/2020</td>
<td>FANNIE MAE</td>
<td>5,600,000.00</td>
<td>5,511,408.00</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>04/01/2019</td>
<td>BANK OF AMERICA CORP</td>
<td>4,000,000.00</td>
<td>3,995,600.00</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>04/26/2019</td>
<td>INTL BK RECON &amp; DEVELOP</td>
<td>5,000,000.00</td>
<td>4,973,500.00</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>08/28/2019</td>
<td>FANNIE MAE</td>
<td>4,217,000.00</td>
<td>4,164,751.37</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>10/21/2019</td>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK</td>
<td>6,200,000.00</td>
<td>6,131,118.00</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>10/22/2019</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE &amp; CO</td>
<td>4,000,000.00</td>
<td>3,971,480.00</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BOUGHT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,417,000.00</td>
<td>$34,050,288.67</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATURED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2018</td>
<td>11/01/2018</td>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>$9,422.34</td>
<td>$9,516.56</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2018</td>
<td>11/01/2018</td>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>6,870.70</td>
<td>6,939.40</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2018</td>
<td>11/01/2018</td>
<td>FANNIE MAE</td>
<td>87,467.52</td>
<td>88,343.41</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/2018</td>
<td>11/03/2018</td>
<td>MICROSOFT CORP NOTES</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td>1,509,285.00</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2018</td>
<td>11/13/2018</td>
<td>CATERPILLAR FINL SERVICE</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,006,560.00</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>TOYOTA ABS</td>
<td>73,953.04</td>
<td>73,948.85</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>TOYOTA ABS</td>
<td>36,871.60</td>
<td>36,870.61</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>HYUNDAI ABS</td>
<td>45,432.25</td>
<td>45,423.44</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>NISSAN ABS</td>
<td>28,064.62</td>
<td>28,060.27</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>TOYOTA ABS</td>
<td>7,539.73</td>
<td>7,538.84</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>JOHN DEERE ABS</td>
<td>24,859.58</td>
<td>24,856.04</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>HYUNDAI ABS</td>
<td>74,451.16</td>
<td>74,441.14</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>ALLY ABS</td>
<td>50,918.05</td>
<td>50,913.60</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>ALLY ABS</td>
<td>49,916.42</td>
<td>49,910.53</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2018</td>
<td>11/19/2018</td>
<td>CANADIAN IMPERIAL HOLDING COMM PAPER</td>
<td>10,000,000.00</td>
<td>9,858,458.33</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/2018</td>
<td>11/21/2018</td>
<td>HONDA ABS</td>
<td>27,896.22</td>
<td>27,894.56</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/2018</td>
<td>11/27/2018</td>
<td>FANNIE MAE</td>
<td>5,500,000.00</td>
<td>5,576,230.00</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>USA TREASURY</td>
<td>23,500,000.00</td>
<td>23,451,347.66</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>CANADIAN IMPERIAL BANK NY CD</td>
<td>4,425,000.00</td>
<td>4,421,548.50</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MATURED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,448,663.23</td>
<td>$47,348,086.74</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/2018</td>
<td>07/15/2020</td>
<td>USA TREASURY</td>
<td>$3,000,000.00</td>
<td>$2,935,791.30</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SOLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000,000.00</td>
<td>$2,935,791.30</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Security was purchased in error and sold the next day resulting in a realized gain.
## December 2018 BUDGET TRANSFERS AND AMENDMENTS

in '000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>CURRENT BUDGET</th>
<th>NEW BUDGET</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7500000</td>
<td>Service Bureau - Main Project FY 2019</td>
<td>$99.7</td>
<td>$73.4</td>
<td>($26.3)</td>
<td>Transferred funds from the Main Service Bureau project (7500000) to establish a new project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7514900</td>
<td>Transportation Modeling: Kearny Mesa Community Plan Update</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$26.3</td>
<td>$26.3</td>
<td>New Service Bureau project for Transportation Modeling: Kearny Mesa Community Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301400</td>
<td>Regional Census Data Center Operations</td>
<td>$186.1</td>
<td>$231.1</td>
<td>$45.0</td>
<td>Accept new funding of $45K from CA Department of Finance for Census work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301400</td>
<td>Regional Census Data Center Operations</td>
<td>$231.1</td>
<td>$186.1</td>
<td>($45.0)</td>
<td>Transfer TDA funds to fund new efforts in 2300600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300600</td>
<td>Data Solutions and GIS for Research, Planning, and Project Delivery</td>
<td>$1,007.0</td>
<td>$1,052.0</td>
<td>$45.0</td>
<td>Add $45K of transferred TDA funds from 2301400 for crossborder freight data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3102003</td>
<td>2019 Regional Plan Sustainable Communities Strategy</td>
<td>$928.0</td>
<td>$975.5</td>
<td>$47.5</td>
<td>Add $42K of additional SB 1 Sustainable Communities grant funds, and transfer $5,500 of TDA from 3102000 Regional Plan for matching requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Reading of Proposed Amendments to the Regional Transit Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and TransNet Ordinance

Overview

SANDAG Board Policy No. 029: Regional Fare Policy and Comprehensive Fare Ordinance, provides guidelines for setting a uniform, fair, and equitable region-wide fare system within the County of San Diego for the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD). The Comprehensive Fare Ordinance includes the existing fare structure used by MTS and NCTD, with a detailed listing of the available fares, their prices, and their limitations.

Over the past two years, SANDAG has been working with MTS and NCTD to consider various ways to simplify the transit fare system and help fare revenues keep pace with rising operational costs while minimizing impacts to ridership.

In order to implement fare changes, SANDAG is required to amend the Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and TransNet Ordinance. Changes to the Fare Ordinance resulting in fare increases were last made in 2009.

Key Considerations

In December 2018, the MTS Board of Directors and NCTD Board of Directors recommended the fare changes outlined in Attachment 1, which include:

- Introduction of a combined Youth and Senior/Disabled/Medicare Regional Day Pass at $3
- Increasing the age limit from 60 to 65 years for the senior discount across all fare types
- Increased discounts to youth monthly passes (would equal a price reduction from $36 to $23 for Regional, $50 to $32 for Premium Regional, and $82.50 to $58 for COASTER)
- Decreased discounts to Senior/Disabled/Medicare monthly passes (would equal a price increase from $18 to $23 for Regional, $25 to $32 for Premium Regional, and $41.25 to $58 for COASTER)
- Changes to numerous MTS- and NCTD-specific one-way fares and monthly pass prices into simplified Regional Fares
- For improved simplification of the fare structure, removal of certain passes including the separate SPRINTER/BREEZE monthly pass, Trolley transfers, and multi-day passes

Fiscal Impact:
The recommended fare changes are estimated to result in an annual passenger revenue increase of approximately $7.6 million and would assist in maintaining high levels of service and help keep pace with rising operating costs to ensure that farebox recovery ratios are kept above legislated minimum levels.

Schedule/Scope Impact:
Any fare changes approved by the MTS, NCTD, and SANDAG Boards would be enacted no sooner than March 10, 2019.

Action Requested: Conduct First Readings
The Board of Directors is asked to:
1. conduct the first reading of amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance, by reading the title and waiving full recitation of the ordinance for this and all future readings; and
2. acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), conduct the first reading of RTC Ordinance No. CO-19-01, related to fare changes, by reading the title and waiving full recitation of the ordinance for this and all future readings.
The recommended changes require amendments to the Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and TransNet Ordinance, which are outlined in Attachments 2 and 3. The TransNet amendments are the result of the proposed changes to the senior age limit and the Senior/Disabled/Medicare monthly pass discount.

**Public Engagement and Feedback**

Six public open-house meetings and 17 pop-up events were conducted in October 2018 for input on the fare changes. Attachment 4 includes a full description of the public outreach conducted and a complete list of the comments received to date. In general, the Senior/Disabled/Medicare monthly pass holders and paratransit riders expressed concern with the increases, while youth and their families generally were pleased with the proposed discount. There was some understanding that it has been nearly ten years since fares were increased, so many of the increases were considered reasonable.

The Transportation Committee and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) reviewed the amendments in January 2019 and recommend that the Board of Directors approve them; however, the ITOC asked that NCTD revisit the transfer fee for paratransit.

In response to public comments, the originally proposed Senior/Disabled/Medicare monthly pass price increase was lowered from $26, to the currently proposed $23. Additionally, NCTD decreased the proposed paratransit fare for those riders that would have had an equivalent transfer on a fixed route. Instead of a potential $10 or $15 one-way fare, the fare will be capped at $5.

**Equity Analysis**

Pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, SANDAG is required to conduct a fare equity analysis to evaluate the effects of fare changes on low-income and minority populations. Attachment 5 includes the analysis of fare changes and shows that there are no disparate impacts to minority riders and no disproportionate burdens to low-income riders.

**California Environmental Quality Act Compliance**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to the “establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges by public agencies” that the public agency finds in writing are for specified purposes, including meeting operating expenses.

In order to establish a basis for this CEQA exemption, the Board of Directors will be asked at its February 8, 2019, meeting to make a finding that the fare ordinance modifications set forth in the proposed Ordinance amendment are calculated to provide MTS and NCTD the ability to revise fares for purposes of simplification of the regional fare structure, to clarify the fare rules for the region, and to increase revenue to bridge funding shortfalls and/or improve farebox recovery ratio levels mandated by state statute as set forth in Resolution No. 2019-12 (Attachment 6).

**Next Steps**

Pending final approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors, the fare changes would be enacted on March 10, 2019.

*Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director*

Key Staff Contact: Brian Lane, (619) 699-7331, brian.lane@sandag.org

Attachments: 1. Overview of Proposed Fare Changes  
2. Proposed Changes to the Comprehensive Fare Ordinance  
3. Proposed Amendments to the TransNet Extension Ordinance  
4. Public Engagement and Feedback  
5. Title VI Fare Equity Analysis  
6. CEQA Resolution No. 2019-12
Overview of Proposed Fare Changes

Single Ride

- MTS Bus
  - Adult and Youth would increase from $2.25 to $2.50
  - Senior/Disabled/Medicare would increase from $1.10 to $1.25

- MTS Rural
  - Adult and Youth Rural two-zone currently ($5-$10), would blend to an $8 flat fare
  - Senior/Disabled/Medicare two-zone currently ($2.50-$5), would blend to a $4 flat fare

- NCTD BREEZE
  - Would increase from $1.75 to $2.50 for Adult/Youth, and from $0.75 to $1.25 for Senior/Disabled/Medicare, in parallel with MTS

- NCTD SPRINTER
  - Would increase from $2.00 to $2.50 for Adult/Youth, and from $1.00 to $1.25 for Senior/Disabled/Medicare, in parallel with MTS

- NCTD COASTER
  - Zone 1 would increase for Adult from $4 to $5, Senior/Disabled/Medicare would increase from $2 to $2.50, Youth would decrease from $4 to $2.50
  - Zone 2 would increase for Adult from $5 to $5.75, Senior/Disabled/Medicare would increase from $2.50 to $2.75, Youth would decrease from $5 to $2.75
  - Zone 3 would increase for Adult from $5.50 to $6.50, Senior/Disabled/Medicare would increase from $2.75 to $3.25, Youth would decrease from $5.50 to $3.25

- MTS Access
  - Would increase from $4.50 to $5

- NCTD LIFT
  - Would increase from $3.50 to $5

Day and Monthly Passes

- Regional 1-Day Pass (Modes: MTS Bus, Trolley, Rapid, NCTD BREEZE, NCTD SPRINTER)
  - Adult 1-Day Pass would increase from $5 to $6
  - NEW: Introduction of Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth 1-Day Pass at $3

- Regional 30-Day/Monthly Pass (Modes: MTS Bus, Trolley, Rapid, NCTD BREEZE, NCTD SPRINTER)
  - Adult would remain at $72
  - Senior/Disabled/Medicare would increase from $18 to $23
  - Youth would decrease from $36 to $23
• Premium Regional 1-Day Pass (Includes Regional Pass Modes, MTS Rapid Express, and NCTD FLEX, except FLEX 372)
  o Adult 1-Day would remain at $12 (but now exclude COASTER)
  o **NEW: Introduction of Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Premium Regional 1-Day Pass at $6**

• Premium Regional 30-Day/Monthly Pass (Includes Regional Pass Modes, MTS Rapid Express, MTS Rural, and NCTD FLEX, except FLEX 372)
  o Adult would remain at $100
  o Senior/Disabled/Medicare would increase from $25 to $32
  o Youth would decrease from $50 to $32
  o **NEW: MTS Rural service added to this pass**

• NCTD COASTER Regional 1-Day Pass (Includes Regional and Premium Regional Pass Modes + all COASTER zones)
  o **NEW: Introduction of Adult 1-Day Pass at $15**
  o **NEW: Introduction of Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth 1-Day Pass at $7.50**

• NCTD COASTER Regional 30-Day/Monthly Pass (Includes Regional and Premium Regional Pass Modes + all COASTER zones)
  o Adult 1 Zone would increase from $120 to $140
  o Adult 2 Zone would increase from $150 to $161
  o Adult 3 Zone would increase from $165 to $182
  o Senior/Disabled/Medicare would increase from $41.25 to $58
  o Youth would decrease from $82.50 to $58

**Simplification**

• Elimination of 2, 3, 4, and 14-day passes
• Elimination of Trolley-to-Trolley one-way cash transfers to align with bus policy
• Elimination of $2.25 SPRINTER/BREEZE Senior/Disabled/Medicare 1-Day Pass (Will now be $3 to include service on the MTS bus and Trolley)
• Elimination of $59 SPRINTER/BREEZE 30-Day/Monthly Pass (Will now be $72 to include service on the MTS bus and Trolley)

**Other Policy Changes**

• Increasing the minimum age for senior discounts from 60 to 65 years (seniors 60 or older prior to the effective date will remain eligible for reduced fares)
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE

An Ordinance Establishing a Regional
Fare Pricing Schedule and Revenue Allocation Formula

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) ordains as follows:

SECTION 1: FINDINGS

This Ordinance is adopted to implement a Comprehensive Fare Ordinance setting forth a fare structure for all public transit service providers in San Diego County.

SECTION 2: REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE DEFINITIONS

2.1 ACCESS: the complementary Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) service operated by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) in Zone 1.

2.2 ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act, as defined in Title 49, Part 37, of the United States Code.

2.3 ADA Complementary Paratransit Service: Specialized origin-to-destination transportation services provided to persons who qualify as eligible for such services under the guidelines of the ADA.

2.4 BREEZE: North County Transit District (NCTD) fixed-route bus service brand name.

2.5 Bus: Rubber-tired transit vehicles operated by MTS and NCTD.

2.6 Cash Fare: Term used to describe fares purchased with United States currency.

2.7 Child: Any person five years of age or under.

2.8 COASTER: The brand name of the commuter rail service operated by NCTD in the coastal corridor from Oceanside to San Diego.

2.9 College Student: Any person currently enrolled as a student in a participating accredited San Diego area post-secondary school with a valid picture identification issued by the school.

2.10 Companion: In relation to the ADA complementary paratransit service, a companion is someone who accompanies an ADA passenger on board a paratransit vehicle, but is not a personal care attendant as specified in the passenger’s ADA certification application.

2.11 Compass Card: The Compass Card is an electronic fare medium based on contactless smart card technology. The Compass Card may hold either transit products or cash for use on regional transit services. Transit products may include but are not limited to Monthly Passes, post-secondary passes, single-day and multi-day passes, and stored value.
The Compass Card utilizes wireless technology to interface with validator devices on buses, rail platforms, and Ticket Vending Machines (TVMs). Passengers must tap their Compass Card on a validator in order to utilize transportation services.

2.12 Compass Cash: The marketing name for the Stored Value product.

2.13 Compass Cloud: Marketing name for Mobile Ticketing application to purchase select fare types.

2.14 Day Pass: a fare medium that allows a passenger to ride one Service Day.

2.15 Discount: A reduction in the price of a fare or fare product as a result of the passenger holding a special identification card or an existing fare product.

FLEX: The brand name of the on-demand, deviated fixed-route, and point-deviated fixed-route service operated by NCTD.

2.16 LIFT: The complementary ADA service operated by NCTD.

2.17 Limited Use Compass Card: A Compass Card printed on a disposable material. Limited Use Compass Cards have a limited lifetime and may not accept all fare products available for loading onto a plastic Compass Card.

2.18 Medicare Recipient: Any person to whom the federal government has issued a Medicare identification card, regardless of age.

2.19 Metrolink: The Commuter rail service operated by the Southern California Regional Rail Authority.

2.20 Mobile Ticketing: A mobile phone application allowing for the purchase of many of the fares available.

2.21 Monthly Pass: This term refers to either the Calendar Month Pass or the 30-Day Pass.

2.22 MTS: The San Diego Metropolitan Transit System which operates services in all areas of San Diego County outside the jurisdiction of NCTD. MTS operates MTS Bus, Rural Bus, MTS Express, MTS Rapid, MTS Rapid Express, MTS Trolley service, and ADA Access Service.

2.23 MTS Suburban Paratransit: The complementary ADA service operated by MTS in suburban areas (ADA Zones 2, 3, and 4).

2.24 NCTD: North County Transit District operating services in Northern San Diego County. NCTD services include the BREEZE, COASTER, SPRINTER, and LIFT.

2.25 OCTA: Orange County Transportation Authority.

2.26 Person with Disability: Any person with a permanent or temporary mental or physical disability as defined by the ADA (Title 49, Part 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations). In order to qualify for a disabled fare a passenger for regular (non-ADA paratransit) transit must be in
possession of a transit identification card or a valid Compass Card with a picture identifying the person as a person with a qualifying disability a Medicare card or DMV placard ID receipt. In order to qualify for ADA paratransit service the person with a disability must be ADA certified.

2.242.26 **Personal Care Attendant:** In relation to the ADA complementary paratransit service, a personal care attendant is a person who is designated by the ADA eligible passenger to aid in their mobility who is not charged a fare to ride on the ADA complementary paratransit vehicle when accompanying the ADA-eligible passenger. The person may be a friend, family member, or paid employee. The need for and use of a personal care attendant must be indicated at the time of eligibility certification.

2.252.27 **Platform Validator:** A validator located in a standalone device on a rail platform. Platform validators must be tapped before boarding a rail vehicle unless a new Compass Card product is loaded and validated at a TVM.

2.262.28 **Rapid:** MTS brand name for a premium rapid transit service operated wholly or partly on exclusive bus lanes, guideways, Managed Lanes, or use of other transit priority measures. Depending on specific route characteristics, individual Rapid routes may be classified as MTS Rapid or MTS Rapid Express for purposes of Table 2.

2.272.29 **Regional Fare System:** The Regional Fare System is governed by SANDAG Board Policy No. 018: Transit Service Policies, Board Policy No. 029: Regional Fare Policy and Comprehensive Fare Ordinance, this Ordinance, MTS and NCTD transit operations ordinances and policies, and any other fare agreements, including agreements entered into by SANDAG with transit operators.

2.282.30 **Regular Fare:** Applies to all persons age six and older, except persons eligible for Senior, Disabled, and Medicare (S/D/M) or Youth fares.

2.292.31 **S/D/M:** Acronym that stands for Senior, Disabled, and Medicare passengers.

2.302.32 **Senior:** Any person who meets the age requirement for transit fares provided in the TransNet Ordinance, Section 4, Paragraph (c)(3), is eligible to pay the discounted Senior Cash Fare or purchase a Senior pass.

2.312.33 **Service Day:** 4 a.m. until 3:59 a.m. on the subsequent day from the start time of the first trip through the end of the last trip in public timetables.

2.322.34 **Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection (SVCC):** A peak period only Community Shuttle service operated by MTS between the Sorrento Valley COASTER Station, and nearby employment centers.

2.332.35 **SPRINTER:** The brand name of the Oceanside to Escondido rail service operated by NCTD with Diesel Multiple Units in a light rail mode.

2.342.36 **Station:** A light rail, Bus Rapid Transit or commuter rail passenger stop.
**2.352.37 Stored Value:** Cash value placed on Compass Cards that can be debited to purchase fare products or pay a Cash Fare on a Compass Card.

**2.362.38 Supplement:** A charge paid on a one-time basis to permit the use of a fare product for a transit ride that requires a more expensive fare. Payment of a supplement does not change the original fare product.

**2.372.39 Sworn Peace Officers:** San Diego County, state, and federal sworn peace officers. Sworn peace officers include but are not limited to all municipal police department officials, all County Sheriff Department deputies, County Marshals, all County of San Diego Probation Officers, State Highway Patrol officers, State Police, U.S. Marshals, Federal Bureau of Investigation Officers, the MTS Chief of Police, and U.S. Immigration and Customs officers.

**2.382.40 Tap:** The act of touching a Compass Card on a validator to validate trips or deduct fares from Stored Value.

**2.392.41 Transit Service Types:**

- **2.394.1 Local – Fixed-route bus service on local or arterial roads serving neighborhood destinations and feeding transit centers. Includes BREEZE and MTS Bus. Also includes routes operating extensively on arterials with transit priority features and limited stops (Rapid Services).**

- **2.394.2 Corridor – A frequent transit service with limited stops including but not limited to major transit centers, residential centers, and activity centers that have more than six stops outside Centre City. Corridor services include MTS Trolley, MTS Rapid, SPRINTER, and express buses generally traveling less than 50 percent of the one-way trip miles on freeways. Corridor services travel at least 12 miles per hour, with an average passenger trip length of approximately 10 miles or under.**

- **2.394.3 Rapid Express – Includes bus service with stops only at major transit centers, residential centers, and activity centers; generally traveling 50 percent or more of the one-way trip miles on freeways; averaging at least 20 miles per hour, with an average passenger trip length of over 10 miles; and using commuter coaches.**

- **2.394.4 Commuter Rail – The commuter rail service operated in the coastal corridor from Oceanside to San Diego by NCTD under the brand COASTER.**

- **2.394.5 Rural – A rural bus service providing limited daily or weekly service linking rural areas to a multimodal transit center or major shopping center and designated by the MTS or NCTD Board of Directors as having a special one or two zone-fare. Service is generally provided in rural areas with one-way vehicle trip lengths ranging from 15 to 80 miles. Rural service includes MTS Rural and NCTD FLEX.**

**2.402.42 Transfer:** The action of a passenger leaving one bus, train, or other transit vehicle and within a brief time, without a stopover, boarding a subsequent bus, train, or other transit vehicle to complete his or her trip.
Transfer Slip: A document that may be issued by a driver to enable a passenger to board another transit vehicle free of charge—typically during a service disruption. Only customers that paid a cash one-way fare are eligible to receive a transfer slip. Transfer slips are only valid in the NCTD service area on BREEZE routes or for a reduced amount. Transfer slips are not issued for travel entirely within San Diego County solely on the fixed-route system. Transfer slips may be issued for transfers between ADA services and fixed-route services and between fixed-route services and other systems outside San Diego County.

TransNet: The TransNet Ordinance is a SANDAG ordinance passed by voters in 2004 that provides for a half-cent transactions and use tax collected in San Diego County and used for transportation-related projects.

Trolley: Light-rail transit service operated by MTS.

TVM: Ticket Vending Machine used for the sale of single and multi-trip fare products, to check value left on Compass Card, and as a validator for MTS services.

Universal Pass: Provides unlimited rides on select transit services for an agreed upon period of time to individuals associated with a sponsoring entity, where the sponsoring entity guarantees universal participation/purchase by its employees, students, or other membership.

Upgrade: An additional fare required to enhance the value of a transit pass to travel on a transit service with a higher fare. Upon payment of an upgrade, the original fare instrument is converted to the new, more expensive product and the original product is no longer available.

Validator: A device for tapping a Compass Card in order to validate the fare product or to deduct Stored Value. Validators may be standalone devices, located on bus fareboxes, or part of a TVM. Validators located in TVMs may not be used as platform validators.

Youth: A person as defined in the TransNet Ordinance Section 4(C)(3).

Zone: For ADA purposes a zone is defined as:

Zone 1 Central San Diego

Zone 2 Mid-County: Poway, Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Peñasquitos, Carmel Mountain Ranch, and Sabre Springs

Zone 3 East County: La Mesa, El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley, and parts of Alpine

Zone 4 South Bay: Chula Vista, Coronado, National City, Imperial Beach, Palm City, Nestor, Otay Mesa, and San Ysidro

Zone 5 NCTD Service area

For the COASTER, the fare zones are set forth in Table 35. The fares zones applicable to Rural Fares are set forth in Section 3.4 of this Ordinance.
SECTION 3: SINGLE TRIP, SINGLE DAY, AND MULTI-DAY FARES

3.1 Fare Product Limitations

3.1.1 SPRINTER/BREEZE fare products may only be used on the SPRINTER and BREEZE.

3.1.2 Regional fare products may only be used on COASTER, ADA, Rapid Express and Rural bus services (MTS Bus and Trolley, and NCTD BREEZE and SPRINTER) without paying an Upgrade or Supplement.

3.1.3 Premium Regional fare products (Rapid Express, COASTER, and RegionPlus) may only be used on Local, Corridor, and single zone certain FLEX routes (listed in the NCTD Riders Guide), and Rural services. Regional fare products may be used with the Supplements indicated in Table 1.

3.1.4 COASTER Regional and RegionPlus fare products may be used on all transit services operated by MTS and NCTD except LIFT, Access, and certain FLEX routes (as listed in the NCTD Riders Guide), but require Supplements for two zone rural services. Discounts are available to holders of Premium and Regional fare products using the COASTER, as shown in Table 1.

3.1.5 Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection fare products are only valid on the Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection.

3.2 Fares and Pass Products

Tables 1 and 2 through 4 list transit fares available to the general public. The tables show the fare for each type of service by passenger category and which passes are accepted on specific services. The notes below the tables show the amount of any Supplement or Discount that may be required or available.

Table 1: Pass Prices, Acceptance, and Required Supplements or Discounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>One-Way Cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult &amp; Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Bus, Rapid, Express, Trolley, NCTD BREEZE and SPRINTER</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rapid Express</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FLEX</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FLEX 372</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>One-Way Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD COASTER 1 Zone</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD COASTER 2 Zones</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD COASTER 3 Zones</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Day Pass Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Day Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Regional</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER Regional</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Monthly/30 Day Pass Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>30-Day/Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Regional</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD COASTER 1 Zone</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 COASTER Zones

The COASTER Fares are based on three zones. The number of zones between stations is shown in Table 35. Passengers must purchase a single-trip or round-trip ticket or pass based on the number of zones between their origin and destination.

Table 35
COASTER Stations and Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To From</th>
<th>Oceanside</th>
<th>Carlsbad Village</th>
<th>Carlsbad Poinsettia</th>
<th>Encinitas</th>
<th>Solana Beach</th>
<th>Sorrento Valley</th>
<th>Old Town</th>
<th>Santa Fe Depot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad Poinsettia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrento Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Depot</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way and round-trip tickets and passes are valid only for travel between the number of zones or the stations listed on the ticket or pass.

3.4 Rural Bus Service Zones

Zone 1 of the rural areas is west of the line that runs due south from a point 14 miles east of Interstate 15 on the San Diego–Orange County line through the mid point of Palomar Mountain State Park and then to Ramona (Ramona Station), Alpine (Tavern Road and Alpine Boulevard), and Tecate border crossing (Tecate Road and Thing Road). Zone 2 of the rural area is east of this line.

3.54 Senior/Disabled/Medicare

The single-trip Cash Fare for persons eligible for S/D/M fares shall be 50 percent of the single-trip regular fare, rounded down to the nearest $0.05.

3.65 Children

NCTD and MTS may each determine how many children five years old and under may ride free on all bus, light rail, and commuter rail services when traveling with a paying passenger.

3.7 NCTD Reduced Fare Identification Card on BREEZE and SPRINTER
Passengers holding a valid NCTD issued Paratransit Reduced Fare Identification Card may ride BREEZE or SPRINTER services without payment of any fare. A personal care attendant also may ride free accompanying the passenger with a Reduced Fare Identification Card if the requirement for a personal care attendant is noted on the NCTD Paratransit Reduced Fare Identification Card.

3.8——Regional Day Pass

3.8.1——With the exception of Juror Day Passes and special marketing programs or event tickets/passes, all Day Passes shall be valid for travel on the specified services from the time of issue for the number of consecutives days indicated on the Day Pass or Compass Card product. The Day Pass is valid for travel until the end of the Service Day. The prices for all 1-Day, 14-Day, Monthly, and 30-Day Passes are shown in Table 1.

3.8.2——Regional Day Passes also will be available for two, three, and four days from the Transit Store, North County Customer Service Centers, and select TVMs at the prices shown in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Pass</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Day Regular</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Day Regular</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Day Regular</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.3——The price of 14-Day Passes shall be 60 percent of the cost of Monthly Passes rounded to the nearest dollar.

3.9——RegionPlus Day Pass

A RegionPlus Day Pass is valid on all services except for LIFT, ACCESS, and MTS Suburban Paratransit. Upgrade required for travel on Rural Zone 2. The price of a RegionPlus Day Pass is $12.

3.106——Classroom Day TripperPass

Classroom Day Trippers Passes are valid for travel between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., and after 6 p.m. Monday through Friday, and may be issued to school and youth groups (up to 18 years of age) on an advance sales basis only. Each group shall consist of a minimum of 15-12 people. One chaperone per every five students may ride at the Regional Classroom Day TripperPass price.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid on</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS Bus, SPRINTER, BREEZE, and Rapid Express</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER only</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER plus any of the following: MTS Bus, MTS Trolley, Rapid Express, SPRINTER, and BREEZE</td>
<td>$64.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A maximum of 135 students and adults per group are permitted to ride a single scheduled COASTER train. Advance confirmation of the availability of space is required at the time of purchase for all COASTER Classroom Day TrippersPass.

3.117 SPRINTER/BREEZE Social Services Agency Day Pass

The SPRINTER/BREEZE Social Service Agency Day Pass is a one-day NCTD Day Pass, sold in packs of ten priced at $45, which is validated by social service agencies by identifying the day, month, and year. It is sold only to qualified social service agencies who agree to dispense the Day Pass according to NCTD requirements. The Social Service Agency Day Pass has a unique serial number code, and the customer may not return or exchange a Social Service Agency Day Pass. Valid for unlimited travel on SPRINTER/BREEZE for day punched.

3.128 Juror Day Pass

Any state or federal court in San Diego County may purchase Juror Passes after signing an agreement with MTS. Juror Passes are not valid for use on any special service with a higher fare (e.g., Stadium Bus Service) or ADA complementary paratransit service. The agreement may include a portion of passes to be supplied free of charge to the courts in exchange for promoting transit use in all juror summons.

A Regional Juror Day Pass is valid for travel on all NCTD and MTS services except Rapid Express, COASTER, or Rural services. A RegionPlus- COASTER Regional Juror Day Pass is valid for travel on all NCTD and MTS services except 2-Zone Designated Rural services.

The price for Regional Juror Day Passes sold to the courts shall be based on the price of the Regional Day Pass and included in the agreement with the court. The price for COASTER RegionalRegionPlus Juror Day Passes sold to the courts shall be based on the price of the COASTER RegionalRegionPlus Day Pass and included in the agreement with the court.

Each Juror Day Pass becomes activated/valid on the day it is tapped by the passenger.

3.139 Advance Purchase Group Day Pass Sales

Groups wishing to purchase a minimum of 100 large amount of Regional-Day Passes shall be entitled to obtain passes at the discount rates shown in Table 5 when the passes are purchased at least 21 days in advance. Groups purchasing 1,000 or more Day Passes shall be entitled to discounts from the Table 5 prices, as shown in Table 6. Additional discounts require the approval of the SANDAG Transportation Committee or SANDAG Board of Directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Day</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Day</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Day</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Day</td>
<td>$14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Day</td>
<td>$16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Additional Discount for Bulk Purchase of Advance Purchase Group Day Passes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passes Purchased</th>
<th>Discount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000–1,999</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000–2,999</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000–3,999</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 or more</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1410 Monthly Passes

All Calendar Month Passes shall be valid until the end of the Service Day on the last day of the calendar month. All 30-Day Passes shall be valid for 30 consecutive days commencing on the first day the pass is validated.

3.15 Upgrades to RegionPlus Day Pass

Upon implementation of Stored Value, a Regional Day Pass residing on a Compass Card may be upgraded to a RegionPlus Day Pass upon payment of the difference between the original price paid and the new pass price. This upgrade only is available on Compass Cards with a sufficient Stored Value balance and occurs automatically when a Compass Card with a valid Regional Day Pass is tapped prior to boarding a service requiring a RegionPlus Day Pass. An upgrade does not extend the period of validity of the pass and is not available for paper Day Passes.

SECTION 4: MULTI RIDE TICKETS AND TOKENS

4.1 Round Trip Tickets

Any transit operator may, at its option, sell round trip tickets at two times the price of a single-trip ticket for any fare category or service. Outbound and return trips must be taken on the same service day and are valid roundtrip from the point of origin to the destination.

4.2 Multi-Trip Ticket Packs

Any transit operator may, at their option, bundle multiple single-trip tickets for any service they operate, and sell the tickets for the full face value of the tickets or with a discount of up to 10 percent.

4.3 Tokens

Tokens are a legacy fare that is no longer sold or issued, but remain in circulation. If a token is presented they shall entitle the person holding the universal token to up to a $2.50 cash fare value trip on any MTS bus, Trolley, BREEZE, or SPRINTER service, except ADA paratransit services. Some services may require a cash upgrade in conjunction with the Regional Universal Token.
Tokens will not be accepted for payment of any COASTER, Access, LIFT, or Rapid Express single-trip fare. Multiple tokens may be used to pay fares or purchase passes with a value of more than one local bus trip, but change will not be given.

SECTION 5: COMPASS CARDS

5.1 Card Acquisition and Registration

MTS, the administrator of the Compass Card Program, may require a nonrefundable fee for passengers wishing to acquire a Compass Card. The fee shall not exceed $5.

Compass Card users may elect to register their card. If registered, users will be entitled to one free replacement if the card is lost or stolen. Additionally, registered users of the Compass Card are entitled to balance protection. Registered users will be reimbursed the value of their cash or transit product at the time the card is reported lost or stolen. Reimbursement will be provided on a new Compass Card. An unregistered user shall have no right to reimbursement or refund of a Compass Card balance even if the card is lost or stolen. Registered Compass Cards are not transferable.

Compass Card users may opt not to participate in the registration program, but shall be required to pay the above-mentioned fee and will not receive the benefits of registration. Whether or not a user pays a fee or participates in the registration program, the Compass Card shall be the property of MTS and may be revoked and/or confiscated by MTS or NCTD.

5.2 Validating a Compass Card

Compass Card users who have a transit fare product or Stored Value loaded on their card must validate their card each time they board a bus or train. Passengers who fail to tap and validate their Compass Card as required may be deemed to not be in possession of a valid fare consistent with the ordinances and policies of MTS and NCTD.

5.3 Inspection and Use of Compass Cards

Users of the Compass Card must produce the Compass Card for inspection by authorized MTS or NCTD personnel or their designated agents. The Compass Card is intended as a fare payment device on MTS, NCTD, or any transportation service that is part of the San Diego Regional Fare System. Any nonauthorized use of the card is strictly forbidden.

5.4 Refunds of Stored Value and Transit Products

Refunds will not be issued for transit pass products loaded onto a Compass Card. Refunds of Stored Value remaining on voluntarily surrendered cards and confiscated cards will be available for registered Compass Cards only. Registered Compass Card holders seeking a refund must complete an application form available from the Transit Store or NCTD Customer Service, and follow the submission instructions on the application. Refunds will only be issued up to the maximum value of any receipts that show cash being loaded onto the subject Compass Card. All refunds are subject to a processing and waiting period of up to 90 days. MTS or NCTD may refuse any improper request for refund, or may make a partial refund. MTS or NCTD may deduct a processing fee of not more than 10 percent on any refund. Refunds
will be issued as a credit on the same card as the original purchase if made by credit card. Original payments made by cash, check, or debit card will be refunded by check.

5.5 Photographs of Cardholders

A photograph of a registered card holder may be printed onto a Compass Card if requested by the registered user. MTS or NCTD may charge up to an $8 fee for placement of a photograph on the Compass Card. Compass Cards bearing a photograph only may be used by the person whose photograph appears on the card.

5.6 Stored Value

Once implemented by MTS or NCTD, the Stored Value feature of a Compass Card (Compass Cash) may be loaded with cash value. A Compass Card with Stored Value may not be used to purchase an additional or replacement Compass Card. A Compass Card with Stored Value may not be used to purchase fare products or Stored Value to be loaded onto a different Compass Card.

5.7 Default Fare for Stored Value

All card holders boarding any bus or rail vehicle and paying their fare with Stored Value on a Compass Card will have the applicable Day Pass or one-way fare cost deducted from the Compass Card when a farebox or platform validator is tapped. Passengers boarding a bus must advise the driver before tapping if they wish to pay a single-trip fare, purchase a Day Pass or purchase a product other than the default Day Pass. Passengers boarding a service at any station or stop equipped with platform validators and TVMs must use the TVM if the passenger prefers to purchase a paper single-trip ticket or a product other than the default Day Pass for the service they will be boarding.

SECTION 6: COMPASS CLOUDMOBILE TICKETING

Compass Cloud is a Mobile Ticketing used on a mobile phone application allowing for the purchase of many of the fares available. It has the capability to offer the full range of fares and passes, including special events, universal passes, discounted fares, one-way fares, day passes and monthly passes. The products offered are at the discretion of the transit agencies. Discounted fares and universal passes require proof of eligibility to make the fares available. Refunds will not be issued for transit pass products loaded onto Compass Cloud.

SECTION 67: DISCOUNTED POST-SECONDARY AND GROUP PASSES

67.1 Post-Secondary Discounted Passes

MTS and NCTD shall each have the right to negotiate agreements, individually or jointly, with educational institutions. MTS and NCTD may establish their own policies, terms or eligibility rules regarding the sale of the passes in the sales agreements; however, the prices to the education institutions must conform to this Ordinance.
67.1.1 Discounted Calendar Monthly Post-Secondary Regional Pass

The price of a Regional Calendar Monthly / 30-Day Pass for post-secondary institutions shall be 80 percent of the price of an Adult Regional Monthly / 30-Day Pass. The discounted pass shall be valid for unlimited travel during a calendar month or 30-day period until the end of the Service Day on the last day of the month. All Regional Pass discounts, supplements, and upgrade rules apply to the Monthly Post-Secondary Pass.

67.1.2 Discounted Post-Secondary Regional Quarter/Trimester/Semester Pass

The price of the quarter/trimester/semester pass for post-secondary educational institutions shall be based on 65 percent of the price of an Adult Regional Monthly / 30-Day Pass, divided by 31 and multiplied by the number of days in the academic term.

The discounted Regional pass shall be valid for unlimited travel during an academic term until the end of the Service Day on the last day of the academic term. All Regional Pass discounts, supplements, and upgrade rules apply to the Post-Secondary Regional Quarter/Trimester/Semester Pass.

67.1.3 SPRINTER/BREEZE Only Post-Secondary Pass

The SPRINTER/BREEZE Monthly Pass may be sold to post-secondary educational institutions with a discount of $10 per month.

67.2 Group Pass Program

67.2.1 Ecopass Group Sales Pass Program

This program is for businesses or groups who purchase Regional and Premium passes and who are willing to purchase sufficient passes to provide a full year of transportation for employees or members at a discounted rate and execute a participation agreement.

The pass price discount would be based on the pre-purchase of a specified number of passes for a 12-month period. Only one three-month trial program is permitted per employer or group interested in testing the program. Advance payment is generally required for both the trial program and permanent program annual passes. Participants may purchase additional monthly passes as provided in the participation agreement at a discounted rate.

The price of the employer or group sales pass program shall be set according to the number of annual regular adult passes purchased as defined in the participation agreement. All passes purchased in excess of limits in the participation agreement will may be sold at retail rates.

67.2.2 Universal Pass Program

MTS and NCTD shall each have the right to negotiate UPass agreements, individually or jointly, with sponsoring entities. MTS and NCTD may establish their own policies, terms, or eligibility rules regarding the sale of the UPass in the sales agreements.
SECTION 78: TRANSFERS WITH OTHER TRANSIT OPERATORS

78.1 MetroLink Trip Tickets and Monthly Passes

MetroLink-Metrolink Trip Tickets and Monthly Passes are valid as full boarding fare on NCTD buses and the SPRINTER on all routes directly serving the Oceanside Transit Center. MetroLink-Metrolink tickets and passes are not valid for transferring between NCTD routes or between NCTD and MTS. MetroLink-Metrolink tickets are not valid for transfers to the COASTER. The rules governing the acceptance of the MetroLink-Metrolink tickets and passes are as follows:

78.1.1 MetroLink-Metrolink Monthly/7Day Pass: This pass must have the correct current month, year, and list Oceanside as a valid city in order to be valid.

78.1.2 MetroLink-Metrolink Round-Trip Ticket: This ticket must be imprinted with the current date and is valid until the time shown on that date on the BREEZE or the SPRINTER at Oceanside Transit Center.

78.1.3 MetroLink-Metrolink One-Way Ticket: This ticket must be imprinted with the current date and is valid until the time shown on that date to board the BREEZE or the SPRINTER departing the Oceanside Transit Center.

7.2 NCTD and Orange County Transit Authority Transfers

The following transfer agreement is in effect with the Orange County Transit Authority (OCTA) between its Route 1 and Route 191 and BREEZE Route 395:

7.2.1 BREEZE Route 395 to OCTA Route 1 or Route 191: The passenger will pay the appropriate NCTD single Cash Fare (or Day Pass fare) and be issued an interagency transfer onboard the 395. This transfer or Day Pass will be accepted by OCTA drivers as full fare for one boarding. In addition, NCTD BREEZE Passes and Regional Passes will be accepted by OCTA as full fare for one boarding on its system.

7.2.2 OCTA Route 1 or Route 191 to BREEZE Route 395: An OCTA passenger may transfer from an OCTA bus to NCTD Route 395 by displaying a valid OCTA Day Pass or a valid OCTA Monthly Pass. No further fare supplement will be required. The OCTA Day Pass or Monthly Pass is good for one boarding only on NCTD service. Therefore, the OCTA Day Pass or OCTA Monthly Pass is valid only on Route 395 in San Clemente, as this is the only route that connects with OCTA. Passengers continuing on other routes in Oceanside will need to pay a single Cash Fare or purchase an NCTD Day Pass.
7.3 Rail 2 Rail

The Rail 2 Rail Program is subject to renewal with the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak). When an agreement is in effect persons holding valid Amtrak tickets may ride any COASTER train between Oceanside, Solana Beach, and Santa Fe Depot within the origin and destination listed on their Amtrak ticket or pass, and persons holding fares valid for COASTER use may ride Amtrak trains designated on the NCTD COASTER schedule as Rail 2 Rail trains. Passengers can determine if an agreement is in place by contacting NCTD.

SECTION 89: PARTICIPATION IN THE REGIONAL FARE SYSTEM

The requirements for participation in the Regional Fare System by transportation providers shall be as follows:

89.1 Transit operators participating in the Regional Fare System must operate fixed-route transit service with fixed, published schedules.

89.2 Transit Operators must serve an area not currently served by an existing publicly subsidized, fixed-route bus operator.

98.3 New transit operators will be incorporated into the Compass Card system to the extent feasible and practical as determined by MTS and NCTD.

98.4 Any transit provider selling or receiving Compass Card, Compass Cloud, or other MTS and NCTD fare media shall have a secure handling procedure for all fare media. All tickets, passes, and transfers shall be handled as cash-value media, with appropriate security provided for acceptance, inspection, storage, distribution, and disposal.

SECTION 910: SPECIAL FARES

910.1 Sworn Peace Officers

MTS and NCTD transit operators will allow all San Diego County, state, and federal sworn peace officers, in uniform or in civilian clothes, to ride on scheduled bus and train routes without charge. Officers must show identification when requested by MTS or NCTD. This privilege does not apply to special events for off-duty officers.

910.2 Temporary, Promotional, and Experimental Fares

MTS and NCTD shall have the ability to set temporary, promotional, and experimental fares. Temporary, promotional, and experimental fares are defined as fares implemented for no more than 12 months for seasonal events or for marketing purposes. These fares, because of their short term/temporary nature, are not included in this Ordinance.
SECTION 1011: S/D/M AND YOUTH COMPASS CARDS ELIGIBILITY AND REQUIREMENTS

1011.1 Eligibility

In order to be eligible to purchase discounted S/D/M Passes, passengers must present an S/D/M or person with disabilities Compass Card with integral photo identification or one of the valid identification cards listed in Sections 10.2 through 10.3.

1011.2 Seniors

Seniors must provide a valid Medicare card, state-issued driver's license, government-issued photo identification, or an S/D/M Compass Card with integral photo identification when paying a Cash Fare, purchasing a Senior Pass, or boarding a transit vehicle with a Senior Pass.

1011.3 Persons with Disabilities and Medicare

1011.3.1 Cash Fares

All persons with a valid MTS identification card, Medicare Card, NCTD disabled identification card, State of California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) disabled identification card, or DMV placard identification card shall be permitted to pay the S/D/M single cash fare.

1011.3.2 Compass Cards

In order to receive a reduced fare Compass Card, a person with a disability must present for approval their completed application form and show a government-issued photo identification card and original versions of at least one of the following (photocopies will not be accepted) at the time of submitting the application:

1011.3.2.1 State of California DMV disabled identification card, (the white receipt from the DMV)

1011.3.2.2 State of California DMV placard identification card

1011.3.2.3 ADA Paratransit Identification Card

1011.3.2.4 Certification on the application form by a doctor or a qualified health care professional or a statement from a physician or rehabilitation center (on original letterhead or prescription notepad with an original signature). In addition to the nature of the disability, the statement should identify whether it is permanent or temporary in nature

1011.3.2.5 Individualized Education Program from school for disabled students

1011.3.2.6 Current year Supplemental Security Income (S.S.I.) or Social Security Administration (S.S.A.), or Social Security Disability Insurance (S.S.D.I.) award letter
4011.3.2.7 Letter from the Epilepsy Foundation

4011.3.2.8 Letter from the San Diego Center for the Blind

4011.3.2.9 Letter from the San Diego Regional Center

4011.3.2.10 Unexpired MTS or NCTD disabled identification card

4011.4 Youth

Youth must provide on request valid school, college, or government-issued photo identification to establish eligibility for a Youth discount when boarding a transit vehicle with a Youth pass.

SECTION 4112: ADA Paratransit

4112.1 Fares

The Cash Fare for ADA paratransit per ride for ADA-certified passengers for one complete trip, origin to destination, regardless of any need to transfer between ADA transit operators or zones, shall be double the local fixed-route fare of the typical fixed-route service linking the origin and destination based on a determination by MTS or NCTD. Such determination must be made by calculating the regular fixed-route fare, including transfers for a trip of similar length, at a similar time of day, on the transit operators fixed-route system.

All ADA prepaid fare media only will be good on the system for which it was created. ADA prepaid fare media may not be loaded onto a Compass Card.

One personal care attendant may ride free with each ADA passenger riding an ADA paratransit or transit vehicle if requirement is identified on ADA certification.

MTS and NCTD may establish their own policies and prices regarding the sale of daily/monthly/30 day passes for fixed-route buses and trains to ADA-certified passengers; however, the prices to these customers must not exceed the S/D/M prices.

4112.2 ADA-LIFT and Access Transfers

Paratransit customers needing to transfer between MTS Access, and NCTD LIFT or FLEX will need to pay the corresponding fares. There is no charge to transfer from any ADA service to any Local, Corridor, or Regional bus or rail service.

A transfer slip or proof of fare payment will be issued by the driver of an MTS ADA paratransit service to allow ADA passengers to transfer to regular transit services. Passengers transferring from LIFT to SPRINTER or BREEZE will not require any transfer slip or proof of payment.

Passengers transferring from any fixed-route service must pay a Supplement if the fare paid on the fixed-route service is less than the fare on the ADA paratransit service they are boarding. The Supplement required will be the applicable ADA paratransit fare less the amount of any fare paid on the fixed-route service. Passengers transferring from fixed-route
to ADA will only receive a transfer credit if the fare paid on the fixed-route service is a fare for which a paper transfer or proof of payment is issued. This includes single and return trip rail tickets, or Regional or RegionPlus Day Passes. If a single trip Cash Fare is deposited into a fixed-route farebox without a proof of payment, the ADA passenger will be required to pay the full fare when boarding a subsequent ADA vehicle as receipts are not issued for single trip Cash Fares deposited into the farebox.

One personal care attendant may ride free with each ADA passenger riding an ADA paratransit or transit vehicle if requirement is identified on ADA certification.

SECTION 1213: REGIONAL TICKET AND PASS ADMINISTRATION, REVENUE SHARING

Processes and rules regarding regional ticket and pass administration and revenue sharing may be the subject of one or more separate agreements between MTS and NCTD, as they see fit.

SECTION 1314: EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDINANCE OR AMENDMENTS

This Ordinance shall go into effect on August 25, 2014. Notwithstanding Board Policy No. 004: Rules of Procedure for Board of Directors and Committees, all amendments shall go into effect not less than 30 days after the second reading and approval of the Board of Directors, unless approved in accordance with Board Policy No. 004 as an urgency measure.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 825th of July 2014.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 825th of February 2019.

______________________________ ATTEST: ________________________________
CHAIRPERSON SECRETARY

Member Agencies: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and Mexico.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
I, Clerk of the Board of SANDAG, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of an Ordinance approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors on 25th-8th of July 2014February 2019, at the time and by the vote stated above, which said Ordinance is on file in the office of SANDAG.

DATED: ______________________________, 20142019

________________________________________

Clerk of the Board
COMMISSION ORDINANCE
CO-19-01

AN ORDINANCE OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AMENDING REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ORDINANCE NO. CO-04-01 RELATED TO FARE CHANGES

THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

The language in Section 4(C)(3) to Regional Transportation Commission Ordinance No. CO-04-01 is hereby amended to read as set forth below:

From the remaining revenues, there shall be expended such sums as necessary to guarantee in the North San Diego County Transit Development Board and Metropolitan Transit Development Board areas of jurisdiction for the duration of the measure (1) a monthly regional transit pass for senior (60-65 years or older) and disabled riders priced at not more than 25-50 percent of the cost of the regular regional monthly transit pass, and (2) a monthly regional youth transit pass for students (18 years or under) priced at not more than 50 percent of the cost of the regular regional monthly transit pass.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 8th of February 2019.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair of the Board of Directors of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission

[Seal]

Attest:

Secretary of the Board of Directors of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission
4.1 Public Engagement Efforts

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), in conjunction with the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD), conducted public outreach to seek input on proposed transit fare changes affecting the MTS and NCTD service areas. The proposed transit fare changes require amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and the TransNet Ordinance. For this reason, SANDAG’s public outreach was conducted in accordance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 004: Rules of Procedure for Board of Directors, Policy Advisory Committees, and other Legislative Bodies; Board Policy No. 025: Public Participation Plan Policy; and Board Policy No. 029: Regional Fare Policy and Comprehensive Fare Ordinance.

SANDAG, along with MTS and NCTD, hosted six public meetings throughout the region to solicit input between October 22, 2018, and November 1, 2018. Two weeks in advance of these meetings, “Take One” fliers in English and Spanish were posted on affected public transit vehicles and advertisements were placed in the Union Tribune and La Prensa notifying riders of the proposed changes; the time, date, and location of the public meetings; and other ways to provide input.

Additionally, SANDAG created a web page (sandag.org/fares) summarizing the proposed changes, providing the details of the public meetings, and offering other ways to provide input including a comment form, an email address (pio@sandag.org), an open phone line, and SANDAG’s physical address for written comments. MTS and NCTD not only posted web pages regarding the proposed changes and the public meetings, but also created surveys to gather further input. These surveys were distributed at the public meetings and posted online for members of the public to complete.

SANDAG publicized the public meetings through the October Region Newsletter, a press release, media advisories, and social media posts. Further, the proposed fare changes were presented to SANDAG’s Community Based Organizations Working Group on October 4, 2018. All public notices and outreach materials listed above are included in Appendix A of this Attachment.

At the public meetings, participants could ask questions of staff, complete the MTS or NCTD surveys provided in English and Spanish, and provide official public testimony recorded by SANDAG staff. Each meeting was opened and closed by a public hearings officer, who ensured the meeting adhered to SANDAG policies and procedures for public input. A copy of the agenda as well as the contact information of SANDAG staff who recorded official public testimony for each public meeting is listed in Appendix A.

In addition to the public meetings and other outreach detailed in earlier pages, MTS and NCTD also led informal “pop-up” events at transit centers in their respective service areas, informing riders of potential fare changes, gathering input, and encouraging riders to complete their fare surveys. The details of the these “pop-up” events, along with other public meetings where MTS staff notified riders of potential fare changes and handed out fare surveys, are listed in Appendix A.

4.2 Public Feedback Received

SANDAG received 629 public comments via mail, email, SANDAG’s online comment form, voicemail, audio and written testimony recorded at public meetings, and via MTS and NCTD surveys. SANDAG staff transcribed fare-related voicemails and recorded audio testimony as well as translated comments received in a language other than English. SANDAG staff also redacted any personably identifiable information. All 629 comments are included in Appendix B, categorized by communication type.
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Se llevarán a cabo seis reuniones públicas en el condado de San Diego para recibir comentarios sobre la propuesta para modificar las tarifas del transporte público que afectaría las áreas de servicio del Sistema de Transporte Público Metropolitano (MTS, por sus siglas en inglés) y el Distrito de Transporte Público del Condado Norte (NCTD, por sus siglas en inglés). Se propone que todos los cambios aprobados en la Ordenanza regional integral de tarifas y en la Ordenanza de TransNet entren en vigor a partir del 27 de enero de 2019.

¿Por qué es necesario ajustar las tarifas?
- Los costos operativos han aumentado en los últimos 10 años, mientras que los ingresos por tarifas han disminuido y las tarifas no han aumentado.
- Un aumento en los ingresos por tarifas ayudaría a mantener un alto nivel de servicio
- Estos cambios simplificarán la estructura de tarifas en toda la región

A continuación encontrará información sobre el programa de reuniones públicas. Los clientes también pueden llamar al (619) 595-5321, enviar un correo electrónico a pio@sandag.org, o entregar comentarios por escrito si no les es posible asistir a una de las reuniones. Luego de recibir y analizar los comentarios del público, las Directivas de la Asociación de Gobiernos de San Diego (SANDAG, por sus siglas en inglés), MTS y NCTD considerarán una recomendación final, que en su momento el público también tendrá la oportunidad de opinar.

REUNIONES PÚBLICAS

Lunes, 22 de octubre de 2018
5:30 a 7:30 p.m.
Chula Vista Library, Civic Center Auditorium
356 F St., Chula Vista, CA 91910

Martes, 23 de octubre de 2018
2:00 a 4:00 p.m.
MTS Board Room
1255 Imperial Ave., 10th Fl., San Diego, CA 92101

Miércoles, 24 de octubre de 2018
6:00 a 8:00 p.m.
El Cajon Police Department, Community Room
100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020

Formularios para comentarios disponibles en sandag.org/fares

Comentarios públicos
Para enviar sus comentarios por escrito, hágalos por correo postal a:
SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101
Correo electrónico: pio@sandag.org
Plazo para enviar los comentarios públicos: 9 de noviembre de 2018

¿Servicios de interpretación en español estarán disponibles en estos lugares y fechas específicas? Para solicitar servicios de interpretación en otros idiomas, comuníquese con SANDAG al (619) 699-1900 al menos con 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión.

Las reuniones públicas se llevarán a cabo en un formato de evento de puertas abiertas, donde los participantes pueden asistir en cualquier momento de la reunión, hacer preguntas al personal, completar tarjetas de comentarios o hablar con representantes de los presentadores y el público presente. De conformidad con la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA, por sus siglas en inglés), SANDAG asistirá a las personas que requieran ayuda para participar en las Reuniones públicas que figuran anteriormente. Si requiere tal asistencia, comuníquese con SANDAG al (619) 699-1900 al menos con 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión. Para solicitar los materiales en otro formato o idiomas adicionales, llame al (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY) o envíe un facsímil al (619) 699-1905.

Seis reuniones públicas se llevarán a cabo en San Diego County en el horario de 5:30 a 7:30 p.m. A continuación se listan las actividades para obtener comentarios sobre cambios de tarifas y modificaciones a la Ordenanza regional integral de tarifas. Se propone que todos los cambios aprobados en la Ordenanza regional integral de tarifas y en la Ordenanza de TransNet entren en vigor a partir del 27 de enero de 2019.

¿Por qué es necesario ajustar las tarifas?
- Los costos operativos han aumentado en los últimos 10 años, mientras que los ingresos por tarifas han disminuido y las tarifas no han aumentado.
- Un aumento en los ingresos por tarifas ayudará a mantener un alto nivel de servicio
- Estos cambios simplificarán la estructura de tarifas en toda la región

A continuación encontrará información sobre el programa de reuniones públicas. Los clientes también pueden llamar al (619) 595-5321, enviar un correo electrónico a pio@sandag.org, o entregar comentarios por escrito si no les es posible asistir a una de las reuniones. Luego de recibir y analizar los comentarios del público, las Directivas de la Asociación de Gobiernos de San Diego (SANDAG, por sus siglas en inglés), MTS y NCTD considerarán una recomendación final, que en su momento el público también tendrá la oportunidad de opinar.

REUNIONES PÚBLICAS

Lunes, 22 de octubre de 2018
5:30 a 7:30 p.m.
Chula Vista Library, Civic Center Auditorium
356 F St., Chula Vista, CA 91910

Martes, 23 de octubre de 2018
2:00 a 4:00 p.m.
MTS Board Room
1255 Imperial Ave., 10th Fl., San Diego, CA 92101

Miércoles, 24 de octubre de 2018
6:00 a 8:00 p.m.
El Cajon Police Department, Community Room
100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020

Formularios para comentarios disponibles en sandag.org/fares

Comentarios públicos
Para enviar sus comentarios por escrito, hágalos por correo postal a:
SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101
Correo electrónico: pio@sandag.org
Plazo para enviar los comentarios públicos: 9 de noviembre de 2018

¿Servicios de interpretación en español estarán disponibles en estos lugares y fechas específicas? Para solicitar servicios de interpretación en otros idiomas, comuníquese con SANDAG al (619) 699-1900 al menos con 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión.

Las reuniones públicas se llevarán a cabo en un formato de evento de puertas abiertas, donde los participantes pueden asistir en cualquier momento de la reunión, hacer preguntas al personal, completar tarjetas de comentarios o hablar con representantes de los presentadores y el público presente. De conformidad con la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA, por sus siglas en inglés), SANDAG asistirá a las personas que requieran ayuda para participar en las Reuniones públicas que figuran anteriormente. Si requiere tal asistencia, comuníquese con SANDAG al (619) 699-1900 al menos con 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión. Para solicitar los materiales en otro formato o idiomas adicionales, llame al (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY) o envíe un facsímil al (619) 699-1905.

Six public meetings will be held in San Diego County on a proposal to amend transit fares affecting the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) service areas. Any approved changes to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and TransNet Ordinance are proposed to become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019.

Why fare revisions are needed:
- Operational costs over the past 10 years have increased, while fare revenue has declined and fares have not increased
- Increased fare revenue will assist in maintaining high levels of service
- These changes will simplify the fare structure across the region

See below for information regarding scheduled public meetings. Customers may also call (619) 595-5321, email pio@sandag.org, or submit comments in writing if unable to attend the meetings. After public input is received and analyzed, a final recommendation will be considered by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD Boards of Directors, at which time the public can also make comments.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

*Monday, October 22, 2018
5:30-7:30 p.m.
Chula Vista Library, Civic Center Auditorium
356 F St., Chula Vista, CA 91910

*Tuesday, October 23, 2018
2:00-4:00 p.m.
MTS Board Room
1255 Imperial Ave., 10th Fl., San Diego, CA 92101

Wednesday, October 24, 2018
6:00-8:00 p.m.
El Cajon Police Department, Community Room
100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020

*Spanish language interpretation will be available at these locations and dates. To request interpretation services in other languages, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting time.

Public Comments
To submit your comments in writing, mail to:
SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101
Email: pio@sandag.org
Deadline for public comments: November 9, 2018

The public meetings will be conducted in an open house format where participants can attend at any time during the meeting, ask questions of staff, complete comment cards, or make their public comments to the officiant and participants. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in the public meetings listed above. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting time. To request the materials in an alternate format and/or additional language(s), please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
PROPOSED FARE CHANGES

• Single one-way fare price ($2.50) for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER and BREEZE

• Addition of a $3 Day Pass for Seniors/Disabled/Medicare and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER and BREEZE ($6 for Rapid Express)

• One discounted pass price of $26 for SDM and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER and BREEZE ($36 for Rapid Express)

• Increasing the minimum age for senior discounts from 60 to 65 years (seniors 60 or older prior to the effective date will remain eligible for reduced fares)

• Price increases for COASTER one-way, Day Pass and 30-Day/Monthly Passes

• Elimination of 2, 3, 4 and 14-day passes

• Elimination of Trolley transfers to align with bus policy

• Elimination of the SPRINTER/BREEZE monthly pass (will now be $72 to include service on the MTS bus and Trolley)

• Consideration of a $5 or $6 Adult Regional Day Pass

CAMBIOS DE TARIFA PROPUESTOS

• Precio único de tarifa unidireccional ($2.50) para autobús MTS, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER y BREEZE.

• Adición de un pase diario de $3 para personas mayores/con discapacidades/Medicare y jóvenes para autobús MTS, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER y BREEZE ($6 para Rapid Express).

• Precio de pase con descuento de $26 para personas mayores/con discapacidades/Medicare y jóvenes para autobús MTS, Trolley Rapid, SPRINTER y BREEZE ($36 para Rapid Express).

• Aumento de la edad mínima para descuentos para personas mayores de 60 a 65 años (las personas mayores de 60 antes de la fecha de entrada en vigor seguirán siendo elegibles para las tarifas reducidas).

• Aumento de precios para pases unidireccionales, diarios y mensuales/30 días de COASTER.

• Eliminación de los pases de 2, 3, 4 y 14 días.

• Eliminación de los traslados de Trolley para cumplir con la política de autobuses.

• Eliminación del pase mensual SPRINTER/BREEZE (ahora será de $72 para incluir servicios en autobús MTS y Trolley).

• Consideración de un pase diario regional para adultos con un valor de $5 o $6.

SINGLE RIDE VIAJE ÚNICO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Product</th>
<th>Pase Diario</th>
<th>Adulto</th>
<th>SDM*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS Bus</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD BREEZE</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD SPRINTER</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (1 Zone)</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (2 Zone)</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (3 Zone)</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FLEX (Except/Excepto 372)</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FLEX 372</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS ACCESS &amp; NCTD LIFT</td>
<td>Proposed Lift fee is per BREEZE/SPRINTER needed to complete trip Tarifa propuesta de Lift es para BREEZE/SPRINTER necesario para completar el traslado</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAY AND MONTHLY PASSES PASES DIARIOS y MENSUALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Product</th>
<th>Pase Diario</th>
<th>Adulto</th>
<th>SDM*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCTD SPRINTER/ BREEZE</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express Pass (MTS Bus, Trolley, Rapid, NCTD BREEZE, SPRINTER)</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RegionPlus+</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Regional+</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER Regional (Rapid Express + all COASTER zones)</td>
<td>Adulto</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER Regional Zone Passes</td>
<td>1 Zone</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zone</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$82.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zone</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
<td>$82.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request. To request, please call (619) 231-1466.

Esta información está disponible en diferentes formatos bajo solicitud. Para solicitar esta información en un formato diferente, por favor llame al (619) 231-1466.
Bill To:
SANDAG - CU00469490
401 B St Ste 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231
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The Undersigned, declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California: That he/she is and at all times herein mentioned was a citizen of the United States, over the age of twenty-one years, and that he/she is not a party to, nor interested in the above entitled matter; that he/she is Chief Clerk for the publisher of

San Diego Union-Tribune
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Stefanie Sobie
San Diego Union-Tribune
Legal Advertising
**NOTICE: Public Meetings for Input on Transit Fare Changes**

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) will host six public meetings in San Diego County to gather input on proposed transit fare changes affecting Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) riders. Any approved changes to the Regional Comprehensive Fare and TransNet ordinances would become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019. As the first proposed fare increase for MTS and NCTD since 2009, the proposed changes will increase fare revenue, offset increased operational costs, and maintain high levels of service. Participants can attend at any time during the meetings, ask questions, and write or record comments. After public input is received, a final recommendation will be considered by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD Boards.

**PUBLIC MEETINGS**

- **Monday, October 22, 2018, 3:30-7:30 p.m.**
  Chula Vista Library, Civic Center, Auditorium
  356 F Street, Chula Vista, CA 91910

- **Tuesday, October 23, 2018, 2-4 p.m.**
  MTS Board Room: 1250 Imperial Avenue, 10th Floor
  San Diego, CA 92101

- **Wednesday, October 24, 2018, 6-8 p.m.**
  El Cajon Police Department, Community Room
  100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020

- **Thursday, November 1, 2018, 6-8 p.m.**
  Oceanside Library, Community Room
  300 N Coast Highway, Oceanside, CA 92054

*Spanish language interpretation will be available at these locations*

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED FARE CHANGES**

- Single one-way fare price ($2.50) for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER, and BREEZE
- Addition of a $3 Day Pass for Seniors/Disabled/Medicare (S/D/M) and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER, and BREEZE ($5 for Rapid Express)
- One discounted monthly pass price of $26 for S/D/M and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER, and BREEZE ($36 for Rapid Express)
- Increasing the minimum age for senior discounts from 60 to 65 years (seniors 60 or older prior to the effective date will remain eligible for reduced fares)
- Price increases for COASTER one-way, Day Pass, and 30-Day/Monthly Passes
- Elimination of 2, 3, 4, and 14-day passes and Trolley transfers
- Elimination of the SPRINTER/BREEZE monthly pass (will now be $72 to include service on the MTS bus and Trolley)

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Mail to:
SANDAG PIO
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
Phone (619) 595-5321
Email pio@sandag.org
Webpage. More information and comment forms available at www.sandag.org/fares

Deadline for public comments
November 9, 2018

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance to participate in the Public Meetings listed above. If such assistance is required or if you would like to request additional language interpretation at specific meeting, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request the materials in an alternate format and/or additional language(s), please call (619) 595-1904 (TTY) or fax (619) 595-1905

5910220
NOTICE: Public Meetings for Input on Transit Fare Changes

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) will host six public meetings in San Diego County to gather input on proposed transit fare changes affecting Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) riders. Any approved changes to the Regional Comprehensive Fare and TransNet ordinances would become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019. As the first proposed fare increase for MTS and NCTD since 2009, the proposed changes will increase fare revenue, offset increased operational costs, and maintain high levels of service. Participants can attend at any time during the meetings, ask questions, and write or record comments. After public input is received, a final recommendation will be considered by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD Boards.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

| Monday, October 22, 2018, 5:30-7:30 p.m. | Monday, October 29, 2018, 3:30-5:30 p.m. |
| Chula Vista Library, Civic Center, Auditorium | City Heights Library, Community Room |
| 356 F Street, Chula Vista, CA 91910 | 3795 Fairmount Avenue, San Diego, CA 92105 |

| Tuesday, October 23, 2018, 2-4 p.m. | Tuesday, October 30, 2018, 12 noon-2 p.m. |
| MTS Board Room: 1255 Imperial Avenue, 10th Floor | Escondido Library, Turriente Room |
| San Diego, CA 92101 | 239 S Kalmia Street, Escondido, CA 92025 |

| Wednesday, October 24, 2018, 6-8 p.m. | Thursday, November 1, 2018, 6-8 p.m. |
| El Cajon Police Department, Community Room | Oceanside Library, Community Room |
| 100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020 | 330 N Coast Highway, Oceanside, CA 92054 |

*Spanish language interpretation will be available at these locations.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED FARE CHANGES

- Single one-way fare price ($2.50) for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER, and BREEZE
- Addition of a $3 Day Pass for Seniors/Disabled/Medicare (S/D/M) and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER, and BREEZE ($6 for Rapid Express)
- One discounted monthly pass price of $26 for S/D/M and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER, and BREEZE ($36 for Rapid Express)
- Increasing the minimum age for senior discounts from 60 to 65 years (seniors 60 or older prior to the effective date will remain eligible for reduced fares)
- Price increases for COASTER one-way, Day Pass, and 30-Day/Monthly Passes
- Elimination of 2, 3, 4, and 14-day passes and Trolley transfers
- Elimination of the SPRINTER/BREEZE monthly pass (will now be $72 to include service on the MTS bus and Trolley)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mail to:
SANDAG PIO
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: (619) 595-5321
Email: PIO@sandag.org
Web page: More information and comment forms available at www.sandag.org/fares
Deadline for public comments: November 9, 2018

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance to participate in the Public Meetings listed above. If such assistance is required or if you would like to request additional language interpretation at a specific meeting, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request the materials in an alternate format and/or additional language(s), please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
NOTICE: Public Meetings for Input on Transit Fare Changes

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) will host six public meetings in San Diego County to gather input on proposed transit fare changes affecting Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) riders. Any approved changes to the Regional Comprehensive Fare and TransNet ordinances would become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019. As the first proposed fare increase for MTS and NCTD since 2009, the proposed changes will include fare revenue, offset increased operational costs, and maintain high levels of service. Participants can attend at any time during the meetings, ask questions, and write or record comments. After public input is received, a final recommendation will be considered by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD Boards.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

*Monday, October 22, 2018, 5:30-7:30 p.m.*
Chula Vista Library, Civic Center, Auditorium
3556 F Street, Chula Vista, CA 91910

*Monday, October 29, 2018, 3:30-5:30 p.m.*
City Heights Library, Community Room
3795 Fairmont Avenue, San Diego, CA 92105

*Tuesday, October 23, 2018, 2-4 p.m.*
MTS Board Room: 1255 Imperial Avenue, 10th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101

*Tuesday, October 30, 2018, 12 noon-2 p.m.*
Escondido Library, Turrentine Room
239 S Kalmia Street, Escondido, CA 92025

*Wednesday, October 24, 2018, 6-8 p.m.*
El Cajon Police Department, Community Room
100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020

*Thursday, November 1, 2018, 6-8 p.m.*
OceanSide Library, Community Room
330 N Coast Highway, OceanSide, CA 92054

*Spanish language interpretation will be available at these locations

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED FARE CHANGES

- Single one-way fare price ($2.50) for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER, and BREEZE
- Addition of a $3 Day Pass for Senior/Disabled/Medicaid (S/D/M) and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER, and BREEZE ($6 for Rapid Express)
- One discounted monthly pass price of $26 for S/D/M and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER, and BREEZE ($36 for Rapid Express)
- Increasing the minimum age for senior discounts from 60 to 65 years (seniors 60 or older to the effective date will remain eligible for reduced fares)
- Price increases for COASTER one-way, Day Pass, and 30-Day/Monthly Passes
- Elimination of 2, 3, 4, and 14-day passes and Trolley transfers
- Elimination of the SPRINTER/BREEZE monthly pass (will now be $72 to include service on the MTS bus and Trolley)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mail to:
SANDAG PIO
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: (619) 696-1900
Email: PIO@sandag.org
Web page: More information and comment forms available at www.sandag.org/MTS

Deadline for public comments:
November 9, 2018

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance to participate in the Public Meetings listed above. If such assistance is required or if you would like to request additional language interpretation at a specific meeting, please contact SANDAG at (619) 696-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request the materials in an alternate format and/or additional language(s), please call (619) 696-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
AVISO:

Reuniones públicas para comentarios sobre cambios en tarifas del transporte público

La Asociación de Gobiernos de San Diego (SANDAG, por sus siglas en inglés) llevará a cabo seis reuniones públicas en el condado de San Diego para reunir información sobre la propuesta para modificar las tarifas del transporte público que afectarán a los pasajeros del Sistema de Transporte Público (MTS, por sus siglas en inglés) y el Distrito de Transporte Público del Condado Norte (NCTD, por sus siglas en inglés). Se propone que todos los cambios aprobados en la Ordenanza regional integral de tarifas y en la Ordenanza de Transporte se entran en vigor a partir del 27 de enero de 2019. Como la primera propuesta de aumento de tarifas para MTS y NCTD desde 2009, los cambios propuestos servirán para aumentar los ingresos por tarifas, compensar el incremento de los costos operativos y mantener un nivel de servicio. Los participantes pueden asistir a cualquier hora durante las reuniones, formular preguntas y escribir o hablar comentarios. Luego de recibir la aportación del público, las Direcciones de SANDAG, MTS y NCTD considerarán una recomendación final.

REUNIONES PÚBLICAS

| *Lunes, 22 de octubre de 2018, 5:30-7:30 p.m. | *Lunes, 29 de octubre de 2018, 3:30-5:30 p.m. |
| Chula Vista Library, Civic Center, Auditorium | City Heights Library, Community Room |
| 350 E St., Chula Vista, CA 91910 | 5795 Fairmount Ave, San Diego, CA 92105 |

| *Martes, 23 de octubre de 2018, 2:00-4:00 p.m. | *Martes, 30 de octubre de 2018, 12:00-2:00 p.m. |
| Sala de juicios de MTS, 1235 Imperial Ave, 10th Fl. | Escondido Library, Turquoise Room |
| San Diego, CA 92101 | 239 S Kalmia St., Escondido, CA 92025 |

| Miércoles, 24 de octubre de 2018, 6:00-8:00 p.m. | *Jueves, 1 de noviembre de 2018, 6:00-8:00 p.m. |
| El Cajon Police Department, Salón Comunitario | Oceanwide Library, Salón Comunitario |
| 100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020 | 330 N Coast Highway, Oceanwide, CA 92054 |

Resumen de cambios de tarifa propuestos

- Precio único de tarifa unidireccional ($2.50) para autobuses MTS, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER y BREEZE
- Adición de un pase diario de $3 para personas mayores/con discapacidades/Medicare y jóvenes para autobuses MTS, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER y BREEZE (6c para Rapid Express)
- Precio de pase mensual con descuento de $25 para personas mayores/con discapacidades/Medicare y jóvenes para autobuses MTS, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER y BREEZE (6c para Rapid Express)
- Aumento de la edad mínima para descuentos para personas mayores de 60 a 65 años (las personas mayores de 60 antes de la fecha de entrada en vigor seguirán siendo elegibles para las tarifas reducidas)
- Aumento de precios para pases unidireccionales, diarios y mensuales/30 días de COASTER
- Eliminación de los pases de 2, 3, 4 y 14 días y traslados en el Trolley
- Eliminación del pase mensual de SPRINTER y BREEZE (ahora $72 para incluir servicios de autobús de NCTD y Trolley)

Comentarios públicos

Correo postal:
SANDAG P.O.
401 B St., Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92101
Teléfono: (619) 595-5221
Correo electrónico: pga@sandag.org
Páginas web: Más información y formularios disponibles en www.sandag.org/laica
Fecha límite para recibir comentarios públicos: 9 de noviembre de 2018

En cumplimiento con la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA, por sus siglas en inglés), SAND AG asistirá a las personas que requieran apoyo para participar en las reuniones que figuran anteriormente. Si requiere tal asistencia o si desea solicitar servicios de interpretación en otros idiomas en una reunión en particular, por favor comuníquese con SANDAG al (619) 699-1900 con al menos 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión. Para solicitar los materiales en otro formato o idioma(s), llame al (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), o envíe un facsimil al (619) 699-1905.

*Servicios de interpretación en español estarán disponibles en estas ubicaciones.
Public Transit

Comprehensive Fare Ordinance

The SANDAG Board of Directors approved the region’s first Comprehensive Fare Ordinance encompassing fares charged on all public transit vehicles in San Diego County operated by Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) on March 24, 2006.

The Comprehensive Fare Ordinance consolidates the existing fare levels and regulations of MTS and NCTD into a single SANDAG ordinance.

The Fare Ordinance is consistent with SANDAG Board Policy No. 029, Regional Fare Policy, which provides the regional framework for transit fares. All fare changes, including fare increases or changes in fare types, must be approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors or the Transportation Committee. Public hearings will be held whenever fare changes are being considered.

2018-2019 Fare Changes

In 2018, MTS and NCTD are proposing to amend the ordinance to adjust transit fares and will collect public comments at six public meetings throughout the region. The adjustments are needed because while operational costs have increased over the past 10 years, fare revenues have declined, and fares have not increased. Increasing fare revenue will assist in maintaining high levels of service and simplifying the fare structure across the region.

After public input is received and analyzed, a final recommendation will be considered by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors.

Public Meetings

*Monday, October 22, 2018
5:30 - 7:30 p.m.
Chula Vista Library, Civic Center Auditorium
356 F St.
Chula Vista, CA 91910

*Tuesday, October 23, 2018
2-4 p.m.
MTS Board Room
1255 Imperial Ave., 10th Fl.
San Diego, CA 92101

Wednesday, October 24, 2018
6-8 p.m.
El Cajon Police Department, Community Room
100 Civic Center Way
El Cajon, CA 92020

*Monday, October 29, 2018
3:30-5:30 p.m.
City Heights Library Community Room
3795 Fairmount Ave.
San Diego, CA 92105

*Tuesday, October 30, 2018
12 noon - 2 p.m.
Escondido Library, Turrentine Room
239 S Kalmia St.
Escondido, CA 92025

Thursday, November 1, 2018
6-8 p.m.
Oceanside Library, Community Room
330 N Coast Hwy
Oceanside, CA 92054

*Spanish interpretation will be available at these locations. To request interpretation services in other languages, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Members of the public also may:

- Call (619) 595-5321
- Email pio@sandag.org
- Use Comment Form
- Submit comments in writing if unable to attend the meetings.

To submit comments in writing, mail to:

SANDAG PIO
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

PROPOSED FARE CHANGES

**SINGLE RIDE VIAJE ÚNICO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Product</th>
<th>Pass Type</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS Bus Autobus</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fare Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass Type</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Trolley Adult</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express Adult</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS RURAL Adult</td>
<td>$5.00 - $10.00</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.50 - $5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD BREEZE Adult</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD SPRINTER Adult</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (1 Zone/Zona) Adult</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (2 Zone/Zona) Adult</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (3 Zone/Zona) Adult</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FLEX (Except/Excepto 372)</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Sin cambios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FLEX 372</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Sin cambios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MTS ACCESS & NCTD LIFT

Proposed LIFT fee is per BREEZE/SPRINTER needed to complete trip
Tarifa propuesta de LIFT es para BREEZE/SPRINTER necesario para completar el traslado

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass Type</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFT</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DAY AND MONTHLY PASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Product</th>
<th>Pass Type</th>
<th>Current Day Pass</th>
<th>Proposed Day Pass</th>
<th>Current 30-Day/ Monthly Pass</th>
<th>Proposed 30-Day/ Monthly Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCTD SPRINTER/ BREEZE</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Pass (MTS Bus, Trolley, Rapid, NCTD BREEZE, SPRINTER)</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00 or $6.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth**</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RegionPlus±</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Regional°</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER Regional (Rapid Express + all COASTER zones)</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$41.25</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth**</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$82.50</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S/D/M = Senior/Disabled/Medicare *Senior = 65+**

*Personas mayores/con discapacidades/Medicare Personas mayores: 65+
+Youth = Ages 6 through 18 (5 & under ride free)
Jóvenes = entre 6 y 18 años de edad (de 5 y menores viajan gratis)

± Currently includes all modes except ACCESS, LIFT, MTS Rural, & FLEX 372
Actualmente incluye todos los modos excepto por ACCESS, LIFT, MTS Rural y FLEX 372
°Premium regional includes Regional Pass modes and MTS Rapid Express and NCTD FLEX (Except FLEX 372),
Regional Premium incluye modos en Pase regional y MTS Rapid Express y NCTD FLEX (Excepto por FLEX 372)

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request. To request, please call (619) 231-1466.

*Esta información está disponible en diferentes formatos bajo solicitud. Para solicitar esta información en un formato diferente, por favor llame al (619) 231-1466.*
Downloads:
- Fact Sheet - Proposed Fare Changes [PDF, 443 KB]
- Fare Change Flier - MTS/NCTD/SANDAG [PDF, 281 KB]
- MTS Fare Collection Whitepaper - November 2016 [PDF, 2055 KB]
- Regional Fare Ordinance - July 2014 [PDF, 173 KB]

Related Resources

Links
- MTS Fares and Passes
- NCTD Fares and Passes

Publications
- Regional Transit Fare Structure and Revenue Sharing Study [PDF: 935KB]
Regional Transit Fare Ordinance

Six public meetings will be held in San Diego County on a proposal to amend transit fares affecting the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) service areas. Any approved changes to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and TransNet Ordinance are proposed to become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019.

Why fare revisions are needed:

- Operational costs over the past 10 years have increased, while fare revenue has declined and fares have not increased
- Increased fare revenue will assist in maintaining high levels of service
- These changes will simplify the fare structure across the region

See below for information regarding scheduled public meetings. Customers may also call (619) 595-5321, email pio@sandag.org or submit comments in writing if unable to attend the meetings. After public input is received and analyzed, a final recommendation will be considered by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD Boards of Directors, at which time the public can also make comments. The MTS online survey (below) will be made available through Thursday, November 1.

View the Take One

PUBLIC MEETINGS

*Monday, October 22, 2018 | 5:30-7:30 pm

El Cajon City Hall, City Council Chambers
Why fare revisions are needed:
- Operational costs over the past 10 years have increased, while fare revenue has declined and fares have not increased
- Increased fare revenue will assist in maintaining high levels of service
- These changes will simplify the fare structure across the region

See below for information regarding scheduled public meetings. Customers may also call (619) 595-5321, email pio@sandag.org or submit comments in writing if unable to attend the meetings. After public input is received and analyzed, a final recommendation will be considered by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD Boards of Directors, at which time the public can also make comments. The MTS online survey (below) will be made available through Thursday, November 1.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

*Monday, October 22, 2018 | 5:30-7:30 pm
Chula Vista Library, Civic Center Auditorium
356 F St., Chula Vista, CA 91910

*Tuesday, October 23, 2018 | 2-4pm
MTS Board Room
1255 Imperial Ave., 10th Fl., San Diego, CA 92101

Wednesday, October 24, 2018 | 6-8pm
El Cajon Police Department, Community Room
100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020

*Monday, October 29, 2018 | 3:30-5:30 pm
City Heights Library, Community Room
3795 Fairmount Ave., San Diego, CA 92105

*Tuesday, October 30, 2018 | 12-2pm
Escondido Library, Turrentine Room
239 S Kalmia St., Escondido, CA 92025

Thursday, November 1, 2018 | 6-8pm
Oceanside Library, Community Room
330 N Coast Hwy, Oceanside, CA 92054

Comment forms available at sandag.org/fares

*Spanish language interpretation will be available at these locations and dates. To request interpretation services in other languages, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting time.
PROPOSED FARE CHANGE

ANNOUNCEMENT

Click here for the Take One

Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and NCTD are considering several changes to the fare system. With operational costs increasing and no fare increases over the past decade, these changes are designed to help maintain higher levels of service, and to simplify the fare structure regionally. We’re asking riders to review the proposed changes and give us your feedback online at sandag.org/fares or in-person at a series of public meetings.

Why fare revisions are needed:

- Operational costs over the past 10 years have increased, while fare revenue has declined and fares have not increased
- Increased fare revenue will assist in maintaining high levels of service
- These changes will simplify the fare structure across the region

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Six public meetings will be held in San Diego County on a proposal to amend transit fares affecting the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) service areas. Any approved changes to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and TransNet Ordinance are proposed to become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019.

See below for information regarding scheduled public meetings. After public input is received and analyzed, a final recommendation will be considered by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD Boards of Directors, at which time the public can also make comments.

*Monday, October 22, 2018 | 5:30-7:30 pm
Chula Vista Library, Civic Center Auditorium
356 F St., Chula Vista, CA 91910

*Tuesday, October 23, 2018 | 2-4pm
Comment forms available at sandag.org/fares through November 9, 2018.

*Spanish language interpretation will be available at these locations and dates. To request interpretation services in other languages, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting time.

**POP-UP MEETINGS**

In addition to the public meetings listed above, NCTD will also be hosting pop-up station events.

**Friday, October 26, 2018 | 2:00-4:00 pm**
Escondido Transit Center

**Monday, October 29, 2018 | 7:00-9:00 am**
Oceanside Transit Center

**Monday, October 29, 2018 | 2:00-4:00 pm**
Vista Transit Center
Regional Transit Fares Survey

MTS is considering several fare changes for its system. If you have not yet reviewed the proposed changes, please visit [sdmts.com/FareChange](http://sdmts.com/FareChange) to learn more. Please mail form to: SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.

1. Your home ZIP Code: 92113

2. How do you usually pay to ride MTS?
   - [ ] 30-Day or Monthly Adult Regional Pass ($72)
   - [ ] 30-Day or Monthly Adult Rapid Express/Premium Pass ($100)
   - [ ] 30-Day or Monthly Senior/Disabled/Medicare (SDM) Pass ($18)
   - [ ] 30-Day or Monthly Youth Pass ($36)
   - [ ] Adult Day Pass ($5)
   - [x] Adult One-Way Fare
   - [ ] SDM One-Way Fare
   - [ ] Other
   - [ ] N/A – I am not a regular rider

3. Please rate the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would rather pay slightly higher fares than have my service reduced.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the Adult Regional Day Pass increased from $5 to $6, I would be less likely to ride.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to use my smart phone to pay to ride MTS.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think transit should be more affordable for Youth (ages 6 – 18) to ride.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently, Youth and SDM riders have a discounted monthly pass. MTS is proposing to add a new discounted $3 Day Pass for SDM and Youth. I like this idea.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to offset the lost revenue of the new $3 Day Pass for SDM and Youth, MTS is proposing to combine the SDM and Youth monthly/30-Day passes into a single discounted $26 pass. (Youth currently pay $36, and SDM currently pay $18.) I like this idea.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I would be willing to pay more to ride MTS to get: (Check all that apply)
   - [ ] Environmentally friendly electric vehicles
   - [ ] Less expensive youth passes
   - [ ] More frequent service and service to new places
   - [ ] More night and weekend service
   - [x] None of the above

5. Comments:

   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
Proposed Fare Change Survey

1. How often do you ride NCTD?
   - Never have used the BREEZE, COASTER, FLEX, LIFT, or SPRINTER
   - Former customer, but no longer ride
   - 1 day per week
   - 2-3 days per week
   - 4-5 days per week
   - 6-7 days per week

2. Which mode(s) do you ride most often? (check all that apply)
   - COASTER
   - SPRINTER
   - BREEZE
   - FLEX
   - LIFT

3. Which fare type do you usually purchase?
   - Adult / Youth One-Way Fare
   - SDM One-Way Fare
   - SDM BREEZE/SPRINTER Day Pass
   - Regional Day Pass (Does not include COASTER)
   - RegionPlus Day Pass (Includes COASTER)
   - SPRINTER/BREEZE Monthly Pass (Does not include COASTER)
   - Adult Regional Monthly / 30 Day Pass (Does not include COASTER)
   - SDM Regional Monthly / 30 Day Pass (Does not include COASTER)
   - Youth Regional Monthly / 30 Day Pass (Does not include COASTER)
   - SDM COASTER Regional Monthly / 30 Day Pass
   - Youth COASTER Regional Monthly / 30 Day Pass

4. There is a proposal to combine the Regional SDM and Youth monthly/30-Day passes into a single discounted $26 pass. (Youth currently pay $36, and SDM currently pay $18.) Do you like this idea?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t Know

5. There is a proposal to give Youth a 50% discount on COASTER One-Way and Round-Trip tickets. Would this affect your decision to ride COASTER with your family?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t Know

6. Would you prefer that NCTD reduce services rather than increase fare rates?
   - Yes, I would prefer that NCTD reduce services rather than increase fares
   - No, I would prefer that NCTD increase fare rates and maintain/improve services
   - Don’t Know

7. Would you stop using NCTD services or take fewer trips if fare rates are increased?
   - Yes, I would stop using NCTD services
   - Yes, I would take fewer trips
   - No, increased fare rates will not change my use of NCTD services
   - Don’t Know

8. Comments
   - Concerned with paying
Also, be sure to take our interactive survey during the month of October.

Community input is a vital part of the plan-development process and will be used to develop draft scenarios for further review and input later this winter. If you haven’t already, please subscribe to receive email updates about other opportunities to get involved and learn more about the process of developing the 2019 Regional Plan by watching this series of informational videos.

Wanted: Public Input on Transit Fare Changes

SANDAG will hold six public meetings to gather input on proposed transit fare changes affecting Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) riders.

Any approved changes to the Regional Comprehensive Fare and TransNet ordinances would become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019. This is the first proposed fare increase for MTS and NCTD since 2009. The proposed changes will increase fare revenue, offset increased operational costs, and maintain high levels of service.

After public input is received, a final recommendation will be considered by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors.
The meetings will take place as follows:

- **Monday, October 22, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.** at the Chula Vista Public Library Civic Center Branch, located at 356 F Street, Chula Vista, CA 91910
- **Tuesday, October 23, 2 to 4 p.m.** in the MTS Board Room, located at 1255 Imperial Avenue, 10th Floor, San Diego, CA 92101
- **Wednesday, October 24, 6 to 8 p.m.** in the El Cajon Police Department Community Room, located at 100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020
- **Monday, October 29, 3:30 to 5:30 p.m.** in the City Heights Weingart Library Community Room, located at 3795 Fairmount Avenue, San Diego, CA 92105
- **Friday, October 30, 12 noon to 2 p.m.** in the Escondido Public Library Turrentine Room, located at 239 South Kalmia Street, Escondido, CA 92025
- **Thursday, November 1, 6 to 8 p.m.** in the Oceanside Public Library Mission Branch Community Room, located at 3861 Mission Avenue, Oceanside, CA 92058

Public comments also may be submitted beginning on October 5, 2018, by calling (619) 595-5321, emailing pio@sandag.org, or mailing to SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101. The deadline to submit public comments is November 9, 2018. For more information about the proposed MTS and NCTD fare changes, visit sandag.org/fares.

### Current Bids:

- **5005443 San Diego Regional FasTrak Customer Engagement, Marketing, Public Outreach, and Branding**
  Proposals are due by 10/9/2018

- **5006135 Maintenance and Landscaping Trucks**
  Proposals are due by 10/11/2018

- **5006104 Traffic Control Services**
  Proposals are due by 10/29/2018

---

**First Passenger Train Crosses New San Elijo Lagoon Rail Bridge**

In September, the first passenger train crossed the newly built rail bridge over the San Elijo Lagoon in Cardiff-by-the-Sea. The aging timber bridge was replaced to accommodate increases...
SANDAG, MTS, AND NCTD TO HOLD PUBLIC MEETINGS FOR INPUT ON PROPOSED FARE CHANGES AND REVISIONS TO COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and North County Transit District (NCTD) will hold six public meetings throughout San Diego County to collect input on proposed MTS and NCTD transit fare changes.

During the meetings, attendees will have the opportunity to submit public comments, speak to staff members, and learn more about the proposed changes. All comments will be summarized and presented to the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors over the next few months. If approved by all three boards of directors, the proposed changes will be implemented no earlier than January 27, 2019.

MTS and NCTD are proposing to adjust fare structures to ensure that safe and reliable transit services are maintained. Over the last ten years, operational costs have increased, while fare revenue has declined, and fares have not increased. The proposed changes also will simplify the fare structure across the region, making it easier to access a wide range of transit options.

The SANDAG Board of Directors approved the region’s first Comprehensive Fare Ordinance encompassing fares on all public transit vehicles operated in San Diego County by MTS and NCTD in March 2006. The Comprehensive Fare Ordinance consolidates existing MTS and NCTD fares and regulations into a single regional ordinance, which is consistent with SANDAG Board Policy No. 029, the Regional Fare Policy.

Because the Regional Fare Policy provides the regional framework for all transit fares, any fare changes, such as increases or changes in fare types, must be approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors. The proposed changes also must be approved by the MTS and NCTD boards of directors before the changes are implemented. Because the proposed changes include the Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Regional monthly pass discounts, as well as the qualifying senior age for all senior fares, the SANDAG TransNet Ordinance also will be revised if the changes are approved by all three boards of directors.

Six public meetings will be held in locations (accessible by transit):

*Monday, October 22, 2018
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.
Chula Vista Library, Civic Center Auditorium
356 F St.
Chula Vista, CA 91910

*Tuesday, October 23, 2018
2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
MTS Board Room
1255 Imperial Ave., 10th Fl.
San Diego, CA 92101

Wednesday, October 24, 2018
6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
El Cajon Police Department, Community Room
100 Civic Center Way
El Cajon, CA 92020
*Monday, October 29, 2018
3:30 – 5:30 p.m.
City Heights Library Community Room
3795 Fairmount Ave.
San Diego, CA 92105

*Tuesday, October 30, 2018
12 noon - 2 p.m.
Escondido Library, Turrentine Room
239 S. Kalmia St.
Escondido, CA 92025

Thursday, November 1, 2018
6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
Oceanside Library, Community Room
330 N. Coast Hwy
Oceanside, CA 92054

*Spanish interpretation will be available at these locations.

Members of the public also may:
Call: (619) 595-5321
Email: pio@sandag.org
Use Comment Form
Submit comments in writing: SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101

For more information about the proposed changes, next steps, and opportunities to provide input, visit sandag.org/fares.

About SANDAG
The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is the San Diego region’s primary public planning, transportation, and research agency, providing the public forum for regional policy decisions about growth, transportation planning and construction, environmental management, housing, open space, energy, public safety, and binational topics. SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, council members, and supervisors from each of the region’s 18 cities and the county government.

About MTS
MTS operates 95 bus routes and three Trolley lines on 53 miles of double-tracked railway. Every weekday more than 300,000 passenger trips are taken on MTS bus and Trolley services in 10 cities and the county. In FY 2017, MTS served more than 88 million riders. For more information on how you can use public transportation and save money, go to www.sdmts.com.

About NCTD
The North County Transit District is a public transportation agency providing over 10 million passenger trips annually throughout North San Diego County and into downtown San Diego. NCTD’s system includes BREEZE buses (with FLEX service), COASTER commuter trains, SPRINTER hybrid rail trains, and LIFT paratransit service. NCTD’s mission is to deliver safe, convenient, reliable and user-friendly public transportation services. For more information visit: GoNCTD.com.

###
MEDIA ADVISORY

Date: October 19, 2018
For Release: Immediately
Contact: Jessica Gonzales, (619) 699-1950, jessica.gonzales@sandag.org
Rob Schupp, (619) 557-4511, rob.schupp@admts.com
Kimy Wall, (760) 967-2807, kwall@nctd.org

SANDAG, MTS, AND NCTD INVITE PUBLIC TO PROVIDE INPUT ON BUS, TROLLEY, AND COMMUTER TRAIN FARES

First of six regional public meetings to take place on Monday

WHEN: Monday, October 22, 2018
5:30 - 7:30 p.m.

WHERE: Chula Vista Library, Civic Center Auditorium
356 F St.
Chula Vista, CA 91910

WHO: Chula Vista Mayor Mary Salas will make welcoming remarks. SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staff members will be available to answer questions and take public comments.

WHAT: SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD invite community members to attend a public meeting for more information and to provide comments on proposed MTS and NCTD transit fare changes. Attendees will have the opportunity to submit public comments, speak to staff members, and learn more about the proposed changes.

All comments will be summarized and presented to the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors over the next few months. If approved by all three boards of directors, the proposed changes will be implemented no earlier than January 27, 2019.

MTS and NCTD are proposing to adjust fare structures to ensure that safe and reliable transit services are maintained. Over the last ten years, operational costs have increased, while fares have remained the same. The proposed changes also will simplify the fare structure across the region, making it easier to access a wide range of transit options.

The SANDAG Board of Directors approved the region’s first Comprehensive Fare Ordinance encompassing fares on all public transit vehicles operated in San Diego County by MTS and NCTD in March 2006. The Comprehensive Fare Ordinance consolidates existing MTS and NCTD fares and regulations into a single regional ordinance, which is consistent with SANDAG Board Policy No. 029, the Regional Fare Policy. Since the Regional Fare Policy provides the regional framework for all transit fares, any fare changes, such as increases or change in fare types, must be approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors. The proposed changes also must be approved by the MTS and NCTD boards of directors before they are implemented. Since the proposed changes include the Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Regional Monthly pass discounts, as well as the qualifying senior age for all senior fares, the SANDAG TransNet Ordinance also will be revised if the changes are approved by all three boards of directors.

*Spanish interpretation will be available at this meeting.*

For those unable to attend a meeting, comments may also be submitted by phone at (619) 595-5321, by email at pio@sandag.org, through the online Comment Form, or by mail to SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800,
For more information about other meeting dates, the proposed changes, and opportunities to provide input, visit sandag.org/fares.

About SANDAG
The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is the San Diego region’s primary public planning, transportation, and research agency, providing the public forum for regional policy decisions about growth, transportation planning and construction, environmental management, housing, open space, energy, public safety, and binational topics. SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, council members, and supervisors from each of the region’s 18 cities and the county government.

About MTS
MTS operates 95 bus routes and three Trolley lines on 53 miles of double-tracked railway. Every weekday more than 300,000 passenger trips are taken on MTS bus and Trolley services in 10 cities and the county. In FY 2017, MTS served more than 88 million riders. For more information on how you can use public transportation and save money, go to www.sdmts.com.

About NCTD
The North County Transit District is a public transportation agency providing over 10 million passenger trips annually throughout North San Diego County and into downtown San Diego. NCTD’s system includes BREEZE buses (with FLEX service), COASTER commuter trains, SPRINTER hybrid rail trains, and LIFT paratransit service. NCTD’s mission is to deliver safe, convenient, reliable and user-friendly public transportation services. For more information visit: GoNCTD.com.

###
MEDIA ADVISORY

Date: October 23, 2018
For Release: Immediately
Contact: Jessica Gonzales, (619) 699-1950, jessica.gonzales@sandag.org
         Rob Schupp, (619) 557-4511, rob.schupp@sdmts.com
         Kimy Wall, (760) 967-2807, kwall@nctd.org

SANDAG, MTS, AND NCTD INVITE PUBLIC TO PROVIDE INPUT ON BUS, TROLLEY, AND COMMUTER TRAIN FARES

Second of six regional public meetings to take place today

WHEN: Tuesday, October 23, 2019
       2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

WHERE: MTS Board Room
        1255 Imperial Ave., 10th Floor
        San Diego, CA 92101

WHO: SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staff members will be available to answer questions and take public comments.

WHAT: SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD invite community members to attend a public meeting for more information and to provide comments on proposed MTS and NCTD transit fare changes. Attendees will have the opportunity to submit public comments, speak to staff members, and learn more about the proposed changes.

All comments will be summarized and presented to the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors over the next few months. If approved by all three boards of directors, the proposed changes will be implemented no earlier than January 27, 2019.

MTS and NCTD are proposing to adjust fare structures to ensure that safe and reliable transit services are maintained. Over the last ten years, operational costs have increased, while fares have remained the same. The proposed changes also will simplify the fare structure across the region, making it easier to access a wide range of transit options.
The SANDAG Board of Directors approved the region’s first Comprehensive Fare Ordinance encompassing fares on all public transit vehicles operated in San Diego County by MTS and NCTD in March 2006. The Comprehensive Fare Ordinance consolidates existing MTS and NCTD fares and regulations into a single regional ordinance, which is consistent with SANDAG Board Policy No. 029, the Regional Fare Policy. Since the Regional Fare Policy provides the regional framework for all transit fares, any fare changes, such as increases or change in fare types, must be approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors. The proposed changes also must be approved by the MTS and NCTD boards of directors before they are implemented. Since the proposed changes include the Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Regional Monthly pass discounts, as well as the qualifying senior age for all senior fares, the SANDAG TransNet Ordinance also will be revised if the changes are approved by all three boards of directors.

*Spanish interpretation will be available at this meeting.*

For those unable to attend a meeting, comments may also be submitted by phone at (619) 595-5321, by email at pio@sandag.org, through the online Comment Form, or by mail to SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.

For more information about other meeting dates, the proposed changes, and opportunities to provide input, visit sandag.org/fares.

About SANDAG

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is the San Diego region’s primary public planning, transportation, and research agency, providing the public forum for regional policy decisions about growth, transportation planning and construction, environmental management, housing, open space, energy, public safety, and binational topics. SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, council members, and supervisors from each of the region’s 18 cities and the county government.

About MTS

MTS operates 95 bus routes and three Trolley lines on 53 miles of double-tracked railway. Every weekday more than 300,000 passenger trips are taken on MTS bus and Trolley services in 10 cities and the county. In FY 2017, MTS served more than 88 million riders. For more information on how you can use public transportation and save money, go to www.sdmts.com.

About NCTD

The North County Transit District is a public transportation agency providing over 10 million passenger trips annually throughout North San Diego County and into downtown San Diego. NCTD’s system includes BREEZE buses (with FLEX service), COASTER commuter trains, SPRINTER hybrid rail trains, and LIFT paratransit service. NCTD’s mission is to deliver safe, convenient, reliable and user-friendly public transportation services. For more information visit: GoNCTD.com.

###
MEDIA ADVISORY

Date: October 26, 2018
For Release: Immediately
Contact: Jessica Gonzales, (619) 699-1950, Jessica.gonzales@sandag.org
Rob Schupp, (619) 557-4511, rob.schupp@sdmts.com
Kimy Wall, (760) 967-2807, kwall@nctd.org

SANDAG, MTS, AND NCTD INVITE PUBLIC TO PROVIDE INPUT ON BUS, TROLLEY, AND COMMUTER TRAIN FARES

Fourth of six regional public meetings to take place on Monday

WHEN: Monday, October 29, 2018
3:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

WHERE: City Heights Library, Community Room
3795 Fairmount Ave.
San Diego, CA 92105

WHO: SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staff members will be available to answer questions and take public comments.

Spanish interpretation will be available at this meeting.

WHAT: SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD invite community members to attend a public meeting for more information and to provide comments on proposed MTS and NCTD transit fare changes. Attendees will have the opportunity to submit public comments, speak to staff members, and learn more about the proposed changes.

All comments will be summarized and presented to the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors over the next few months. If approved by all three boards of directors, the proposed changes will be implemented in early 2019.

MTS and NCTD are proposing to adjust fare structures to ensure that safe and reliable transit services are maintained. Over the last ten years, operational costs have increased, while fare revenue has declined, and fares have not increased. The proposed changes also will simplify the fare structure across the region, making it easier to access a wide range of transit options.
The SANDAG Board of Directors approved the region’s first Comprehensive Fare Ordinance encompassing fares on all public transit vehicles operated in San Diego County by MTS and NCTD in March 2006. The Comprehensive Fare Ordinance consolidates existing MTS and NCTD fares and regulations into a single regional ordinance, which is consistent with SANDAG Board Policy No. 029, the Regional Fare Policy. Since the Regional Fare Policy provides the regional framework for all transit fares, any fare changes, such as increases or change in fare types, must be approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors. The proposed changes also must be approved by the MTS and NCTD boards of directors before they are implemented. Since the proposed changes include the Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Regional Monthly pass discounts, as well as the qualifying senior age for all senior fares, the SANDAG TransNet Ordinance also will be revised if the changes are approved by all three boards of directors.

For those unable to attend a meeting, comments also may be submitted by phone at (619) 595-5321, by email at pio@sandag.org, through the online Comment Form, or by mail to SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.

For more information about the proposed changes and other opportunities to provide input, visit sandag.org/fores.

About SANDAG
The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is the San Diego region’s primary public planning, transportation, and research agency, providing the public forum for regional policy decisions about growth, transportation planning and construction, environmental management, housing, open space, energy, public safety, and binational topics. SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, council members, and supervisors from each of the region’s 18 cities and the county government.

About MTS
MTS operates 95 bus routes and three Trolley lines on 53 miles of double-tracked railway. Every weekday more than 300,000 passenger trips are taken on MTS bus and Trolley services in 10 cities and the county. In FY 2017, MTS served more than 88 million riders. For more information on how you can use public transportation and save money, go to www.sdmts.com.

About NCTD
The North County Transit District is a public transportation agency providing over 10 million passenger trips annually throughout North San Diego County and into downtown San Diego. NCTD’s system includes BREEZE buses (with FLEX service), COASTER commuter trains, SPRINTER hybrid rail trains, and LIFT paratransit service. NCTD’s mission is to deliver safe, convenient, reliable and user-friendly public transportation services. For more information visit: GoNCTD.com.

###
MEDIA ADVISORY

Date: October 29, 2018
For Release: Immediately
Contact: Jessica Gonzales, (619) 699-1950, Jessica.gonzales@sandag.org
         Rob Schupp, (619) 557-4511, rob.schupp@sdmts.com
         Kimy Wall, (760) 967-2807, kwall@nctd.org

SANDAG, MTS, AND NCTD INVITE PUBLIC TO PROVIDE INPUT ON BUS, TROLLEY, AND COMMUTER TRAIN FARES

Fifth of six regional public meetings to take place tomorrow

WHEN: Tuesday, October 30, 2018
       12 noon - 2 p.m.

WHERE: Escondido Library, Turrentine Room
       239 S. Kalmia St.
       Escondido, CA 92025

WHO: SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staff members will be available to answer questions and take public comments.

Spanish interpretation will be available at this meeting.

WHAT: SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD invite community members to attend a public meeting for more information and to provide comments on proposed MTS and NCTD transit fare changes. Attendees will have the opportunity to submit public comments, speak to staff members, and learn more about the proposed changes.

All comments will be summarized and presented to the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors over the next few months. If approved by all three boards of directors, the proposed changes will be implemented in early 2019.

MTS and NCTD are proposing to adjust fare structures to ensure that safe and reliable transit services are maintained. Over the last ten years, operational costs have increased, while fare revenue has declined, and fares have not increased. The proposed changes also will simplify the fare structure across the region, making it easier to access a wide range of transit options.
The SANDAG Board of Directors approved the region’s first Comprehensive Fare Ordinance encompassing fares on all public transit vehicles operated in San Diego County by MTS and NCTD in March 2006. The Comprehensive Fare Ordinance consolidates existing MTS and NCTD fares and regulations into a single regional ordinance, which is consistent with SANDAG Board Policy No. 029, the Regional Fare Policy. Since the Regional Fare Policy provides the regional framework for all transit fares, any fare changes, such as increases or change in fare types, must be approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors. The proposed changes also must be approved by the MTS and NCTD boards of directors before they are implemented. Since the proposed changes include the Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Regional Monthly pass discounts, as well as the qualifying senior age for all senior fares, the SANDAG TransNet Ordinance also will be revised if the changes are approved by all three boards of directors.

For those unable to attend a meeting, comments also may be submitted by phone at (619) 595-5321, by email at pio@sandag.org, through the online Comment Form, or by mail to SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.

For more information about the proposed changes and other opportunities to provide input, visit sandag.org/fares.

About SANDAG
The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is the San Diego region’s primary public planning, transportation, and research agency, providing the public forum for regional policy decisions about growth, transportation planning and construction, environmental management, housing, open space, energy, public safety, and binational topics. SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, council members, and supervisors from each of the region’s 18 cities and the county government.

About MTS
MTS operates 95 bus routes and three Trolley lines on 53 miles of double-tracked railway. Every weekday more than 300,000 passenger trips are taken on MTS bus and Trolley services in 10 cities and the county. In FY 2017, MTS served more than 88 million riders. For more information on how you can use public transportation and save money, go to www.sdmts.com.

About NCTD
The North County Transit District is a public transportation agency providing over 10 million passenger trips annually throughout North San Diego County and into downtown San Diego. NCTD’s system includes BREEZE buses (with FLEX service), COASTER commuter trains, SPRINTER hybrid rail trains, and LIFT paratransit service. NCTD’s mission is to deliver safe, convenient, reliable and user-friendly public transportation services. For more information visit: GoNCTD.com.

###
MEDIA ADVISORY

Date: October 31, 2018
For Release: Immediately
Contact: Jessica Gonzales, (619) 699-1950, Jessica.gonzales@sandag.org
Rob Schupp, (619) 557-4511, rob.schupp@sdmts.com
Kimy Wall, (760) 967-2807, kwall@nctd.org

SANDAG, MTS, AND NCTD INVITE PUBLIC TO PROVIDE INPUT ON BUS, TROLLEY, AND COMMUTER TRAIN FARES

Last in series of six regional public meetings to take place tomorrow

WHEN: Thursday, November 1, 2018
6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

WHERE: Oceanside Library, Community Room
330 N. Coast Hwy
Oceanside, CA 92054

WHO: SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staff members will be available to answer questions and take public comments.

WHAT: SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD invite community members to attend a public meeting for more information and to provide comments on proposed MTS and NCTD transit fare changes. Attendees will have the opportunity to submit public comments, speak to staff members, and learn more about the proposed changes.

All comments will be summarized and presented to the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors over the next few months. If approved by all three boards of directors, the proposed changes will be implemented in early 2019.

MTS and NCTD are proposing to adjust fare structures to ensure that safe and reliable transit services are maintained. Over the last ten years, operational costs have increased, while fare revenue has declined, and fares have not increased. The proposed changes also will simplify the fare structure across the region, making it easier to access a wide range of transit options.

The SANDAG Board of Directors approved the region’s first Comprehensive Fare Plan.
Ordinance encompassing fares on all public transit vehicles operated in San Diego County by MTS and NCTD in March 2006. The Comprehensive Fare Ordinance consolidates existing MTS and NCTD fares and regulations into a single regional ordinance, which is consistent with SANDAG Board Policy No. 029, the Regional Fare Policy. Since the Regional Fare Policy provides the regional framework for all transit fares, any fare changes, such as increases or change in fare types, must be approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors. The proposed changes also must be approved by the MTS and NCTD boards of directors before they are implemented. Since the proposed changes include the Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Regional Monthly pass discounts, as well as the qualifying senior age for all senior fares, the SANDAG TransNet Ordinance also will be revised if the changes are approved by all three boards of directors.

For those unable to attend a meeting, comments also may be submitted by phone at (619) 595-5321, by email at pio@sandag.org, through the online Comment Form, or by mail to SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.

For more information about the proposed changes and other opportunities to provide input, visit sandag.org/fares.

About SANDAG
The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is the San Diego region’s primary public planning, transportation, and research agency, providing the public forum for regional policy decisions about growth, transportation planning and construction, environmental management, housing, open space, energy, public safety, and binational topics. SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, council members, and supervisors from each of the region’s 18 cities and the county government.

About MTS
MTS operates 95 bus routes and three Trolley lines on 53 miles of double-tracked railway. Every weekday more than 300,000 passenger trips are taken on MTS bus and Trolley services in 10 cities and the county. In FY 2017, MTS served more than 88 million riders. For more information on how you can use public transportation and save money, go to www.sdmts.com.

About NCTD
The North County Transit District is a public transportation agency providing over 10 million passenger trips annually throughout North San Diego County and into downtown San Diego. NCTD’s system includes BREEZE buses (with FLEX service), COASTER commuter trains, SPRINTER hybrid rail trains, and LIFT paratransit service. NCTD’s mission is to deliver safe, convenient, reliable and user-friendly public transportation services. For more information visit: GoNCTD.com.

###
Six public meetings between October 22 and November 1 will be held around the region to solicit input on proposed MTS and NCTD fare changes. If approved by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors, the changes would become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019.

Visit [www.sandag.org/fares](http://www.sandag.org/fares) to find out more about the upcoming meetings and view the proposed changes.

To submit comments, members of the public can attend a meeting, call (619) 595-5321, email pio@sandag.org, use the comment form at [https://www.sandag.org/organization/configComment/index.asp?pid=18](https://www.sandag.org/organization/configComment/index.asp?pid=18), or submit comments by mail to:

SANDAG P/O

See More
Fare Ordinance Amendment Public Meeting

Public · Hosted by SANDAG - San Diego Association of Governments

Tuesday, October 23, 2018 at 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM PDT
about 1 month ago

Metropolitan Transit System
1255 Imperial Ave Ste 1000, San Diego, California 92101

Six public meetings between October 22 and November 1 will be held around the region to solicit input on proposed MTS and NCTD fare changes. If approved by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors, the changes would become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019.

Visit www.sandag.org/fares to find out more about the upcoming meetings and view the proposed changes.

To submit comments, members of the public can attend a meeting, call (619) 595-5321, email pio@sandag.org, use the comment form at https://www.sandag.org/organization/configComment/index.asp?pid=18, or submit comments by mail to:

SANDAG PIO

See More

About SANDAG - San Diego Association of Governments

SANDAG - San Diego Association of Governments
Government Organization · San Diego, California
Thanks for stopping by the official SANDAG Facebook page. Visit our website at sandag.org.

Photos of SANDAG - San Diego Association of Governments
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Six public meetings between October 22 and November 1 will be held around the region to solicit input on proposed MTS and NCTD fare changes. If approved by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors, the changes would become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019.

Visit www.sandag.org/fares to find out more about the upcoming meetings and view the proposed changes.

To submit comments, members of the public can attend a meeting, call (619) 595-5321, email pio@sandag.org, use the comment form at https://www.sandag.org/organization/configComment/index.asp?pid=18, or submit comments by mail to:

SANDAG PIO

See More
Fare Ordinance Amendment Public Meeting

Public · Hosted by SANDAG - San Diego Association of Governments

Monday, October 29, 2018 at 3:30 PM – 5:30 PM PDT
about 1 month ago

City Heights Library
3795 Fairmount Ave, San Diego, California 92105

Six public meetings between October 22 and November 1 will be held around the region to solicit input on proposed MTS and NCTD fare changes. If approved by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors, the changes would become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019.

Visit www.sandag.org/fares to find out more about the upcoming meetings and view the proposed changes.

To submit comments, members of the public can attend a meeting, call (619) 595-5321, email pio@sandag.org, use the comment form at https://www.sandag.org/organization/configComment/index.asp?pid=18, or submit comments by mail to:

SANDAG PIO
Six public meetings between October 22 and November 1 will be held around the region to solicit input on proposed MTS and NCTD fare changes. If approved by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors, the changes would become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019.

Visit [www.sandag.org/fares](http://www.sandag.org/fares) to find out more about the upcoming meetings and view the proposed changes.

To submit comments, members of the public can attend a meeting, call (619) 595-5321, email pio@sandag.org, use the comment form at [https://www.sandag.org/organization/configComment/index.asp?pid=18](https://www.sandag.org/organization/configComment/index.asp?pid=18), or submit comments by mail to:

SANDAG PIO

**See More**
Six public meetings between October 22 and November 1 will be held around the region to solicit input on proposed MTS and NCTD fare changes. If approved by the SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD boards of directors, the changes would become effective no sooner than January 27, 2019.

Visit [www.sandag.org/fares](http://www.sandag.org/fares) to find out more about the upcoming meetings and view the proposed changes.

To submit comments, members of the public can attend a meeting, call (619) 595-5321, email pio@sandag.org, use the comment form at [https://www.sandag.org/organization/configComment/index.asp?pid=18](https://www.sandag.org/organization/configComment/index.asp?pid=18), or submit comments by mail to:

SANDAG P/I

See More
Meeting Notice and Agenda

2019 Regional Plan Community Based Organizations Working Group

The 2019 Regional Plan Community Based Organizations Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, October 4, 2018
10 to 11:30 a.m.

SANDAG Board Room, 7th Floor
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Please take the elevator to the 8th floor to access the meeting room.

Staff Contact: Jane Clough
(619) 699-1909
jane.clough@sandag.org

Agenda Highlights

- Regional Housing Needs Assessment Update
- San Diego Forward: The 2019-2050 Regional Plan Extension
- Regional Transit Fare Study

Please silence all electronic devices during the meeting

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 Working Group on any item at the time the Working Group is considering the item. Please complete a Request to Comment form and then present the form to the Working Group coordinator. Members of the public may address the Working Group 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 Working Group may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Both agenda and non-agenda comments should be sent to the Clerk of the Committee via clerk@sandag.org. Please include the meeting date, agenda item, your name, and your organization. Any comments, handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the meeting should be received by the Clerk no later than 5 p.m. two working days prior to the meeting. All public comments and materials received by the deadline become part of the official public record and will be provided to the members for their review at the 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 sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for email notifications at sandag.org/subscribe.

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. To access the meeting room, please arrive on the 8th floor.**
2019 Regional Plan Community Based Organizations Working Group
October 4, 2018

Item No. | Recommendation
--- | ---
+1. | Approval of Meeting Minutes

The Community Based Organizations Working Group (Working Group) is asked to review and approve the minutes from its August 2, 2018, meeting.

2. | Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments

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

Reports

+3. | Regional Housing Needs Assessment Update (Seth Litchney)

Staff will provide an update on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and overview the priorities and goals for the development of a methodology to distribute the housing units from the RHNA Determination to each jurisdiction in the region.

+4. | San Diego Forward: The 2019-2050 Regional Plan Extension (Coleen Clementson)

Staff will provide an update on the Board of Directors approval to extend the Regional Plan timeline to allow for additional public input on the transportation network concepts and scenarios. For reference, the September 14, 2018, SANDAG Board of Directors Report will be provided.

+5. | Regional Transit Fare Study (Brian Lane)

Staff will provide an update on the Regional Transit Fare Study initiated by Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, and SANDAG to consider changes to the regional transit fares to simplify the fare structure and to contain rising operational costs.

8. | 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.
9. **Upcoming Meetings**

The Working Group is asked to discuss possible topics for the next meeting.

The next Working Group meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 1, 2018, at 10 a.m.

10. **Adjournment**

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
Regional Transit Fare Study

Introduction

SANDAG Board Policy No. 029: Regional Fare Policy and Comprehensive Fare Ordinance, provides guidelines for setting a uniform, fair, and equitable regionwide fare system within the County of San Diego for the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD). The Comprehensive Fare Ordinance (Ordinance) further defines the existing fare structure used by MTS and NCTD, with a detailed listing of the available fares, their prices, and their limitations.

SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD initiated a regional fare study in the spring of 2016 to look for ways to simplify the fare structure in advance of the procurement of the next generation of fare collection. While simplification was the initial primary goal of the study, ensuring that fare revenues keep pace with rising operational costs also has become an important consideration for the analysis performed to date.

This report provides a history of the Regional Fare Policy and Comprehensive Fare Ordinance, discusses the need for and status of the current transit fare study, and outlines potential fare changes.

Background

Fare Policy and Ordinance History

Senate Bill 1703 (Peace, 2003) consolidated transit agency planning and programming functions under SANDAG and designated SANDAG as the agency responsible for developing a Regional Fare Policy, including setting fares for transit services in the region through a Comprehensive Fare Ordinance. The Regional Fare Policy (Board Policy No. 029) calls for setting a uniform, fair, and equitable regionwide fare structure consistent with revenue-producing requirements and the established budget, based on four key elements: 1. Regional Participation, 2. Production of Revenue, 3. Fairness, and 4. Simplicity.

The Regional Fare Policy was originally adopted in 2004 and the Regional Fare Ordinance was adopted in 2006. Because the Regional Fare Policy is generally broad in nature, few changes have been made to it since its adoption. The Regional Fare Ordinance has been amended each time a fare change has occurred, most notably with fare increases in 2008-2009 for both MTS and NCTD, fare reductions in 2011 for numerous NCTD services, and in 2014 to allow Universal Pass (UPass) agreements with post-secondary educational institutions.

Discussion

Regional Fare Study Purpose, Scope, and Work to Date

SANDAG included funding to conduct a Regional Fare Study in the FY 2017 Overall Work Program and Budget. The primary purpose was to simplify the fare system. In addition, the most recent state Transportation Development Act (TDA) Triennial Performance Audit of SANDAG recommended that “SANDAG should conduct a fare study to identify and develop opportunities to define fare policies that enhance connectivity between MTS and NCTD and with other connecting providers of public transportation services, such as Amtrak and Metrolink.”
The scope of the fare study includes the following primary activities:

1. Data collection including a compilation of industry best practices, peer agency fare structures, agency staff interviews and surveys regarding fares, and customer surveys.
2. Development and modeling of fare change scenarios to estimate the change in revenue and ridership resulting from potential fare changes.
3. Recommended new fare structure and simplification.

A working group of SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staff was assembled to implement the scope of work. The data collection effort has been completed and reviewed by the staff working group. Shortly after, initial work began to develop fare simplification scenarios. Ridership declines (with associated declines in fare revenues) and cost increases forced the working group to begin thinking about scenarios that could include fare increases.

As reported to the Transportation Committee as part of the FY 2018 TDA Productivity Improvement Program on May 19, 2017, NCTD was below the state- and SANDAG-mandated farebox recovery threshold for its LIFT and fixed-route services and was considering proposed fare increases to become compliant. In May 2017, the NCTD Board of Directors reviewed the proposals and approved a recommendation to submit the proposals to SANDAG for consideration as part of the regional fare study, with the desire to have these changes enacted by July 1, 2018.

Similarly, MTS staff presented fare change alternatives to their Budget Development Committee on February 22, 2018, to their Board of Directors on March 8, 2018, and then again on September 20, 2018 (Attachment 1). NCTD staff presented fare change alternatives to their Board of Directors on March 15, 2018, and then again on September 20, 2018 (Attachment 2). The fare change proposals range from the removal of some seldom-used multi-day passes, introduction of a Senior/Disabled/Medicare Regional Day Pass, increased discounts to youth monthly passes, and increases to one-way fares and monthly pass prices. Key discussion topics included the pricing for regional fares and potential changes to the TransNet ordinance that would increase the age limit from 60 to 65 for the senior discount and providing an increased discount for youth fares.

Next Steps

With feedback from the respective Boards of MTS and NCTD, as well as feedback from the Community-Based Organizations Working Group, the fares working group will refine the draft alternative fare options and present them to the public to gather feedback. These draft alternatives will be incorporated into the Regional Transit Fare Study and presented to the Transportation Committee later this month.

Key Staff Contact: Brian Lane, (619) 699-7331, brian.lane@sandag.org
Attachments: 1. MTS Board of Directors Report on Regional Fare Study, September 20, 2018
2. NCTD Board of Directors Report on Proposed Changes to Comprehensive Fare Ordinance, September 20, 2018
PUBLIC MEETING

PROPOSED MTS AND NCTD FARE CHANGES

AGENDA

Monday, October 22, 2018
Chula Vista Library
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

AGENDA

• Welcoming remarks
• Overview of fare change proposal, history, and reasoning
• Open house meeting with opportunities to speak with staff and provide written or recorded public comments

RESOURCES

• Display boards with information about future meetings, next steps, opportunities to provide comments
• Fact sheets with more information about the fare change proposal and timeline
• Take one fliers
• Surveys
PUBLIC MEETING

PROPOSED MTS AND NCTD FARE CHANGES

AGENDA

Tuesday, October 23, 2018
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
MTS Board Room

AGENDA

• Welcoming remarks
• Overview of fare change proposal, history, and reasoning
• Open house meeting with opportunities to speak with staff and provide written or recorded public comments

RESOURCES

• Display boards with information about future meetings, next steps, opportunities to provide comments
• Fact sheets with more information about the fare change proposal and timeline
• Take one fliers
• Surveys
PUBLIC MEETING

PROPOSED MTS AND NCTD FARE CHANGES

AGENDA

Wednesday, October 24, 2018
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.
El Cajon Police Department, Community Room

AGENDA

• Welcoming remarks
• Overview of fare change proposal, history, and reasoning
• Open house meeting with opportunities to speak with staff and provide written or recorded public comments

RESOURCES

• Display boards with information about future meetings, next steps, opportunities to provide comments
• Fact sheets with more information about the fare change proposal and timeline
• Take one fliers
• Surveys
PUBLIC MEETING

PROPOSED MTS AND NCTD FARE CHANGES

AGENDA

Monday, October 29, 2018
3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.
City Heights Library Community Room

AGENDA

• Welcoming remarks
• Overview of fare change proposal, history, and reasoning
• Open house meeting with opportunities to speak with staff and provide written or recorded public comments

RESOURCES

• Display boards with information about future meetings, next steps, opportunities to provide comments
• Fact sheets with more information about the fare change proposal and timeline
• Take one fliers
• Surveys
PUBLIC MEETING

PROPOSED MTS AND NCTD FARE CHANGES

AGENDA

Tuesday, October 30, 2018
12 noon - 2 p.m.
Escondido Library, Turrentine Room

AGENDA

• Welcoming remarks
• Overview of fare change proposal, history, and reasoning
• Open house meeting with opportunities to speak with staff and provide written or recorded public comments

RESOURCES

• Display boards with information about future meetings, next steps, opportunities to provide comments
• Fact sheets with more information about the fare change proposal and timeline
• Take one fliers
• Surveys
PUBLIC MEETING

PROPOSED MTS AND NCTD FARE CHANGES

AGENDA

Thursday, November 1, 2018
6-8 p.m.
Oceanside Library, Community Room

AGENDA

• Welcoming remarks
• Overview of fare change proposal, history, and reasoning
• Open house meeting with opportunities to speak with staff and provide written or recorded public comments

RESOURCES

• Display boards with information about future meetings, next steps, opportunities to provide comments
• Fact sheets with more information about the fare change proposal and timeline
• Take one fliers
• Surveys
# Public Meeting Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Meeting Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Public Meeting Officer Name</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista Library, Civic Center</td>
<td>10/22/2018</td>
<td>5:30 - 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Coleen Clementson</td>
<td>Zachary Rivera</td>
<td>(619) 699-4892</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Zachary.Rivera@sandag.org">Zachary.Rivera@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristine Gong</td>
<td>(619) 595-5342</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kristine.Gong@sandag.org">Kristine.Gong@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Board Room</td>
<td>10/23/2018</td>
<td>2:00 - 400 p.m.</td>
<td>Coleen Clementson</td>
<td>Zachary Rivera</td>
<td>(619) 699-4892</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Zachary.Rivera@sandag.org">Zachary.Rivera@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristine Gong</td>
<td>(619) 595-5342</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kristine.Gong@sandag.org">Kristine.Gong@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon Police Department</td>
<td>10/24/2018</td>
<td>6:00 - 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Linda Culp</td>
<td>Zachary Rivera</td>
<td>(619) 699-4892</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Zachary.Rivera@sandag.org">Zachary.Rivera@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jazmin Amini</td>
<td>(619) 595-1466</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jazmin.Amini@sandag.org">Jazmin.Amini@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Heights Library</td>
<td>10/29/2018</td>
<td>3:30 - 5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Elisa Arias</td>
<td>Zachary Rivera</td>
<td>(619) 699-4892</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Zachary.Rivera@sandag.org">Zachary.Rivera@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristine Gong</td>
<td>(619) 595-5342</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kristine.Gong@sandag.org">Kristine.Gong@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido Library</td>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>12:00 - 2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Charles &quot;Muggs&quot; Stoll</td>
<td>Zachary Rivera</td>
<td>(619) 699-4892</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Zachary.Rivera@sandag.org">Zachary.Rivera@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristine Gong</td>
<td>(619) 595-5342</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kristine.Gong@sandag.org">Kristine.Gong@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside Library</td>
<td>11/1/2018</td>
<td>6:00 - 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Keith Greer</td>
<td>Jazmin Amini</td>
<td>(619) 595-1466</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jazmin.Amini@sandag.org">Jazmin.Amini@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristine Gong</td>
<td>(619) 595-5342</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kristine.Gong@sandag.org">Kristine.Gong@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Lead</td>
<td>Event Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>H Street Transit Center</td>
<td>10/17/2018</td>
<td>5:30 - 6:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>24th Street Transit Center</td>
<td>10/17/2018</td>
<td>7:00 - 8:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>San Ysidro Transit Center</td>
<td>10/17/2018</td>
<td>2:30 - 3:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>UTC Transit Center</td>
<td>10/17/2018</td>
<td>2:30 - 3:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>SDSU Transit Center</td>
<td>10/17/2018</td>
<td>3:00 - 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>Iris Avenue Transit Center</td>
<td>10/17/2018</td>
<td>4:00 - 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>University Av &amp; I-15 Transit Plaza</td>
<td>10/17/2018</td>
<td>4:30 - 5:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>Kearny Mesa Transit Center</td>
<td>10/17/2018</td>
<td>4:30 - 5:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>Sabre Springs Transit Center</td>
<td>10/18/2018</td>
<td>6:00 - 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>City College Station</td>
<td>10/18/2018</td>
<td>2:30 - 3:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>Old Town Transit Center</td>
<td>10/18/2018</td>
<td>3:00 - 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>El Cajon Transit Center</td>
<td>10/18/2018</td>
<td>3:30 - 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>Euclid Transit Center</td>
<td>10/18/2018</td>
<td>4:00 - 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>Fashion Valley Transit Center</td>
<td>10/18/2018</td>
<td>4:30 - 5:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Other Meeting:</td>
<td>Crawford High School</td>
<td>10/24/2018</td>
<td>12:30 - 2:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Other Meeting:</td>
<td>Fair@44 (4530 El Cajon Blvd., San</td>
<td>10/25/2018</td>
<td>2:30 - 6:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Heights Transit for Tacos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>Escondido Transit Center</td>
<td>10/26/2018</td>
<td>2:00 - 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>Oceanside Transit Center</td>
<td>10/29/2018</td>
<td>7:00 - 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Pop-up Event</td>
<td>Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>10/29/2018</td>
<td>2:00 - 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mrs.

Bus and Trailway

I am writing this letter about the proposed fare change. And I must say, the increase in fare will hurt a lot of family, plus myself. A lot of family live from paycheck to paycheck; this increase will hurt us everywhere it will put us in hole. Do not increase the fare!

I have to ride the MTS bus and Trailway to work five days.
Well it will really hurt
my pocket! Thank
SANDAG/MTS

To whom it may concern: I have been to at least 2 public meetings of representatives from Sandag/MTS. In both cases we were told that there would be a question and answer time after their presentations. There was none. We were told on both occasions that they were out of time.

They spent most of their time tooting their own horns by saying what a great job they were doing and their super plans for the future. I was not impressed and neither were any of the other people in the audience. I don’t believe that any of your people have ever ridden on MTS or have any idea how to make a schedule that would be convenient for a rider.

As a senior citizen of San Diego on a fixed income that is very small, an $8.00 increase on the monthly pass is going to affect my income. I could see a $2.00 raise being more reasonable and have expected it. Please consider a less drastic increase. Thank you.

Sincerely,
A concerned senior.

P.S. I have ridden on most public transits on the West Coast and they are all better than San Diego’s.
Subject: Fee Increases

Increasing: Sex-Disabled Monthly Transit Fee Passes are not a solution. That group cannot earn extra per month.

Day Passes and Tourist Day Passes including Senior Tourist Day Passes could be raised greatly to $18-$20 more.

A bargain compared to using taxis or driving and parking fees.

Compared to driving, fees can be increased and still be reasonable.

All the adult, college age and some even youth can earn extra per day easily.

Concerned Citizens
Carl Metzgar
10/15/18

SANDAG PIO
401 B Street Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear MTS Representative,

I am writing this letter to state my opposition to proposed fare changes for 2019. I've been an MTS rider for the last 10 years using Park & Ride, Bus, Express Bus, Trolley and bike lockers. I'm very impressed with the future vision for San Diego transit.

However, there are 2 changes being proposed I disagree with.

First, increasing the age for senior eligibility from 60 to 65. This age group represents the best opportunity for increasing ridership. The demographic between 60 and retirement should be a target market for MTS and NCTD. While the easy solution to balanced budgets is raising senior eligibility, MTS can instead promote being "60 friendly" and strive to increase riders in this segment. I do recognize rising costs for MTS and NCTD. Therefore, I suggest increasing the senior fare and not changing the age eligibility.

The second objection, is elimination of the 14 day pass. I purchase a monthly premium pass for my commute to work. Sometimes, business travel or vacation means a monthly pass goes to waste. The "half month" 14 day pass is more expensive so it seems an alternative pricing solution could be made to retain the 14day pass option.

I urge the SANDAG, MTS and NCTD Boards of Directors to reconsider these fare changes in the revision to Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Carl Metzgar
Member of UTC Aerospace Systems - Green Team
2018 iCommute Diamond Awards Gold Tier Recipient

cc: Ron Roberts
SANDAG Board of Director
Subject: LIFT Paratransit service/price increases

To: Corporate and management directors

I would like to begin by stating The Lift Paratransit Service has given me, a person with impairments from brain injury, including loss of some vision, my freedom and Independence. Speaking for myself, I am incredibly grateful and appreciate the service we rely on. I understand it’s complicated.

I have never been present for a meeting or written a letter but decided it was necessary as I have seen a steady decline and flagrant waste of money, most likely subsidies, in many aspects of this service. Particularly, since clients have been notified of a substantial rate increase! Ticket prices are being raised to $5. Many clients are low income or fixed income, like myself. If we could afford Uber, we would do so but it’s not possible. I am being an advocate for myself and those like me.

I would like to express areas of concern. Management must be addressed directly and be diligent in looking into serious issues, which you most like have no idea are taking place, being so far removed. There are certainly common sense solutions. All of the separate corporations cannot sit on the sidelines. Come together and take immediate action!

Sandag, represents the public, NCTD receives tax payer subsidies as the responsible entity, with MV, as the hired operations contractor.
The subsidy monies should be utilized effectively and definitely not wasted! Management should be fully aware of all elements of the daily operations.

Both management for NCTD and MV should have a mandatory requirement for several days, to ride along or shadow a variety of drivers, both East and West, to witness what reality looks like. Follow up with brain storming, including representation from each of the various departments, finding solutions to some of the glaring problems. Get out from behind your desks to witness what is happening!

Your extraordinary devoted, empathetic, compassionate, caring drivers, many I have had the pleasure of riding with for years, are well trained. However, many clients, in their frustration with the ill managed system, have taken out their anger out on the drivers. I’ve heard it! Since I have been a client for years, I know it is not their fault and certainly not the intention to cause chaos for the clients and the appointments we need to get to in a
timely manner. I am witnessing the loss of drivers at a rapid and unfortunate rate. Good people are being lost and many at the end of their ropes!

Taxpayer’s funds are paying for subsidies, received by your company for training. The drivers should be compensated fairly to keep the clearly best drivers; genuine men and women. This is one of those areas that lack good business practice.

Scheduling is a nightmare and absolutely does not show minimal common sense and getting worse with some of the recent changes. An Oceanside driver is sent in the morning all the way to the East, such as Valley Center or Escondido to pick up clients and then, an Escondido driver is sent to Oceanside to pick up a client, both having the possibility of being late with a 45 minute plus commute. Does this sound remotely responsible to you? Definitely wasted resources, especially if the wrong vehicle is sent for a large apparatus or client need. The so called guidelines are not always practical.

Scheduling personnel, should first of all, absolutely know the area well, be familiar with Paratransit requirements, the logistics of the vehicle such as how many wheel chairs it can accommodate in reality, is a van more suited to a bus in a tight space logistics situation.

Clients in wheel chairs should not be subjected to a 2 hour ride while other clients are being picked up and dropped off, being the last to be delivered. I have acquiesced my ride home to deliver a fatigued dialysis patient, before me. I’ve heard drivers frustration with the insane scheduling and how they can be ignored by dispatch. Its plain wrong!

I can guarantee, a driver is being ripped to shreds in this situation, feeling helpless to serve the needs of the client. Some of your clients cannot speak. Do you understand what this is like for them?

I am also advocating on behalf of the clients and directors at Cal State University San Marcos Speech and Language Clinic. The clients are delivered late and picked up over an hour late often! I’m one of them.

This brings me to vehicle shortages. Is this subsidized as well; most likely? Where is the money sitting and why isn’t it being used for your fleet? Many vehicles are worn out, have mechanical issues and must be urgently addressed.

When you contract out to another transportation provider, such as Golden State, etc., they should be required minimally, to watch the Lift Paratransit training video. Many drivers are unacceptable, dangerous drivers. I’m not going to waste time on examples but I can speak and am able to file a complaint with customer service. Others, with a speech or mental challenge, cannot!

If a price increase is forthcoming, we should expect a well-managed, efficient operation and quality service by all means! Are the ADA requirements being met? I doubt it!

Thank you for the opportunity to address concerns. I certainly hope it can make a difference!

Sincerely,

Diedre Franck

cc: NCTD - Oceanside, MV Transportation; Oceanside and Dallas, San Diego Union Tribune
October 15, 2018

SANDAQ PIO
401 B Street
Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92020

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

In order for the riding public especially the Senior/Disable/Medicare riders who are the most vulnerable sector of our society can understand the rationale of the proposed fare increase, please enlighten us by providing detailed operational expenses related to salaries, bonuses, travel/meeting, and other related expenses.

SDM 30-day monthly pass will increase $8 from $18 to $26 an increase of 44%.

Youth (6 through 18 years old) day pass will decrease $2 from $5 to $3 a decrease of 40%.

Youth 30-day monthly pass will decrease $10 from $36 to $26 a decrease of 28%.

What appears in the MTS Notice is that Senior/Disable/Medicare riders are targeted for stiff fare increase in all modes of public transportations (Regional Pass, Premium Regional, Coaster Regional). We will be adversely affected and this is wrong. Fares for adult riders will remain the same. Fares for youth riders will decrease significantly.

SDM riders are single out for the fare increase. This is wrong.

Thank you and we appreciate your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Eddie R. Padua
NO, NO, NO TO RAISING LOW INCOME OR DISABLED SENIORS REGIONAL MO. TRANSIT FEES!
They have no way to earn even $10/mo.

RAISE THE FARES ON ALL THE TOURISTS DAY PASSES TO $18-20.
AND CHEAPER THAN TAKING CABS.
YOUTH PASSES SHOULD NOT BE ONLY @ $5-
LOW INCOME ANOTHER.
RAISE THE FARES ON ADULT MONTHLY $30+

ADULTS, COLLEGE AGE CAN EASILY PAY MORE AS CAN EASILY EARN. BESIDES,
MO. ADULT COMPASS PASSES ARE A BARGAIN
COMPARABLE TO AUTO COSTS, GAS COSTS, AND PUBLISHING FEES PER MO.

FROM:
GROUP OF INDEPENDENTS WHO CONSIDERED AND COMMENT ON ISSUES
Dear SANDAG Representatives,

Regarding the proposed Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and the TransNet Ordinance, I have several suggestions.

As a resident who prefers to use transit, I feel that the County as well as each city that benefits must subsidize the proposed fare increases. Transit is a much needed public service. But many residents in all categories would not be able to pay the fare increases due to our extremely high cost of living. It is time for the County and each individual city to pay their fair share so that costs to the riders remain affordable. We must prioritize transit. We should also use electric buses rather than big buses to move riders to the larger bus stops or the major routes. This would save fuel costs and improve air quality as well as increasing ridership.

However you decide, I will continue to use transit. We must all change our lifestyles if we value our living planet, our children's well-being, and a livable future for us all. Please consider these comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Helen M. Bourne
Sirs,

I am a 69yr old retiree, and use my SDM MONTHLY PASS (MTS) regularly. I find your FARE INCREASE PROPOSAL for it, reasonable in one area and not in another.

Your proposal states two goals: "increasing revenue" and "simplification", but they don't seem to be working in the same direction, and the SDM seem to be "getting the short end of the stick".

I do agree with raising the SDM age requirement to 65. That is more in accordance with the current definition of a "senior", and should generate a significant increase in revenue.

However, instead of following the example of the "single ride" fare increase of approx. 12% (which would increase the SDM MONTHLY PASS to just $20.00), you want to raise it up approx. 45% to $26.00. Then, you want to lower the YOUTH FARE to the same $26.00, and decrease revenue. How is this logical and fair?

Examples from other businesses that combine Seniors and Youth, don't practically apply here, as this situation is more "unique". The current structure has an established precedent that the SDM depend on, and figure into their tight budgets.

The SDM need and deserve to maintain their own price category. Unlike other age groups, options of suplimenting their modest income or walking greater distances are extremely limited. AND, no one treats "transit equipment" more respectfully, or shows more consideration for fellow passengers than the SDM do.

Also, if there was a choice between a ns$ 3.00 SDM DAY PASS, or only a $2.00 monthly increase, the SDM( WHO use predominately a monthly pass ) would "hands down" chose the latter.

REMEMBER, studies that might recomend this type of simplification, look at people as "statistics", but you need to "humanize" those numbers to decide what is really right.

Thank you for your time.

[Signature]

John A. Hammer
A Sandag:

Por medio de esta carta les informo que yo, Josefina Alanís, que cuando hagan sus aumentos de servicio de transporte público en todo San Diego, y modificaciones, piensen en personas como yo, familia de 2 hijas, no tenemos carro, porque nos gusta la transportación pública, nos gusta caminar más, hacer el ejercicio de pie nos mantienen saludables y conocer más nuestra región san diegina como del Sur y del Norte, y del centro, las hagan de acuerdo a nuestras necesidades, a nuestros horarios y más servicios públicos, facilitando a todos y a ustedes.

El aumento de tarifa que sea asequible a nuestras familias y amigos, y así todos tengamos una o muchas oportunidades.

Gracias.

JAA
I, Josefina Alanis, hereby request that when modifying and increasing transit services throughout San Diego, you consider people like me, a family with two daughters. We don’t have a car because we like public transportation; we like to walk and exercise more. This allows us to stay healthy and get to know our San Diego region from North to South to Downtown. It should be done according to our needs, our schedules and more public services that benefit you and everyone else. The fare increase should be affordable for our families and friends, so that there is one or more opportunities for everyone. Thank you.
I think you waited too long to propose and ask for an increase in fares for public transportation services. You should have been able to foresee the need for extra funding a long time ago when you could have raised prices a little bit, and put some of it in the bank to cushion future financial impacts and give people time to get used to the expectation of the results of inflation and maintenance needs. Now, all of a sudden, you are asking for very substantial increases which, if implemented, can seriously jeopardize the financial well-being of low-income people, which I myself am one of.

The main concern at this point is the proposed increase in the cost of the Senior/Disabled/Medicare passes. It is only an $8 increase, but it is a big jump for some for the monthly/30-day pass. People have difficulty with sudden large increases in prices when they already have their budgets planned and something like this hits.

I noticed that the cost for youth passes in some instances is very significantly reduced while the price for SDM passes is increased so much that we can climb a ladder made of dollar bills to the moon on it. This difference is unfair and displays a lack of moderation. It is too great a difference.

Sincerely,
Leslie Carr

(Save the envelope for referring to return address.)
To whom it may concern,

I am a 74 year old age 74. I think raising the cost for the is going to hurt alot. But after or, only have S.S. to live on.
also I wish bus 7 would still stop at Park & Robinson and that bus 215 would stop at the Park as it is a regular stop. Also I wish bus 10 could still stop at University & Geddes when Bridge is finished.

Sincerely,

Mary

P.S. Army can't make the meetings & don't have a computer
To whom it may concern:

SANDAG, MTS and NCTD Board of Directors.

Can any one of your agencies explain why it is more important for you to hire and retain Code Enforcement Officers as well as the same Contracted officers, in lieu of using your Valuable Resources towards the lack of or non-existent Mass Transportation in San Diego County throughout?

As one customer whose supports MTS and would like to continue to do same.

I cannot correlate the #1 (one) discrepancies.

Why can you not keep track of your customer rider ship, peak commute times?
Between #3 (there) government agencies, why is this not done?
Do you have any clue how unconsiderate, intolerable and not acceptable this is to your customer base? Most communities are on a very tight schedule when using your service to get to their next transportation destination. Especially at stations, distance is typically very far when catching a bus, front the trolley above. Please consider this, not appropriate, having their cack of mass transportation systems valuable resources or waste of these valuable resources. For some real mass transportation takes, thank you for your consideration, Nancy Taylor.
November 5, 2018

Dear People,

I am writing to submit comments about the proposal to amend transit fares.

I am 78 years old. You are lucky I do not drive. Although I do have a driver’s license.

I am on a fixed income. The proposed change in the senior monthly pass from $18.00 to $26.00 is HUGE! Almost double. (Hawaii is $30.00 a YEAR! Good way to make it appealing to seniors so they ride rather than drive.) If anything, I think you should lower senior fares and passes and keep seniors off the roads. Less congestion, less accidents.

I believe it would also be good to LOWER the age for senior fares and passes to 55. Get folks used to taking transit early. Have fares be so lucrative it is cheaper to ride transit than drive. Start earlier before they feel they could NEVER give up driving.

Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,

Noyita Saravia
Robert Oliver

November 1, 2018

PLEASE CONSIDER THE SENIORS

Do not raise the age for seniors to 65 and do not put much of a fare burden on seniors.

I am 61, so I already have my S/D/M card, therefore I already pay $18 per month.

This fare has been a lifesaver to me as I work part-time and have not made a full-time income in a while. There may be many people around my age who will turn 60 soon. Please do not put an unnecessary burden upon them financially by requiring them to be age 65.

PLEASE PRESERVE AGE 60

Robert Oliver
OCT. 26, 2018

SANDAG:

I ATTENDED THE MEETING LAST TUES. AFTERNOON ON OCT. 23RD AT 12TH & IMPERIAL.

THE ONLY COMPLAINT I HAVE IS WITH TROLLEY SECURITY!!!

SECURITY OFFICERS ARE OVER-PAID FOR WHAT THEY DO. THEY BOARD THE TROLLEYS AND CHECK FOR PASSES — AND THAT'S ALL!!! THEY SHOULD STAY ON THE TROLLEYS FOR SAFETY ISSUES.

I HAVE HAD QUITE A FEW RUN-INS WITH PEOPLE ON THE TROLLEYS OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS. I'VE SEEN WOMEN WHO HAVE BEEN RACISTED – YOUNG & OLD THEY ARE ALL SCARED TO DEATH!!!

I NOW CARRY PEPPER SPRAY WITH ME. WHEN I BOARD A TROLLEY I SOMETIMES SEE DRUG ADDICTS SLEEPING IN THE AISLES.

YOUR SECURITY STAFF IS A JOKE!!! YOU NEED AT LEAST ONE OFFICER ON BOARD AT ALL TIMES TO COMBAT POSSIBLE ASSAULTS, ESPECIALLY TOWARD WOMEN — OR M.T.S. WILL BE FACED WITH POSSIBLE LAWSUITS — AND ALSO — WHY DON'T YOU BAN BIKES ON THE TROLLEYS. THERE AER TIMES WHEN YOU CAN'T EVEN GET ON OR OFF THE TROLLEYS BECAUSE BIKES ARE BLOCKING THE ENTRANCES & EXITS !!!!!!

I ALSO SAW MAN LATE AT NIGHT WHO WAS RANTING: "I SHOULD KILL THE WHOLE BUNCH OF YOU!!! THAT WAS A TERRORIST THREAT!!! THEN AGAIN, NO SECURITY!!!!!!"
ALSO, THE LANGUAGE AMONG THE PASSENGERS IS A DISGRACE ESPECIALLY AFTER GAMES AT PETCO PARK - PEOPLE & FAMILIES ARE CATCHING THE GREEN LINE AND YOU HAVE FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN WHO HAVE TO ENDURE FOUL LANGUAGE ON THE TROLLEYS.

I DON'T MIND PAYING EXTRA FOR THE NEW INCREASE - HOWEVER I THINK I'M SPEAKING FOR ALL SENIOR CITIZENS WHO ALSO WENTED THEIR SAFETY CONCERNS AT THE MEETING ON OCT 23RD.

"TO ME, ALL THIS MEETING WAS JUST A DOG & PONY SHOW."

"M.T.S. IS NOT GOING TO ADDRESS THE CONCERNS OF SENIORS !!!!"

ANOTHER ISSUE I ENCOUNTERED BY YOUR SECURITY STAFF LAST YEAR, WAS THE ASSULT ON A BLACK TEENAGER WHO SAT ACROSS FROM ME - WHO WAS APPROACHED BY ONE OF YOUR "BIG FAT BULLY SECURITY OFFICERS". IF YOU'D LIKE MORE INFORMATION ON THIS, YOU CAN CALL ME AND I WILL EXPLAIN WHAT HAPPENED. IF THIS OFFICER HAD APPROACHED ME THE WAY HE APPROACHED THIS BLACK TEENAGE BOY, THAT OFFICER WOULD HAVE HAD ALL HIS FRONT TEETH KNOCED OUT! (THE BOY WAS ASSAULTED)

I KNOW I WILL NOT GET A RESPONSE ON THIS LETTER - BUT THE CITY IS LOOKING AT MULTIPLE LAWSUITS IF SOMEONE IS HURT BECAUSE YOUR SECURITY TEAM IS NOT DOING THEIR JOB !!!!
WHY DO THESE OFFICERS CARRY GUNS??
WHAT'S THE POINT ??? ARE THEY GOING TO
SHOOT A PASSENGER FOR NON-COMPLIANCE ??

GO AHEAD - RAISE THE FARES BUT
HIRE PROFESSIONAL SECURITY OFFICERS

RON TATO

PS:

WHEN YOU HIRE THESE
OFFICERS, DO YOU DO A BACKGROUND
CHECK? SOME OF THESE GUYS COME
OFF AS 'THUGS'.

I COULD ALSO GIVE YOU MORE
EXAMPLES OF MISBEHAVIOR OF PASSENGERS
IF YOU'D LIKE, BUT I THINK THEY
WILL FALL ON DEAF EARS ! ! ! ! ! !!

IF I SOUND ANGRY - YOUR RIGHT.
To: SANDAG PIO, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101
From: Roy A. Schroeder, [Redacted]
Subject: Comment on Proposed Public Transit Fare Increase
Date: 6 November 2018

I believe that the proposed increase for SDM COASTER Regional 30-day/monthly fare from $41.25 to $65.00 is excessive. This equates to a 58% increase, which is far larger than any of the other fare products. It appears to be targeted to cover your proposed decrease for the Youth Fare from $82.50 to $62.50, a 21% decrease. The difference suggests to me that you arrived at these figures based on usage by youth at about 3 times usage by SDM passengers to “balance” the net revenue from these two sources.

I live near the Solana Beach Coaster Station so after I retired in 2003 I switched from driving to public transit for most trips using a COASTER Regional 30-day pass. I average 5-6 trips a month, usually accompanied at my train destination by an MTS bus or trolley transfer. Some months when I took fewer trips I “lost” compared to the cost of purchasing individual tickets, but it was worth the convenience to not have to purchase a ticket at every station.

If the proposed fare increase takes effect I will likely switch to driving for future trips, particularly those that involve transfers, which most of mine do.
To MTS:

I am against the raise of a S-D-M month 19 pass — especially if the youth pass is cut by so much.

I propose this:
Raise adult to $75.00
Price youth at $40.00
Price S.D.M. at $32.00
(30 day/monthly) This way, everyone gets a small increase.

Your other proposals I agree with. I'm a many year rider with MTS because I no longer drive — so if I want to go anywhere it's my bus or trolley, but an $8.00 increase is too much.

Susan E. Pettit
I am a retired Oceanside school district employee and retired California Army National Guard. I was deployed to the LA Riots in 1992, the Northridge earthquake in 1994 and more recently to the Global War on Terrorism in 2003-2004.

I am told that there are 3.2 million residents in San Diego County of which one hundred thousand are visually impaired.

The recent proposed Lift fee hike is attached. The proposed increase for disabled riders is vague at best. Please refer to page two last line, highlighted.

The language in the first column reads in part, Lift fee will be related to the breeze/sprinter route needed to complete trip. The third column reflects a $5.00 instead of $5-15.00 one way price.

The omission of a scheduled price makes me think that the disabled passengers are such an insignificant amount of riders, that such attention in a proposed schedule is unwarranted.

If we, the disabled, are a very minor portion of the overall ridership of NCTD, then may I suggest that the disabled riders receive a carve out and retain the current cost of $3.50 one way.

Currently in North County, disabled Lift riders pay three dollars and fifty cents one way for a Lift ride. They also have an NCTD photo ID card that permits us to ride the fixed bus routes and Sprinter free of charge.

I further suggest that NCTD resume the outreach program that educated and encouraged blind riders to transition some of their Lift rides to fixed/flex routes. This practice was discontinued about fifteen years ago.

William Myers
## PROPOSED FARE CHANGES

- Single one-way fare price ($2.50) for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER and BREEZE
- Addition of a $3 Day Pass for Seniors/Disabled/Medicare and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER and BREEZE ($6 for Rapid Express)
- One discounted pass price of $26 for SDM and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER and BREEZE ($36 for Rapid Express)
- Increasing the minimum age for senior discounts from 60 to 65 years (seniors 60 or older prior to the effective date will remain eligible for reduced fares)
- Price increases for COASTER one-way, Day Pass and 30-Day/Monthly Passes
- Elimination of 2, 3, 4 and 14-day passes
- Elimination of Trolley transfers to align with bus policy
- Elimination of the SPRINTER/BREEZE monthly pass (will now be a $72 to include service on the MTS bus and Trolley)
- Consideration of a $5 or $6 Adult Regional Day Pass

### SINGLE RIDE VIAJE ÚNICO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Product</th>
<th>Pass Type</th>
<th>Tapa de pase</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>Proposed Propuesto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS Bus Autobús MTS</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Trolley Trolley de MTS</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS RURAL</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$5.00-10.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>$2.50-5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD BREEZE</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD SPRINTER</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (1 Zone/Zona)</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (2 Zone/Zona)</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (3 Zone/Zona)</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FLEX (Except/Excepción 372)</td>
<td>Unchanged, Sin cambios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FLEX 372</td>
<td>Unchanged Sin cambios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS ACCESS &amp; NCTD LIFT</td>
<td>Proposed Lift fee is per BREEZE/SPRINTER needed to complete trip Tarifa propuesta de LIFT es para BREEZE/SPRINTER necesario para completar el trayecto</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFT</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DAY AND MONTHLY PASSES PASES DIARIOS y MENSUALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Product</th>
<th>Pass Type</th>
<th>Tapa de pase</th>
<th>Current Day Pass</th>
<th>Proposed Day Pass de un día Propuesto</th>
<th>Current 30-Day/ Month Pass</th>
<th>Proposed 30-Day/ Month Pass de 30 días Propuesto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCTD SPRINTER/ BREEZE</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>Removed Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>Removed Removed</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Pass (MTS Bus, Trolley, Rapid, NCTD BREEZE, SPRINTER)</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00 or $6.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/ Jóvenes*</td>
<td>Youth/ Jóvenes*</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Plus*</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>Removed Removed</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Regional*</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/ Jóvenes*</td>
<td>Youth/ Jóvenes*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER Regional (Rapid Express + all COASTER zones)</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$41.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/ Jóvenes*</td>
<td>Youth/ Jóvenes*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$82.50</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER Regional Zone Passes</td>
<td>1 Zone Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zone Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$161.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zone Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
<td>$182.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SD/M = Senior/Disabled/Medicare *Senior = 65+ Personas mayores/con discapacidades/Medicare Personas mayores: 65+  
*Youth = Ages 6 through 16 (5 & under ride free)  
Jóvenes = entre 6 y 18 años de edad (de 5 y menores viajan gratis)  
*Currently includes all modes except ACCESS, LIFT, MTS Rural, & FLEX 372  
Actualmente incluye todos los modos excepto ACCESS, LIFT, MTS Rural y FLEX 372  
*Premium regional includes Regional Pass modes and MTS Rapid Express and NCTD FLEX (Except FLEX 372)  
Regional Premium incluye modos en Pas regional y MTS Rapid Express y NCTD FLEX. (Excepto por FLEX 372)

---

Esta información está disponible en diferentes formatos bajo solicitud.  
Para solicitar esta información en un formato diferente, por favor llame al (619) 231-1466.
From: albert grant
To: PIO
Subject: Senior fare increases
Date: Friday, October 26, 2018 4:50:25 PM

Sandag:
Why must you always steal money from Seniors who can little afford it?
Why must you give all the money that you steal from us seniors, to reduce the Youth monthly pass cost?
Why did the working people with jobs not get a monthly pass cost increase, but the seniors with no jobs get a 44% rate hike on our monthly pass?
Are you Insane or just too Stupid for words?
Several other cities Do Not charge seniors for a bus pass. Some of those cities are in california and washington state.
Their costs went down as a result. Not up - - Down!
It always costs all public transit companies more money to collect the money, than the money is. Always.
Therefore all public transit companies use the bus fare to just collect the bus fare, and tax subsity money
on top of that, to collect the fare money. Therefore all the cost of actually transporting the passangers
is 100% paid by taxpayer subsidies and 0% from the fare box. Even the cost of passangers using the
transit pass costs the bus company for all the fare tracking computers, and computer maintainance,
and programing,
and electricity to run it, and slower load times ( than if it was free for all passangers and they
loaded in both
front and back doors ), and more cost of wait times for each passanger to have his pass read by the expensive
machines and for the machine to send a message over the cell phone network to check the pass account for payment,
and the cost in more time for the driver to wait while he gets paid an hourly wage, and for the bus
to use up
expensive CNG fuel and whear out the engine while waiting at idle, and increased maintainance
costs on the bus,
and increased costs of the buses because you have to have more buses on all the routes to account for all those
accumulated wait times, and more employee costs to run all those extra buses caused by the extra time it takes
to load fare paying passangers ( especially Cash paying passangers ), and the extra costs of having Fare Inspectors
check everybody to see if they all paid to ride ( they even check on some bus routes ), and the extra costs of the
passes and the machines to load the fares on them and the collecting of the cash from the busses and fare
machines and the counting of all those coins and accounting for them and protecting them from theft.
By the time you have accounted for all the extra cost of collecting fare, you will see that it far exceeds the actual
fare its self. Public transit can never pay for even a small part of its costs, by collecting fares. If you think otherwise,
then you are just fooling yourself. So it is totally silly to think that you can solve anything by raising the
Monthly Pass ( SDM ) cost for seniors. Also it is totally UNFAIR because almost all of the increase in costs of
the SDM monthly pass is to be born by just the seniors and not the ones that have jobs and income that
far exceeds the little that seniors get.
You should not be increasing our costs, you should be making it free for the seniors and disabled who can least
afford what you are charging now, let alone any large increase you are planning. It would save you more money
if you made the SDM pass free, and quit sticking it to seniors every chance you get.
Also every fare increase always causes more people ( seniors and regular adults alike ) to travel in their cars a lot more. More car traveling causes more wear and tear on all the roads, more need for Ambulance services from low income seniors ( many of whom should not be driving in the first place ) and others ( like pedestrians and regular adults ), who get involved in car accidents in direct proportion to all increases in car traffic caused by more people choosing to drive rather than pay the increase in monthly pass cost . low income seniors can not pay for the ambulance services, and so the city will pay the extra cost. Even one more accident can cost the city more than all the bus fare increases that the city and sandag might try . Even just one more highway accident by another ex-bus passanger that would rather drive, than pay the increase in monthly pass fare, can even cost the hundreds of thousands of commuters more dollars worth of wasted time because of road delays , than they would have suffered from a normal commute day . This extra wasted time results in less overall money earned by those delayed wage earners, going on their commute to and from work, results in less money ( in the millions of $ $ , per lost hour per each commuter ) available to spend in San Diego on goods and services (and less property tax and sales tax and other government fees, from less taxable income) which will lower home values which will lower property taxes because fewer newer workers move here, to pay the higher home prices ( prices only go up because more people bid on the properties ) because less money is available to be spent on things people want , because they earned less, because they spent extra time waiting for another accident to be cleared from the road, caused by more drivers that did not want to pay the extra cost of the senior ( SDM ) pass. Anytime less money is available, the less the taxes are available to be collected. At the same time the city must subsidise the extra cost of more unpaid ambulance costs from seniors that can not pay, and more hospital emergency room costs from the increase of accidents by persons that can not pay, and increased police services from more traffic, and more road repair costs. All while the tax collections go down due to workers spending longer times waiting in traffic, for slow seniors to get out of the way or for the extra accidents to be cleared , giving the workers less work time, and therefore less income to spend and for taxes to be paid from all that lost business . Free bus passes save money for the city overall, and a good place to start is by not charging seniors . When the city sees the savings from no cost senior fares, the economy of it all will be appearant to all who look . thank you for reading all of this very long but necessary explanation . Albert
To Whom It May Concern:

I understand that the plan is to raise the bus fair for seniors and disabled from the current cost of $18.00 to $26.00 as of December 10, 2018. I also understand the bus fair for compass cards, day passes, and non-senior, non-disabled persons will not change. What is the logic behind this proposed plan? This doesn’t make sense, and this is a big mistake! As a blind individual on a fixed income, I am concerned that this will not only adversely affect seniors and disabled persons themselves, but it would also most likely decrease ridership among this population. Ridership is crucial in maintaining the financial stability of SD Transit, and this is what this company aims for. Decreased ridership has the opposite effect. There are many seniors and individuals with disabilities who ride the public bus and trolley, and for anyone on a fixed income, $8.00 is a big increase. Our population deserves to travel without extra cost, and it’s not fair to raise senior/disabled bus fairs when everything else remains unchanged! I am asking whom this may concern to please reconsider this costly increase in bus fair for those who are senior, and/or disabled on a fixed income. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amy R. Gilstrap
Hello,

Like my fellow public transit commuters, I’m disappointed by the proposed rate hike. I take the Coaster from Santa Fe Depot to Encinitas at least four days a week, and I believe the cost of riding the train is expensive enough as it is.

Raising rates is not likely to increase ridership, which should be the goal. Rate hikes will only encourage more commuters to drive, which will only contribute to the region’s awful traffic issues. Please don’t penalize those of us who choose to go green and are committed to sustainable transportation in San Diego County.

Thank you,

AMY STEELE
MARKETING COORDINATOR

DUDEK
605 THIRD STREET
ENCINITAS, CALIFORNIA 92024
T: 111
WWW.DUDEK.COM
Dear MTS team,

As we were spending last weekend some time as tourists in San Diego we would like to comment on the planned changes and revisions to Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance. We agree that fare increases are necessary but kindly ask you to reconsider the elimination of X-day-passes as these are a perfect fit for tourists. Every major city we have travelled offers day-passes to relieve some of the stress that tourists have and to make sure that the public transport and its fares will not be an obstacle to discover the city/area. In SD we used our 4-days-passes quite a lot and would have been moving around way less without them. Thank you very much in advance for reconsidering this elimination of the day-passes!

Best regards,

André Willenbrecht
To whom it concerns; California is so expensive to live with high rent & costs, I'm a native Californian & a senior/disabled person - I go to free meals to eat & housing/utilities will take most of my money! too many poor people w no housing or work to raise fares. find the money from another source thank you d
RE Fare increases: I strongly urge focus on increasing ridership, not fare-box economics. More frequency on existing routes and more routes to unserved streets are a prerequisite to make MTS a reasonable alternative to car use. Each car-driver converted to MTS saves transportation funding by reducing reduced road maintenance, and reduced cost to remove carbon (which is very expensive). James Condon Zip 92110
Dear MTS, NCTD, Sandag,

I'm contacting you as a long time Coaster rider (since 2010) regarding your fare increase notice. I'm including my city council member and others on this comment as well as I feel it affects our city.

I read your notice with your reasons for why the increase. It states in broad terms, operational costs have increased & fare revenues have decreased. Also, included is a desire to simplify the fare structure.

The city has a stated Mobility Plan and a Climate Action Plan. In both, we have important goals for regarding our public transit including creating ways to increase ridership. I think your "notice" is counterproductive to our community's goals. You are suggesting a general overall increase in fares, which is not a way to increase ridership, it's a plan to decrease ridership and go into a repeating loop of increase fares then losing ridership until you have a broken, reduced system.

If your goal was to increase ridership to boost revenue. Which would be a goal more aligned with the city's goals, then you would consider a model to boost monthly / subscription ridership to have a strong and consistent base.

Rather than an overall increase, you would consider increasing only daily, one-trip rates while maintaining or even decreasing subscription rates. And market the plan to customers as such, that you are looking for ridership. This is normal business practices to drive up customer retention! By providing benefits and discounts to join you create a more consistent revenue base and a larger community committing to use public transit on a normal basis.

I didn't see any link or access to any factual information to back up these first 2 reasons your notice states. Can you provide this? Seems like you have this to make this claim. Can you also provide how this breaks down in fares from monthly passengers vs. daily tickets and fares? Also, what do you include as "operational costs"? Do you include the upgrades to the blue line to extend to La Jolla? Or the station modification at the Poinsettia Coaster station? And are you doing anything to just reduce these operational fees?

Overall, your proposal seems short-sighted and not addressing the city's broader needs. I urge you to consider better options to build ridership vs. a general fee increase.

By the way, this "notice" was not easy to find. Normally information like this is placed on seats of the Coaster – this time it was hidden from view in the bin with rider pamphlets.

I would appreciate a response (e-mail or in writing) to this comment.

Sincerely,

Bill Leach
Se llevarán a cabo seis reuniones públicas en el condado de San Diego para recibir comentarios sobre la propuesta para modificar las tarifas del transporte público que afectarían las áreas de servicio del Sistema de Transporte Público Metropolitano (MTS, por sus siglas en inglés) y el Distrito de Transporte Público del Condado Norte (NCTD, por sus siglas en inglés). Se propone que todos los cambios aprobados en la Ordenanza regional integral de tarifas y en la Ordenanza de TransNet entren en vigor a partir del 27 de enero de 2019.

¿Por qué es necesario ajustar las tarifas?
- Los costos operativos han aumentado en los últimos 10 años, mientras que los ingresos por tarifas han disminuido y las tarifas no han aumentado.
- Un aumento en los ingresos por tarifas ayudará a mantener un alto nivel de servicio.
- Estos cambios simplificarán la estructura de tarifas en toda la región.

A continuación encontrará información sobre el programa de reuniones públicas. Los clientes también pueden llamar al (619) 595-5321, enviar un correo electrónico a pio@sandag.org, o entregar comentarios por escrito si no les es posible asistir a una de las reuniones. Luego de recibir y analizar los comentarios del público, las Directivas de la Asociación de Gobiernos de San Diego (SANDAG) y las transacciones de las reuniones incluirán una recomendación final, que en su momento el público también tendrá la oportunidad de opinar.

### REUNIONES PÚBLICAS

#### Lunes, 22 de octubre de 2018
5:30 a 7:30 p.m.
Chula Vista Library, Civic Center Auditorium
356 F St., Chula Vista, CA 91910

#### Martes, 23 de octubre de 2018
2:00 a 4:00 p.m.
MTS Board Room
1255 Imperial Ave., 10th Fl., San Diego, CA 92101

#### Miércoles, 24 de octubre de 2018
6:00 a 8:00 p.m.
El Cajon Police Department, Community Room
100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020

#### Lunes, 29 de octubre de 2018
3:30 a 5:30 p.m.
City Heights Library, Community Room
3795 Fairmount Ave., San Diego, CA 92105

#### Martes, 30 de octubre de 2018
12:00 a 2:00 p.m.
Escondido Library, Turritene Room
239 S Kalmia St., Escondido, CA 92025

#### Jueves, 1 de noviembre de 2018
6:00 a 8:00 p.m.
Oceanside Library, Community Room
330 N Coast Hwy, Oceanside, CA 92054

### Formularios para comentarios disponibles en sandag.org/fares

Comentarios públicos
Para enviar sus comentarios por escrito, hágalo por correo postal a:
SANDAG P.O. BOX 800, San Diego, CA 92101
Correo electrónico: pio@sandag.org
Plaza para enviar los comentarios públicos: 9 de noviembre de 2018

Las reuniones públicas se llevarán a cabo en un formato de evento de puertas abiertas, donde los participantes pueden asistir en cualquier momento de la reunión, hacer preguntas al personal, completar tarjetas de comentarios o hacer comentarios públicos a los presentadores y el público presente. De conformidad con la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA, por sus siglas en inglés), SANDAG asistirá a las personas que requieran ayuda para participar en las Reuniones públicas que figuran anteriormente. Si requiere tal asistencia, comuníquese con SANDAG al (619) 699-1900 al menos con 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión.

### PUBLIC MEETINGS

#### Monday, October 22, 2018
5:30-7:30 p.m.
Chula Vista Library, Civic Center Auditorium
356 F St., Chula Vista, CA 91910

#### Tuesday, October 23, 2018
2:00-4:00 p.m.
MTS Board Room
1255 Imperial Ave., 10th Fl., San Diego, CA 92101

#### Wednesday, October 24, 2018
6:00-8:00 p.m.
El Cajon Police Department, Community Room
100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020

#### Monday, October 29, 2018
3:30-5:30 p.m.
City Heights Library, Community Room
3795 Fairmount Ave., San Diego, CA 92105

#### Tuesday, October 30, 2018
12:00-2:00 p.m.
Escondido Library, Turritene Room
239 S Kalmia St., Escondido, CA 92025

#### Thursday, November 1, 2018
6:00-8:00 p.m.
Oceanside Library, Community Room
330 N Coast Hwy, Oceanside, CA 92054

### Comment forms available at sandag.org/fares

Public Comments
To submit your comments in writing, mail to:
SANDAG P.O. BOX 800, San Diego, CA 92101
Email: pio@sandag.org
Deadline for public comments: November 9, 2018

*Spanish language interpretation will be available at these locations and dates. To request interpretation services in other languages, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting time.*

The public meetings will be conducted in an open house format where participants can attend at any time during the meeting, ask questions of staff, complete comment cards, or make their public comments to the Efficient and Efficient in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). SANDAG will accommodate participants who require assistance in order to participate in the public meetings listed above. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request the materials in an alternate format and/or additional language(s), please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
**PROPOSED FARE CHANGES**
- Single one-way fare price ($2.50) for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER and BREEZE
- Addition of a $3 Day Pass for Seniors/Disabled/Medicare and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER and BREEZE ($6 for RapidExpress)
- One discounted pass price of $26 for SDM and Youth for MTS bus, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER and BREEZE ($36 for RapidExpress)
- Increasing the minimum age for senior discounts from 60 to 65 years (seniors 60 or older prior to the effective date will remain eligible for reduced fares)
- Price increases for COASTER one-way, Day Pass and 30-Day/Monthly Passes
- Elimination of 2, 3, 4 and 14-day passes
- Elimination of Trolley transfers to align with bus policy
- Elimination of the SPRINTER/BREEZE monthly pass (will now be $72 to include service on the MTS bus and Trolley)
- Consideration of a $5 or $6 Adult Regional Day Pass

**SINGLE RIDE VIAJE ÚNICO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Product</th>
<th>Pass Type</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>Proposed Propuesto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS Bus Autobús MTS</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Trolley Trolley de MTS</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS RURAL</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$5.00-10.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.50-5-5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD BREEZE</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD SPRINTER</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (1 Zone/Zona)</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (2 Zone/Zona)</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER (3 Zone/Zona)</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>Same Igual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FLEX (Except/Excepción 372)</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Sin cambios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FLEX 372</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Sin cambios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS ACCESS &amp; NCTD LIFT</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFT</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request. To request, please call (619) 231-1466.
*Esta información está disponible en diferentes formatos bajo solicitud. Para solicitar esta información en un formato diferente, por favor llame al (619) 231-1466.

**CAMBIOS DE TARIFA PROPUESTOS**
- Precio único de tarifa unidireccional ($2.50) para autobús MTS, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER y BREEZE.
- Adición de un pase diario de $3 para personas mayores/con discapacidades/Medicare y jóvenes para autobús MTS, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER y BREEZE ($6 para RapidExpress).
- Precio de pase con descuento de $26 para personas mayores/con discapacidades/Medicare y jóvenes para autobús MTS, Trolley, Rapid, SPRINTER y BREEZE ($36 para RapidExpress).
- Aumento de la edad mínima para descuentos para personas mayores de 60 a 65 años (las personas mayores de 60 antes de la fecha de entrada en vigor seguirán siendo elegibles para las tarifas reducidas).
- Aumento de precios para pases unidireccionales, diarios y mensuales/30 días de COASTER.
- Eliminación de las pases de 2, 3, 4 y 14 días.
- Eliminación de los traslados de Trolley para cumplir con la política de autobuses.
- Eliminación del pase mensual SPRINTER/BREEZE (ahora será de $72 para incluir servicios en autobús MTS y Trolley)
- Consideración de un pase diario regional para adultos con un valor de $5 o $6.

**DAY AND MONTHLY PASSES PASES DIARIOS Y MENSUALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Product</th>
<th>Pass Type</th>
<th>Current Day Pass</th>
<th>Proposed Day Pass</th>
<th>Current 30-Day Monthly Pass</th>
<th>Proposed 30-Day Monthly Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCTD SPRINTER/ BREEZE</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>Removed Removido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>Removed Removido</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Pass (MTS Bus, Trolley, Rapid, NCTD BREEZE, SPRINTER)</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00 or $6.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth* Jóvenes*</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RegionPlus*</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>Removed Removido</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Regional*</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth* Jóvenes*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER Regional (Rapid Express + all COASTER zones)</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$41.25</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth* Jóvenes*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$82.50</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER Regional Zone Passes</td>
<td>1 Zone</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zone</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$161.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zone</td>
<td>Adult Adulto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
<td>$182.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S/D/M = Senior/Disabilidad/Medicare  *Senior = 65+  *Persons mayores/con discapacidades/Medicare  *Personas mayores: 65+  *Youth = Ages 6 through 18 (5 & under ride free)  *Jóvenes = entre 6 y 18 años de edad (de 5 y menores viajan gratis)  *Currently includes all modes except ACCESS, LIFT, MTS Rural, & FLEX 372  *Actualmente incluye todos los modos excepto ACCESS, LIFT, MTS Rural y FLEX 372  *Premium regional includes Regional Pass modes and MTS Rapid Express and NCTD FLEX (Except FLEX 372)  *Regional Premium incluye modos en Pase regional y MTS Rapid Express y NCTD FLEX (Excepto por FLEX 372)
I am a an occasional rider on the lift. I use the Breeze and Sprinter when I can but due to blindness there times when I should use the Lift.

If I were sitting across from you, I would counter propose to carve out a provision that keeps the rate for disabled at $3.50 and an active program from NCTD to educate disabled patrons How to use the Breeze and Sprinter.

I have been told that there are 3.2 million residents in San Diego County, of which 100,000 are blind. Using this data I figure that 5,000 Oceanside residents are blind. I assume that you have not received comments from each of these blind people.

I will stick out my neck and speak for them asking that you raise the price collectively and do not raise the price for the disabled.

I am a resident of Oceanside, retired from OUSD and retired US Army.

Thank you for your time and attention.

-Bill

This email was made possible by the Veterans Administration.
Hi. My name is Brian Korn. I use an SDM pass and ride the bus and Sprinter at least 4 days a week.
I work 9am - 5pm. Sometimes on my way to work or on my way back there is only a single car Sprinter. This seems ridiculous to me to be running a single car Sprinter during the rush hours. I have attached a picture of what it feels like to ride the single car train during those hours. (From the movie Schindler's List.) I feel like I'm on the "pack 'em in like sardines" Amtrak. That's why when I go to Orange County I ride the Metrolink. I always get a seat to myself. It's very disappointing to have to ride a crowded single car Sprinter at the 5pm hour after a long day at work. I feel like someone in the attached picture.
I wouldn't mind paying a higher fare if I was guaranteed to always ride a double car Sprinter for my commute. I understand the Sprinters need maintenance. But it shouldn't be done at the 8am or 5pm hours.

Please contact me if you have any questions. I would appreciate a response so I know someone reads this.

Thank you,
Brian Korn
Dear Sirs,

When I saw you were thinking about raising the prices of bus passes for seniors, my first thought was don’t they realize that will make them lose money?

Probably not. They don’t realize COLA increases in Social Security have already been eaten up by increases in Medi-Cal and decreases in SNAP (every time the government increases the amount they send me, I fall further behind). People have to cut costs somewhere. If it’s choice of taking the bus and having less money to buy food, or walking to the grocery store and having more money for food, older people tend to choose the latter. Unless they’re physically unable to walk.

So your increase will improve the health of those seniors who can walk, but those who can’t, will screw up your bus schedules. Why? Because older people who can’t walk long distances, usually use walkers (or in the case of males, refuse to use walkers) and between maneuvering the walker up onto the bus – with or without the ramp – and fumbling to get the money into the slot, moving down the aisle to the senior seating, sitting down, folding up the walker, it takes five minutes before the bus can continue on its’ route. And that’s just for one person.

The people who can walk, will ride the bus less often, if at all. And for the most part these were people who either weren’t buying a monthly pass or who will decide that an eight dollar increase in too much for the number of times per month they ride the bus. (If you’d only raised the price to twenty dollars, people would have grumbled, but figured it wasn’t that bad).

Another problem: Raising the day pass from $5 to $6 means people have push a five dollar bill AND a one dollar bill into the slot – while the bus waits, and waits, and waits. People have enough trouble getting one bill to go through, now you want them to get two to go through.

So now that I’ve told you what you shouldn’t do to increase your profits, I’ll tell you what you should do. The people who set up schedules don’t seem to understand people will ride more if it’s convenient and the cost is reasonable. That’s one of the trade offs of mass transit. It’s not really convenient. (it takes me and hour and a half or more, for what would be a ten minute drive) but if it’s cheap enough people will put up with the inconvenience.

First: Offer special deals on monthly passes. Maybe for a year, lower the cost of the regular monthly pass to $50.00 (or at least $60.00) Why? Because for people who work at minimum wage jobs four days a week, it’s cheaper to buy a one way pass ($2.25/2.50), than it is to buy a monthly pass ($72.00).

Second: Run all your buses/trolleys at least every fifteen minutes during the day (6 am to 6 pm) or at least during morning and evening rush hours (6-9 am, 3-6 pm) and the middle of the day on weekends (10 am–2 pm) for at least a year and see how much more money you make.

Third: (and this one you can’t do even though it would increase paying ridership) Work with Health and Human Services to have them transport homeless people, rather than having homeless riding mass transit.

Why? Because a lot of people who’ve tried riding the bus decided against it because
they can’t stand the smell of someone who’s wearing the same clothes for months on end (I’ve held my breath walking past them a time or two) or who has roaches (and who knows what critters you can’t see) crawling over them or their bundles. And you don’t even want to think about stepping over ‘stuff’ they leave behind.

Also, spend more time enforcing your non smoking rules. (I’d really prefer not to get on a bus or trolley with the smell of marijuana so strong, I have to sit by the door and breathe deep every time it opens. The clove smelling ones aren’t quite so bad). And you really need to push back against those people vaping. At least at the trolley station or bus stop I can move away from them. The problem is the children who can’t. Last thing you need is parents suing you because their kid developed pediatric cancer.

Thank you for your time. I hope you will consider my input in making your decisions.

Sincerely,
Catherine Siebert
Hi, my name is Charles Freeman and I purchase a monthly compass pass. I am a San Diego native 73 yrs. I am very happy to pay 26.00 for the pass instead of 18.00. I rely on the excellent transit system every day.

I think the system can be better and a raise in fares should help in keeping the schedules frequent and add new routes.

I am very excited about the new trolley line. I think route 10 should go down Washington between Park and Fifth Ave. This would avoid one of the slowest sections of the route as well as the busy intersection at Fifth and University. Route 10 should be made as efficient as possible to be an East/West connection to the new trolley line.

Thank you for an excellent job in providing San Diego with public transportation.

Charles Freeman
Your proposed rate increases are outrageous and unearned. If approved, I will stop purchasing my monthly (or 30 day) pass and resume my driving commute from San Diego to Carlsbad.

Your current service levels are not deserving of any rate increases. Your reliability is so bad as to, by itself, make many riders consider abandoning the Coaster on a weekly basis. The connections with NCTD buses have become consistently unreliable, with often times (just this week provided two examples in two days) where the connecting buses (444 and 445) are not present when the train drops off.

There is human excrement and urine in the tunnel and surrounding areas of the Old Town Transit station and the invasion of CMH discharges and homeless renders the parking lot a dangerous environment at any hour of the day, but especially in the dark, early morning hours.

Your unilateral decision to reduce service levels to "4-car" service has provided a much more crowded environment making it difficult to conduct work. The lack of consistency between 4 and 5 car service has disrupted the boarding process as riders typically line up where they know doors will be available. With a shift if the number of cars, these locations are impossible to define. The wifi service on the Coaster has always been bad and basically unusable.

The Coaster trains are filthy. Both internally and externally, the cars are dirty and trash is left between seats and stains are left to remain on the floors. By the afternoon commute, many of the bathrooms are so soiled as to be unusable. You provide virtually no security on the trains - I have seen one deputy sheriff in the 18 months I have been riding.

Please consider this a strong objection to your proposed rate increases until such time as your service provides value for the cost. Rest assured, every dollar I save by not subscribing to a pass, will be spent on ensuring defeat of the SANDAG and NCTD board members if this is passed.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Chris R. Carlson
This submittal responds to the media release dated October 18, 2018 on this subject. This is made as a formal hearing submittal to the parties conducting the public meetings, and to the governing board members of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and North County Transit District (NCTD).

From the public notice, it appears that public transportation fare increases are being considered for the bus and rail systems operated by MTS and NCTD. Such fare increases will continue a trend in our region of fare increases over time, which have the effect of reducing affordable access to public transit for all populations, especially those which are most dependent on such transportation; and for the greater populations of potential riders who are looking for cost comparability to private automobiles.

We have been in a downward spiral of fare increases, causing decreased financial accessibility and cost attractiveness, causing reduced ridership and reduced fare recovery, leading to more fare increases, and so on. New fare increases may seem attractive to increase revenues, but will continue this downward spiral. As an alternative, a truly cost-attractive public transit network which provides increased frequency and time-comparability to the private automobile, will increase ridership and operating fare recovery. A new approach to the region’s public transportation system is needed.
I'm both saddened and outraged by the proposed minimum age increase from 60 to 65 years old for senior discounts.

I found myself homeless and fully unprepared for that type of lifestyle. My saving grace after years of transitional housing and living in a tent on the streets was the senior discount for a monthly pass through MTS at age 60.

Forced to apply for my early Social Security benefits at age 60 due to an injury finally made it possible for me to enter a senior homeless prevention program. Thankfully, the injury wasn't permanent so I also was able to receive the senior discount on a monthly pass which enabled me to look and find a part time job.

If the minimum age was 65 years before I could receive the senior discount I wouldn't be celebrating having my own apartment until this coming December when I have my 65th birthday. I'm celebrating 3 years of not being homeless thanks to discounted senior rates at age 60. This increase in the minimum age will hurt a lot of seniors and most likely they will be forced to quit their jobs due to their inability to get to and from work and they too may end up living on the streets.

The charitable (free) monthly passes that SANAG donates to places such as St Vincent de Paul and the passes that are purchased at discounted rates by the clients at the YWCA should be stopped before increasing the minimum age limit to 65 years because clients at these transitional housing complexes don't have to deal with high rent, purchasing food and all the other costs such as clothing and hygiene products. I'm sure there are more charities that SANDAG donates to but I can only state for a fact about the two mentioned above because I was a client at both.

Those riders that only purchase a daily pass while visiting San Diego or coming downtown to eat or attend a game should be the riders that absorb the cost increases. They aren't the riders that will go hungry and/or not be able to pay their rent due to their inability to purchase a monthly pass at a discounted rate until they are 65 years of age.

Please, don't add to the numbers of seniors living on the streets. Keep the minimum age at 60 not 65.

Thank you.

Deborah Cluck

I'm forever grateful for the senior discount at age 60 that enabled me to rise above being homeless.
Dear MTS,

I work for a non profit organization named Urban Corps and like most of the corps members, I rely on Urban Corps' ability to purchase month pass stickers in bulk at a discount in order to travel to work. Will this be affected by the proposed changes?

Regards,
Derek Selby
While I am not available to make the meetings you have scheduled concerning the proposed fare increases, I would like to supply you with my opinion concerning same.

I have been taking the Coaster from Carlsbad to San Diego for almost 20 years. Over the past 3-5 years, the service has declined considerably - from mechanical issues, old dirty interior cab cars, dirty windows, lack of communication from NCTD management and Board of Directors and most importantly too many train cancellations.

I have prepared an Xcel spreadsheet from July 1, 2018 to the present information taken from NCTD's Twitter account (while you will see a gap from 10/18 to 10/29 because I just got frustrated with spending the time to do this), you will note there were 128 train delays/cancellations; 21 of those were not the fault of NCTD due to trespassers, police activity and Del Mar cliff collapses - there were 20 train cancellations (11 in the month of October alone) and 87 delayed trains due to mechanical issues, PTC and the like.

For SANDAG and NCTD to feel now is the right time to impose a fare increase is unbelievable. I have been in communication with Matt Tucker and his team for over 2 years discussing the train schedules and the purchase of new locomotives. All of my communications seems to have fallen on deaf ears. I suggested over a year ago that NCTD should be looking into purchasing new locomotives. Those locomotives have now been "ordered" but will not be received until the Spring of 2021 and then there will be a delay for those locomotives to be put on rails. It is anticipated that the new locomotives will be placed on the rails in late 2021. The current locomotives will not last until 2021.

I strongly feel that increasing the Coaster passes at this time is not appropriate. I also feel that if you look at the ridership over the past several months you will note that it has declined because of the declining service we are receiving. While NCTD Management will differ with that opinion, I am on the train 2-3 times a week and hear the unhappy passengers.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please feel free to give me a call.

Farika Rickabaugh
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TRAIN</th>
<th>DELAY</th>
<th>REASON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Train meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>Late turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>CANCELLED</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>CANCELLED</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>Late turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Door issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>CANCELLED</td>
<td>Mechanical @ Solana Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Police Activity - Encinitas*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Passenger issue*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Passenger issue*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>Trespasser - Encinitas*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/18</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>Train congestion/late Amtrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Passenger assistance/door malfunctions*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/21</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Large crowds*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/21</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Late incoming 684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>CANCELLED</td>
<td>Trespasser - Poinsettia*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Switch Malfunction north of Old Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>Earlier mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>No reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>PTC &amp; Mechanical @ Solona Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Train traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/25</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>Disabled Amtrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Broken crossing arm South of CBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Following late Amtrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Late turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/27</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/27</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Late turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/27</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Late turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Late turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Late turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/29</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>PTC &amp; mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>Late turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>Late turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>CANCELLED</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Train congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Train congestion &amp; PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Train congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Train congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Speed restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Train congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td>PTC issues - returned to Solana Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>To assist 660 passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13</td>
<td>663</td>
<td></td>
<td>CANCELLED Mechanical - passengers on Amtrak - 10 late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>Disabled 660 on track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>630</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
<td>CANCELLED Due to 630 mechanical issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>Earthquake**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>665</td>
<td></td>
<td>CANCELLED Earthquake**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Late MetroLink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td>CANCELLED Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20</td>
<td>655</td>
<td></td>
<td>CANCELLED Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cliff Collapse**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/28</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Train meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/28</td>
<td>ALL TRAINS</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Speed restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31</td>
<td>ALL TRAINS</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Speed restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Late incoming 631 &amp; speed restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>No reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Individual tampering with train**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Passenger medical attention**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>ALL TRAINS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed restrictions - up to 10 minutes due to weekend track construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>ALL TRAINS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed restrictions - up to 20 minutes due to weekend track construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Speed restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>Late incoming equipment (speed restrictions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Passenger assistance*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Train meet with 636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Train meet with 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>ALL TRAINS</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Speed restrictions in Encinitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>663</td>
<td></td>
<td>CANCELLED Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>Stalled Amtrak 769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Late incoming equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9/22   61   -5   PTC
9/24   638  -12  No reason
9/27   644  -6   Passenger assistance**
9/27   660  -10  Mechanical
9/27   663  -10  Late incoming equipment
9/28   645  -10  No reason
9/29   692  -34  Mechanical
9/29   697  -30  Disabled freight train
10/4   651  CANCELLED Mechanical (in Solana Beach)
10/4   656  CANCELLED Due to 651 cancellation
10/4   661  CANCELLED
10/4   655  -15  Train traffic
10/5   645  -60  Bluff collapse**
10/5   654  -45  Bluff collapse**
10/5   651  -20  Bluff collapse**
10/5   655  -15  Bluff collapse**
10/5   655  -20  Bluff collapse**
10/5   662  -20  Bluff collapse**
10/9   645  -8   Passenger assistance**
10/10  663  -10  Train traffic
10/10  656  CANCELLED Mechanical
10/10  661  CANCELLED Bus bridge due to 656 cancellation
10/15  ALL TRAINS potentially late due to weekend work
10/16  638  -15  no reason
10/17  662  CANCELLED mechanical
10/17  663  CANCELLED mechanical
10/17  665  No service from Santa Fe to Sorrento Valley
10/18  638  CANCELLED mechanical - using same train that broke down the night before
10/18  657  CANCELLED mechanical from 638
10/19  644  -12  mechanical in Sorrento Valley
10/29  660  CANCELLED mechanical
10/29  663  CANCELLED mechanical
Here's a breakdown of proposed MTS 30 day pass increases. MTS is trying to align the SDM & Youth prices to be the same. But why do this at the expense of the people who can least afford it. Largest increases by far affects SDM riders with 30 Day Passes with Youth 30 Day Passes drastically reduced.

MTS Regional 30 Day Pass Adult 0%
MTS Regional 30 Day Pass SDM plus 44%, $18 to $26
MTS Regional 30 Day Pass Youth minus 38%, $36 to $26

MTS Premium Regional 30 Day Pass Adult 0%
MTS Premium Regional 30 Day Pass SDM plus 44%, $25 to $36
MTS Premium Regional 30 Day Pass Youth minus 39%, $50 to $36
Is the age for the senior citizen rate going to be raised from 60 to 65 with the new proposed coaster fare increases?
I am a senior now.

Eirik Einarsson
Caltrans District 11 Safety Specialist
Phone # 619 688 6667
Fax # 619 688 3290
M.S. 251
eirik.einarsson@dot.ca.gov
Dear SANDAG Board of Directors,

My name is Eric Reese and my public comment is on the proposal to consider integrating the San Diego Compass Card with the Amtrak Pacific Surfliner for payment of Pacific Surfliner fares via a Compass Card. To pay for Pacific Surfliner fares with a Compass Card, a passenger would present their Compass Card to the train conductor for validation and payment. The conductor would “tap” the Compass Card to their iPhone ticket scanner to check that the Compass Card is valid, meaning that there is no hold on the card, the card has not expired, and that the card has stored value that is greater than the minimum fare for the Pacific Surfliner. If the iPhone scanner shows valid, then the conductor would ask the passenger for their origin and destination station pairs. Once entered into the iPhone the iPhone would calculate the fare due. The conductor would then tell the passenger the fare and would tap their card to their iPhone scanner to deduct the Pacific Surfliner fare from the Compass Card’s stored value. With the use of a Bluetooth mobile printer attached to the conductor’s belt, a receipt would then print serving as the official ticket and proof of payment for the fare. There could also be an option for the phone to embed an electronic transfer to the Compass card that can be used to transfer to other public transit agencies in San Diego County. My hope is that you would please consider this proposal and turn it over to SANDAG staff for a possible coordination between SANDAG, San Diego Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Amtrak, and the LOSSAN Corridor Agency for a fare payment integration. The fare integration would require a memorandum of understanding between stakeholders, a Compass Card back office server that would connect to the Amtrak iPhone scanner and would reconcile fares collected, and updated business rules between stakeholders that address the reconciliation of fares collected as well as the appropriation of fares collected to the LOSSAN Agency for Pacific Surfliner Operating Expenses. Integrating the Compass Card with the Pacific Surfliner Service would help reduce the need to buy separate fares for the Pacific Surfliner service and other public transit agencies and would help increase transfer connectivity. Thank you for your time and consideration of this important proposal.

Sincerely,

Eric Reese
Fare Changes are not fare! If you increase your prices for all is fare. BUT TO INCREASE COST TO SDM, AND LOWER THE COST FOR YOUTH NOT FARE. This would be hard for me a senior to pay the increase. Thank you a Senior from Oceanside

Esther Simon
I have lived in San Diego for almost 30 years and have been using the North County pass, now known as the Breeze monthly pass for 26 years without missing a month. I am firmly opposed to your attempt to eliminate this pass and force riders to use the more expensive regional pass. From $59 to $72, this is a 22% increase per month, which is quite significant. With the increase of other expenses (rent, utilities, medical cost, and other bills) this is making life very difficult for people who are encouraged to use mass transit. You are not helping!

Thank you for attention to this message.

Sincerely,

Mr. Ez Udo

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone
Sandag pio:

Why is it that you have decided to increase the monthly Pass fares on the backs of Seniors and Disabled who are mostly on fixed incomes, with no increase on the monthly Pass fares of the Working able bodied Adults who have the current and future income to pay for such increases?

The Senior Pass (SDM) is our only Lifeline to the Senior services that we need to survive. A 44% increase in monthly fare just for Seniors and Disabled, and NO monthly pass fare increase, on those (Adult pass) who can best afford it is Unconscionable.

It is obvious that you are trying to pay for the Decrease (27%) in Youth monthly pass fares, by sticking the Seniors with the Bill.

It is also obvious that you want to take a cut of our very small Social Security increase for yourselves, without any regard to our greatly increased other costs of living. Our very small social security increase does not begin to pay for all of just the increases that the City of San Diego has mandated on us Seniors and Disabled. Most of us Seniors living on fixed incomes over the last 10 years (the very 10 years you complain about your cost increases) from 2008 to 2018 have lost a large part of our pensions, like IRAs and the lower (.01%) bank interest on our savings (which was 5%), due to Government manipulations of the currency and bond interest (including lower city bond interest) has put us in a Much Poorer state than we were prior to 2008.

It is Not the backs of Seniors and Disabled where the burden should be placed. If you are really interested in reducing the increased Operational Costs, then do what is done in almost all other countries. Stop collecting Cash Fares on board busses.

You already do not take cash fares on board Trolleys. You already require a pre-purchased Ticket/Pass to ride a Trolley. There is no reason to believe that only Vons/Albertsons/Safeway stores are the only ones that are interested in drawing more customers into their stores by having Automatic Cash/Pass machines in many of their stores. The California DMV now has automatic cash collection machines in many stores (which draws in more customers for the store) to pay the "California department of motor vehicles" cash money for registration renewals and other fees, and eliminates trips to the dmv offices and the clerk's time to process the cash and paperwork, that the machines do for very little cost.

The MTS/Sandag could put such machines (the same type that is at SDSU college) in many stores and other convenient locations, to eliminate cash fares on buses. San Francisco already has many such machines already installed and they issue a temporary paper (electronics inside just like the solid plastic pass) pass at a cost of only 5 cents/pass. It costs way more than 5 cents to collect the cash fare on a bus. San Francisco Municipal Railroad (MUNI), uses the Exact Same Pass system as San Diego does. Also the same in Beijing china (who also have, no cash fares on buses).
Elimination of the cash fare on board busses, will reduce passenger loading wait times. This will reduce bus headways and allow fewer busses to do the same job. This will save money on fuel while the bus waits to load cash paying passengers, and on the bus driver hourly wages. Less wait time = less cost. Also allow passengers to load on both front and rear doors with the pass (just like they do in San Francisco). Both methods save lots of $$$. Installing a few more Bus Pass Cash machines near bus stops is a whole lot less costly, than having cash fare machines on every bus. Also unloading all those cash fare machines from every bus, is also one of your more costly mistakes you make in fare collection. You could also Eliminate all One Way fares. Turn all Fare Tickets into Round Trip only tickets/Day Passes.

If you think that people that travel by airplane need special privilege, then you could have transfer/return ticket machines inside airports, and in other cities/counties/airports/bus terminals and have machines that turn your one day pass (inside the airport etc.) into an out-of-town return option, like they also do in San Francisco.

All of the above suggestions are better than to put a 44% fare increase on the backs of the Seniors and Disabled who can least afford it.

thank you for your consideration of the above suggestions.

Fred
To: Sharon Cooney
Subject: FW: Proposed MTS/NCTD fare changes

For emails regarding the fare changes.

Should I forward those to you to have them logged in?

-----Original Message-----
From: Councilmember Georgette Gomez
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2018 10:21 AM
To: Barrios, Kelvin <KBarrios@sandiego.gov>
Subject: FW: Proposed MTS/NCTD fare changes

MTS related, please respond. Thanks!
-Stopher

-----Original Message-----
From: Councilmember Georgette Gomez
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Councilmember Georgette Gomez <GeorgetteGomez@sandiego.gov>
Cc: CouncilMember David Alvarez <DavidAlvarez@sandiego.gov>
Subject: Proposed MTS/NCTD fare changes

I've just learned of fare changes to be considered by MTS/NCTD. I won't be attending the public meeting(s) but want to let you know my opinion on what has been reported to me.

I applaud reduction of Youth monthly fares to $26. That not only makes public transportation more affordable for a class of riders who may well require public transit to get to jobs and school, but it's an opportunity to help create a habit of using public transportation into their post-age 18 years.

However, I'm horrified at the suggestion of a 45% increase for Senior/Disabled/Medicare riders, a class of public transportation users who most often have finances as limited or more limited than the Youth category. As with the Youth category, most if not all Seniors et al are dependent on use of public transportation, for shopping, for medical appointments as well as for getting out and about which is essential for maintaining a healthy lifestyle, both physical and psychological. Too many seniors and disabled (can be one and the same) end up isolated because of limitations on ability to get about.

Please reconsider this increase and look more closely at the Adult fare which I understand isn't proposed for increase. Even there, the negative impacts on low-wage earners who depend on public transportation must be carefully considered.

Thank you for consideration of my comments.  Judy Swink
I object to your proposed increase in Senior Monthly MTS passes. While you propose no increase in adult free and a decrease in youth fare, your proposal to raise ONLY the senior fare is discriminatory and creates a financial burden on seniors on fixed income and no other means of transportation other than MTS services.

Please reconsider your increase in senior fares.

Gaynell Schenck, Senior
MTS Monthly Fare Pass User
San Diego, CA 92109

Sent via my Samsung Galaxy, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone
Good Morning,

Please see the following concern we received in regards to changes in the fare ordinance.

Best,

Tamara Acevedo
Support Services Coordinator
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System
https://www.sdmts.com/fares-passes-pass-programs/classroom-day-passes
619.233.9558
Comments: To whom it may concern,

I recently noticed that you will be increasing only the fare on disabled passengers. Several of my friends, my boyfriend and I have disabled bus passes. I am the only of us that has the capacity to work. I have epilepsy (which makes me unable to drive because I can lose consciousness any time of any day). However because I am not "unable to work" I do not qualify for S.S.I. and I work 40 hours a week. I walk 30 minutes to the closest bus stop to my home to catch the 848, to get to the El Cajon transit center, catch the green line to the Santee transit center and walk 10 minutes to my job. In summary I get up at 6 a.m. to arrive at work by 9 a.m. I did an interview with an M.T.S. C.E.O. in the downtown office in 2005 for a college class inquiring as to why rates were going to increase by .25 for all riders (when a disabled pass was $11.25 each month). He explained in detail how monthly passes,
transfers and using tokens all resulted in loss of revenue and it was an attempt to recoup your losses. Learning that the current monthly passes are going to increase by $6.00 solely for disabled passengers is extremely inequitable. Many disabled passengers take buses and trolleys because they are unable to drive due to a disability. People on S.S.I. receive barely enough to pay for food and rent, and riding the bus is a necessity for them. When I inquired about this increase on the bus the other day the driver said it was because of the gas tax and the fact that wheel chair riders result in more usage of gas. It seems ironic that society doesn't think of someone as having a disability if it is not apparent (i.e. a wheelchair or other visual limitations). However, when people who are confined to a wheelchair result in an increase in expenses, people who have a disabled pass (regardless of whether or not they are in a wheel chair) suffer an increase in their fare. As I previously noted many people who use the M.T.S. system have no other option. Ask yourselves, not as M.T.S. employees/ C.E.Os but as parents/relatives, if someone you cared about was unable to drive due a disability and was metaphorically eating cheerios off of the floor to survive because of a broken economy, a social security system that attempts to pay as little benefits as possible (to the disabled passengers who ARE on S.S.I.) and the cost of living in San Diego which increases on a daily basis, would you want them to fall through the cracks and become a victim of capitalism? I have some suggestions on how you can improve your services and increase your revenue without increasing the bus rates.

(1) Sync the trolley schedule up with the bus schedule at transit stations. When I catch the green line in Santee to get home from work, I arrive at the El Cajon Transit Center just as the 848 is pulling out of the lot, causing me to have to wait an entire hour for the next bus because it only runs once an hour after 7 p.m.

(2) Alter the bus schedules to where the buses run once every half hour throughout the entire week (not once an hour on the weekend and holidays). Although it is a common misconception that people only work Monday through Friday, many people work on the weekends. Those who don't often go to places such as the beach, Sea World or Balboa Park where they would prefer to avoid driving their own vehicle because of parking rates or difficulty finding a parking space. Others go to supermarkets and the mall and want to avoid the hassle of circling the parking lot searching for an available space.

(3) Reinstate the 854 bus route. No buses run through Lakeside other than the 848 and I used to take the 854 to Grossmont college, Santee and many other locations. When that bus line was discontinued I had to rely on classmates who could drive to take me to school. Many college students would be quick to utilize the M.T.S. system if it were more accessible to them and involved less transferring to other buses and/or the trolley.

(4) If these suggestions do not help you can create a different category for bus passes: In addition to adult, youth and disabled there could be a category for wheel chair passengers.

If you can in good conscience take away the small amount of money
that people with disabilities such as epilepsy, schizophrenia, muscular
dystrophy, P.T.S.D. and any other number of disabilities are able to
save up to regain lost revenue, despite the fact that they suffer daily
beyond your wildest dreams, while they are trying to live as normal a
life as they can in their conditions, then all humanity is lost. Just
remember who is suffering as a result of those decisions when you leave
work in your nice air conditioned vehicle with a stereo and a
comfortable place to sit while you drive home, while disabled people
walk up hills, nurse our blistered feet and eat scraps with no luxuries
in our lives because it doesn't affect you. However one day it will,
whether it is because a loved one becomes disabled or because people
come to the realization that yet again the M.T.S. system has put money
before its passengers. Initially it was just cutting routes, now raising
rates on the most vulnerable. Essentially people pay more and get less.
Your bread and butter, your passengers can only remain blinded by the
greed and lack of empathy for those who need it most, so long. If the
rates do increase, when passengers open their eyes, the M.T.S.
administrators who chose to increase the bus rates on the disabled will
be saying the same thing that the people who voted for Donald Trump are
asking themselves: What did I do? What was I thinking? Why didn't I see
this coming? Is there any way to fix this?
Stop this before it becomes irreversible and your revenue drops even
more. People with disabilities are quite familiar with being targeted as
a way to regain revenue, whether by social security, employers (if they
can work) and corporations. Disabled people stand together to fight this
injustice and together we will make our voices heard. Believe me, it a
noise that you will not forget any time soon.
My roommate (who has schizophrenia and P.T.S.D.) is home most of the
time and can answer any questions you may have. My work hours make it
difficult to reach me at my landline that I provided to you and I rarely
check my e-mail. I sincerely hope, for the sake of all of the disabled
people who ride the M.T.S. system as well as for yours that you take my
suggestions seriously and the concerns of myself and many others to
heart.

Sincerely,

Heather Hurd

[Redacted]
Regarding the fare increase proposed, certainly I can understand the need for budget stability, however the fare increase proposal does not conform to best practices at other agencies in California or nationally, and seems to be concentrated on the goal of simplification to the extent of valuing passengers and future riders, important to meet the State's climate change goals and help arrest global warming.

Conforming the fare to $2.50 is appropriate, but the lack of either fare capping to the $5 day pass or transfers discourages ridership and does not follow best practices. For example, on Northern California Clipper, day pass accumulators allow day passes to be earned and riders to not pay more than the daily fare. On LA Metro, another Cubic system, riders can transfer. Although there is not a day pass accumulator the day pass is set at four times the base fare so is only valuable for individuals running errands or making multiple trips. Someone who may want to ride transit from auto repair, the airport, or a similar one way trip will have to pay the $5 and may use Uber or Lyft for a more direct trip instead. Similarly, individuals who are not sure how many transit trips they may make may be discouraged from riding at all.

In addition, with the elimination of a single fare for Trolley riders, Trolley fare inspectors will be required to intricately know the system and whether someone had "transferred", which may be challenging (i.e. someone boarding at 12th/Imperial riding on the Green Line could have ridden the Orange Line and transferred for a faster trip). Trolley users will need to find TVMs at transfer stations to purchase another ticket in order to legally continue to ride. In practice, few fare inspectors will learn the system and where they are riding, and few tickets will be issued for individuals "transferring" within the Trolley system. It should be noted that VTA, another day pass system, prior to introducing transfers treated the light rail as one "line", and most POP agencies do not have such a system. LA Metro tried it and received significant complaints over "transferring" between subway branches at between subway and light rail at Metro Center so implemented a transfer system.

Therefore, I strongly urge fare capping at the $5 level for base fare and $2.50 for seniors (I am ambivalent about the change to 65, although the norm in Southern California is 60 (OCTA, Riverside) or 62 (Omnitrans, LA Metro)). Do not implement the fare change without capping. It will also encourage usage of the COMPASS card and the valuable data collected.

Elimination of 2, 3, and 4 day passes cause issues during special events such as Comicon and are not necessary. One missing fare component that most other major California agencies (Metrolink, RTA, Omnitrans, LA Metro) have is a 7 day pass. This should be implemented at a cost of one third the 30 day pass, to account for those with specific needs and those who cannot afford a 30 day pass, rather than purchasing multiple day passes. In this instance, at $24, it would provide a commemorative pass for visitors, meet the need previously fulfilled by the four day and 14 day passes, achieve some fare simplification, and conform to best practices at transit agencies across the country. The NCTD staff presentation omitted the number of 14 day passes sold and with greater marketing, especially to lower income individuals, a 7 day pass could be well received.

Sincerely,
Henry Fung
Hi; I do support some increases! I'm age 58, working part time at Vons grocery store. How about increase age of qualifying for senior passes to age 62 not age 65?

Compass card for adults is at $72.00, if it's raised to $82.00, I'll be hurting financially. I pay almost half my income to rent, compass card.

Take care and God Bless you. Hope Manley

P.S. Those rapid buses are really helping thanks!
Oct 9. 2018

Hello, I am a frequent user of both the Trolley and Buses in the MTS system. I was reading the notice you put out about fare changes and revisions in the flyer I took from the bus this week. I am emailing my comments about these changes to you as I am not able to attend the public meeting nearest me as I won't be home from work in time.

My Comments:
1) I believe the increase in fares for single rides is very fair.
2) I think the proposed fare increase for SDM passes is a bit steep, jumping $8 at one time is not very fair. I could see a $3 to $5 dollar increase as being ok, I am a member of the senior and handicapped group and I have a monthly pass as I still work part time. I am working because I still have 2 adopted minor children living with me and to be able to make ends meet each month I need the income a large $8 jump in my bus pass would be hard to cover.
3) I think that the decrease of the youth pass $10 is a bit much, maybe change it from $36 to $30 decreasing it $6 instead of $10.
4) I think the regular passes could be raised from $72 to $75 to help offset so large a raise in seniors and also so large decrease you want on the youth passes.
5) I believe the $3 day pass for youth and SDM is an excellent idea, as they currently have to pay $5 for a day pass and if they only use them on rare occassions it would be more fair.
6) I do believe increasing the minimum age for seniors from 60 to 65 is fair, as your not eligible for Medicare till 65 and full Social Security is now set at 66.
7) I think that you should keep the 2,3 and 4 day passes with a slight increase in price if day pass prices are increased to $6, tourists use these as they are a good way for them to get around the county. I would get rid of the 14 day pass.
8) I also think there should be some tightening up of the passes handed out to handicapped people, I often see people using them that really don't look like they should have them at all.

Thank You for you consideration
Jacqueline Loomer
Transit Rider for 45 years now.

Virus-free. www.avast.com
RE Fare increases: I strongly urge focus on increasing ridership, not fare-box economics. More frequency on existing routes and more routes to unserved streets are a prerequisite to make MTS a reasonable alternative to car use. Each car-driver converted to MTS saves transportation funding by reducing reduced road maintenance, and reduced cost to remove carbon (which is very expensive). James Condon Zip 92110
Sandag:
Such a huge fare increase of over 44% for the seniors and disabled who can least afford it is unheard of in any other city in the USA. Why must you Punish seniors and disabled people who have less money than the fully able-bodied working persons, who can afford the cost increase and can ask their bosses for a wage increase to pay for it. We seniors are no longer working, and have no chance to get an increase from our non-existent bosses.

It looks like you are trying to hijack our very small increase in the cost of living from our small social security money.

Why are you doing this? or do you just hate seniors. It also looks like you are giving our fare increase in our monthly pass, to the youth with a decrease in their pass cost.

You do not need more money. you just need to improve your efficiency, similar to almost all other countries, changes in methods of operation. You are still running a very inefficient method of operation, especially on your methods of fare collection. We need bus ticket machines in many many more stores and other places.

All bus tickets should only be all-day-passes or monthly passes. This alone would cut in Half the cost of collecting cash.

Faster bus loading means lower costs overall. Less time (time is money) and lower fuel costs.

If you were an airline, would you idle your engines while each passenger paid cash, before boarding the airplane?
If not, then why do you do it on buses?

Also eliminate all parking spaces for all Sandag employees, and require 100% of them to take the MTS / North county transit busses and trains to work. Especially the Management (including the elected officials and top management), and have all of them leave their cars at home. If public transit is good enough for us seniors it is good enough for workers and management of the public transit companies. You would then be able to balance your budget by eliminating all non-public-transit transportation activities, for all your employees and management. No more cars, no more parking, no more taxi costs, and no more costs of accounting for such transit activities. And all such employees would be built in inspectors, of all things public-transit, if they were forced to use what they make. Think of all the gas money they would save with a "free bus pass" as part of their pay. You might even save on the next need for a pay hike, to pay the high cost of gas for their cars.

If you are good enough to run public transit, and public transit is good enough for us seniors, then public transit is good enough, to be the employees only method of transportation.

Thank you for listening.

James
You asked for comments, here are mine:

1. Removing the 30-day pass and the SDM Day Pass for Sprinter/Breeze? And raising the one-ride fare? Really? Trying to cut down on your ridership on those services?

2. Raising the monthly SDM Regional Pass from $18 to $26? No, that is too big a jump. $20 is OK. Especially if you are not raising the Adult pass accordingly.

3. Reducing the Youth pass? That’s OK with me. Though I think you should do that for all students.

4. And OK for bringing the Bus fares up to the Trolley fares. They should be the same.
It is morally unfair to increase the fares for the Disable Senior Citizen passages and other Disable persons. These individuals are on fixed disability pensions. When the SANDAG via MTS increase the fares concerning the Elderly, we have to choose between transportation, food, and prescriptions. We may or may not receive a COLA, Cost of Living Increase. Some of the Elderly, receive Veterans Pension/Social Security Pensions. In my case, I receive a V.A. pension. Many Disable seniors are home bound, thus not by chose. The Senior Citizen must not bear the increase of the increase on the back of the Elderly. We deserve the total respect on the younger generation. This must not be on MTS terms. You in force this in moral expense on the Senior Citizen, they will stay home. You have elder parents, one day, will have to deal with this situation. Remember, what goes around comes around. Shame on you, for your financial disrespect to the Senior Citizen.

I am 74 years old, and receive a Veterans disability pension. I also receive a Section 8 assistance for rent.

I contacted The FTA Region Office San Francisco Region 9 Office, San Francisco Federal Office Federal Office 90, 7th St. # 15-300 San Francisco, CA 94103. Their is only one way to solve this unpleasantness, do not increase the projected increases fees for the Senior Citizen Compose Card.

As to the youth, they receive Pell Grant, and Cal Grant. There is funding included for public transportation as the youth attend their formal education. At the same time, this money from other grants/scholarships. The needs of the Senior Citizen are more important than the younger person. They are healthy and strong. The young should think more for the Senior Citizen then themselves.

You have shown the worst disrespect to the Senior Citizen. One day, you will be a Senior Citizen. This will be your pain. Your children will be a possible disrespect to you. I mean what I say, I say what I mean.

John J. Lamendola,
Senior Citizen. and Viet-Nam Era
Dear Clerk, Ms. Tessa Lero and Pio of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG),

Request of those addressed: Please pass this "Recommendation to Reject Metropolitan Transit System's Price Increase on Seniors, Disabled and Medicare (SDM) and Price Decrease on Youth" to the appropriate members in SANDAG who will decide on this recommendation this week of December 17, 2018:

I am writing in hopes that you will reject the recommendation by the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System's Board to impose a 28% percent increase in the monthly fare on "Seniors, Disabled and Medicare" (SDM) customers, and a concomitant 36% decrease in the monthly price for "Youth." It is my unequivocal belief that this unprecedented 28% price increase in fares by MTS on San Diego's most economically-impacted and financially-susceptible demographic group of riders will place an unacceptable burden on San Diego Seniors, Disabled and Medicare riders of MTS's buses and trolleys by expecting them bear more than their share in contributing to the Fairbox Recovery Ratios already seen by SDMTS.

By historical precedent, when Los Angeles Metro raised their fares in September of 2014, bus ridership declined by 5% while rail declined by 2.7%. This week, San Diego's Metropolitan Transit District Board proposed that the recommended increase in fares taking effect next early 2019 will result in a decrease of 1.8 million in ridership (Cooney & Maldonado, Oral Presentation with Accompanying PowerPoint Presentation on December 13, 2018, Item #32). However, based on LA Metro's ridership loss, and MTS weekday ridership of 300,000 trips per weekday, MTS will lose as much as 3.9 million in ridership based on San Diego's 78 million weekday passenger trips per-year. This projection in loss of ridership loss will gravely impact the revenue base and Fairbox Recovery Ratio that currently MTS enjoys; In fact, some agencies report that San Diego MTS Trolley enjoys the highest Firebox Recovery Ratio in the nation of all light rail systems at 55%, and the Blue Line at a remarkable 76.4% (National Transit Database; VoiceofSan Diego.org accessed on December 12, 2018, Gallegos, G.). Nevertheless, with fare increases SDMTS FBRR's could drop significantly.

My impassioned plea to SANDAG's members is that you understand the implication of raising fares by 28% on the least capable of paying such an exorbitant increase in fares on the elderly and disabled that ride our transit system's trolley and buses. This price increase is a targeted, unwarranted and unproportional price increase on our severely disabled and elderly senior citizens who are more often than not mentally and physically challenged, emotionally and psychologically unstable, handicapped or disabled, and are more often than not on a low, subsidized, fixed-income at or near the poverty-level. Many of our seniors have incomes are subsidized with food-
subsidies from third-parties with government-supplied shelter and/or housing and are most often incapable of paying for their monthly food and rent let alone an increase in their bus or trolley fare of 28%! It is unacceptable to expect that this low-income segment of the population pay for the $10 million deficit projected by the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System!

Let's do what is morally ethical and make the right decision to not expect our seniors, disabled or medicare passengers bare the burden of the operational costs of one of the best transit systems with one of the highest Farebox Recovery Ratios in the country. Please rescind the recommendation by the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System Board to raise the fares on Seniors, Disabled and Medicare passengers and not jeopardize MTS ridership in the process!

Sincerely,

Rev. Joseph Marchese
Phone: [redacted]
Buenas tardes
No es justo que desaparezcan los pases mensuales de $59.00. Y lo cobren a $72.00 como pase regional. Yo pocas veces viajo al sur del condado (1 viaje cada 6 u 8 meses). No se me hace justo que nos obliguen a pagar por algo que no utilizamos. Los que sí viajan al sur del condado que lo paguen, por usar el servicio. Den las 2 opciones.
Imagen, 8 meses pagando por un servicio que NO necesito solo porque no hay mas opciones.
Nos van a tener como rehenes de su servicio.
Yo dependo del servicio de autobus para todas mis actividades fuera de casa. (Trabajo, compras, llevar hijo a la escuela, descanso, visitas medicas; etc)
Espero que mi opinión sea tomada en cuenta.
Muchas gracias
Good Afternoon. It is not fair that they are getting rid of the $59.00 monthly passes and now they charge $72.00 for it as the regional pass. I rarely travel to South County (one trip every six or eight months). I don’t think it’s fair that we have to pay for something we do not utilize. Those who travel to South County should pay for it, because they use the service. Both options should be available. Imagine having to pay a service I DON’T need for 8 months just because there are no other options. It is like we are being held hostage to your service. I rely on the bus service for all my activities away from home (work, shopping, taking son to school, relaxation, medical appointments, etc.). I hope my opinion is taken into consideration. Thank you very much.
To: Sharon Cooney  
Subject: FW: Proposed MTS/NCTD fare changes

For emails regarding the fare changes.

Should I forward those to you to have them logged in?

-----Original Message-----
From: Councilmember Georgette Gomez  
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2018 10:21 AM  
To: Barrios, Kelvin <KBarrios@sandiego.gov>  
Subject: FW: Proposed MTS/NCTD fare changes

MTS related, please respond. Thanks!
-Stopher

-----Original Message-----
From: jswine - [redacted]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2018 6:14 PM  
To: Councilmember Georgette Gomez <GeorgetteGomez@sandiego.gov>  
Cc: CouncilMember David Alvarez <DavidAlvarez@sandiego.gov>  
Subject: Proposed MTS/NCTD fare changes

I've just learned of fare changes to be considered by MTS/NCTD. I won't be attending the public meeting(s) but want to let you know my opinion on what has been reported to me.

I applaud reduction of Youth monthly fares to $26. That not only makes public transportation more affordable for a class of riders who may well require public transit to get to jobs and school, but it's an opportunity to help create a habit of using public transportation into their post-age 18 years.

However, I'm horrified at the suggestion of a 45% increase for Senior/Disabled/Medicare riders, a class of public transportation users who most often have finances as limited or more limited than the Youth category. As with the Youth category, most if not all Seniors et al are dependent on use of public transportation, for shopping, for medical appointments as well as for getting out and about which is essential for maintaining a healthy lifestyle, both physical and psychological. Too many seniors and disabled (can be one and the same) end up isolated because of limitations on ability to get about.

Please reconsider this increase and look more closely at the Adult fare which I understand isn't proposed for increase. Even there, the negative impacts on low-wage earners who depend on public transportation must be carefully considered.

Thank you for consideration of my comments.  Judy Swink - [redacted]
Here is a comment about the survey that I received from one of the employers I work with copied below.

**Destree Bascos**

Principal Consultant

Consultant to SANDAG’s Shift San Diego and iCommute programs

Hi Destree,

I filled out the transit survey the other day- I found it to be complicated & kind of confusing. Too many “moving parts” on every single page of the survey for me. I completed it, but really not sure that I understood all the questions.

Krista
Hi,

The RegionalPlus $12 ticket is going to be discounted. Does the new COASTER Regional (Rapid Express + all COASTER zones) $15 ticket include the trolley?

My commute includes Breeze, Coaster and Trolley, does that ticket cover all of them for the day?

Regards,
Leonardo Prosperi
From: Lois Lindsey
To: PIO
Subject: Please don’t change the price on the SDM I’m a every day bus and trolley rider I’m also a SDM customer I go to all doctor appointment s by transportation this new 30day monthly pass proposed will hurt me due to I’m disabled.
Date: Friday, November 09, 2018 5:42:50 PM
Please do not raise the age from 60 to 65. Many older adults not yet 65 need to pay less for transportation and this will make it harder to make ends meet for many of us.

Thank you

Lynn Horton
To Whom It May Concern,

As a long time MTS patron, I can see the need for an increase in fares, BUT I think the increase needs to come by reducing all of the huge discounts given to everyone, except the average ordinary citizen who pays dearly to be over looked when it comes to public transportation both in San Diego and all other areas of California as well. The fact that I as an adult pay $72 a month compared to a youth at $36 or Senior/"Disabled" at $18 is an outrageous difference in price. When I who was unemployed and looking for work and certainly couldn’t afford a vehicle was struggling to get to interviews because I didn’t have the fare for public transportation. Yet seniors, (granted not all) receive an income, live near wherever they shop or visit, students (most) can ride a school bus, allowance from parents etc, sneak on and off the trolley constantly, all get a discount for what? Being loyal, taking up the same space (often more) with book bags, push carts, feet, disobeying rules, guidelines, expect special treatment, music blaring, eating, loud conversations, etc....
What do I get, a larger fare. I never get the discount, I never get a break, even when buying a pass in advance it still almost triple everyone else’s fare. I with no steady income, part-time, travel from one end to the other, often walking home miles because the bus stops running that late or it’s another hour, or it never comes at all. That’s what I get. Harassed by the drug dealers, and the peddlers, and worse. That’s what I get.
To be honest it’s not just San Diego, it’s like that all over Southern CA. And what’s worse is every city and county has their own plans, fare structures, heck some of you even have the same bus colors and names. And yet why can we, not now, but in the near future come up with a plan that is universal all over the region. Then I do t need to carry 3 cards, 2 passes, and a map larger than google to figure out who I owe what to when and cash or card or cloud or app. Please make that your next objective task.
But for now raise the prices, because that’s certainly going to increase riders, especially the full fare ones. You want us to increase ridership and reduce traffic and yet we get nothing in return but higher prices, decreased routes and times that are usually all late.
Maybe I’ll just stick to Lyft, Uber, my bike, and my feet. All of the above are cheaper, more reliable and more dependable.

Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,

Your Average Rider
Mark B.

Gmail
I am 60 and living at poverty level. The pass rate age has been a blessing to myself and many others. Raising the age to 65 will be a huge hardship on myself and thousands of men and women in the same financial situation. I pray that you will have compassion on the poor. God bless Michael Hays
TO: SANDAG, MTS, AND NCTD – Attn: Jessica Gonzales, jessica.gonzales@sandag.org; Rob Schupp, rob.schupp@sdmts.com; Kimy Wall, kwall@nctd.org

FROM: Mike Bullock

DATE: October 24, 2018

SUBJECT: Submittal for Public Hearings re: Proposed Fare Changes and Revisions to Comprehensive Fare Ordinance

This submittal responds to the media release dated October 18, 2018 on this subject. This is made as a formal hearing submittal to the parties conducting the public meetings, and to the governing board members of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and North County Transit District (NCTD).

From the public notice, it appears that public transportation fare increases are being considered for the bus and rail systems operated by MTS and NCTD. Such fare increases will continue a trend in our region of fare increases over time, which have the effect of reducing affordable access to public transit for all populations, especially those which are most dependent on such transportation; and for the greater populations of potential riders who are looking for cost comparability to private automobiles.

We have been in a downward spiral of fare increases, causing decreased financial accessibility and cost attractiveness, causing reduced ridership and reduced fare recovery, leading to more fare increases, and so on. New fare increases may seem attractive to increase revenues, but will continue this downward spiral.

As an alternative, a truly cost-attractive public transit network, one which provides increased frequency and time-comparability to the private automobile, will increase ridership and operating fare recovery. A new approach to the region’s public transportation system and to transportation in general is needed.

The first attached file shows much of what needs to be done. The California Democratic Party has a rigorous process for approving updates to its Platform, which is its official policy. Besides this, SANDAG, the MTS, the NCTD, and California state government have a responsibility to consider ideas from all sources, including the CDP.

Please recognize the harm in the fact that there is no plan to ensure that LDVs (light duty vehicles, meaning cars and light-duty trucks) will achieve...
climate-stabilizing targets. I know such a plan is possible since I have written one myself. As a retired systems engineer, I recognized that climate change is a systems engineering problem and there was no systems engineering plan. No plan to succeed is a plan to fail. Your failure path is made clear by your mistaken idea that you must raise fares. My LDV plan has been presented at several conferences (AWMA and EUEC) and has therefore been peer reviewed. Attachments 2, 3, and 4 are the plan. Note that no discretionary project as defined in CEQA can fail to show such a plan if the project has any impact on LDV usage. Either the discretionary project supports the LDV plan or it does not. Remember the well-established concept of cumulative impacts. Climate destabilization is an environmental impact, although it is always poorly described in EIRS, violating both the moral imperative of considering life important and CEQA law.

You may mistakenly believe that CARB’s Scoping Plan is enough of an LDV plan. However, that Scoping Plan fails in at least several important regards.

- Scoping Plan Failure 1: It does not focus on LDVs, the category that is by far the biggest emitter, the biggest challenge, and so far, the biggest failure.
- Scoping Plan Failure 2: it implies that the state mandates are climate stabilizing. Implying such a thing is a moral and logical failure. CARB needs to try to prove it. Sadly, that would be impossible, given what the climate scientists are currently saying.
- Scoping Plan Failure 3: it does not “show its work” in suggesting that its plan to electrify the fleet will somehow match up with some per-capita driving, to result in somehow magically achieving the state’s climate mandates, which, as stated above are NOT climate stabilizing.

The need to have a plan to succeed (to stabilize the climate at a livable level) is shown in bullets 2 and 5 of the first attached file. All of the bullets are important but bullets 4 and 7 are especially important. You can’t continue to pretend that parking systems and road-use charge systems are not crucial to achieving success.

The 5th and 6th attached file show the needed car parking system.

My wife and I attended a house party Tuesday also attended by Stephen Stills of Crosby Stills, Nash and Young. Mr. Stills performed. It reminded me of the power of music to get people to consider different points of view.

From the final attached file (reference the original song here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Soy3PHV3RiM):

Park the car in the parking lot
Its free but the transit's not
Get on the bus and pay some bucks
Even though the service sucks

I have been trying to get SANDAG to consider different ideas for 11 years now. I have little to show for it. Maybe music will help. Please consider the entire text of the song shown in the final file. In my opinion, the song is art that is firmly grounded in reality.

Please use your influence to lobby SANDAG to lobby CARB and the state to either adopt the plan shown in attachments 1, 2, and 3 or do one of their own. Also, please work to implement the parking system shown in the 4th and 5th attached files. The first place for these systems could be MTS parking, NCTD parking, SANDAG parking and/or parking for municipal governments, as part of their Climate Action Plans.

The current trajectory leads to disaster. A fare increase is one more step. If you feel you have no choice but to raise fares, do so concurrent with a commitment to do what is suggested in this letter.

As Governor Brown said the Pope, "Humanity must reverse course or face extinction." (Or as County Joe might say, "Whoopee, we’re all going to die.)

Highest regards,

Mike Bullock

California Democratic Party Delegate, 76 AD (author of 2 adopted resolutions and 5 Platform changes)
Elected Member of the San Diego County Democratic Party Central Committee (author of 5 adopted resolutions)

Satellite Systems Engineer, 36 years (Now Retired)
Air and Waste Management Association published and presented papers:
Author, The Development of California Light-Duty Vehicle (LDV) Requirements to Support Climate Stabilization: Fleet-Emission Rates & Per-Capita Driving
Author, A Climate-Killing Regional Transportation Plan Winds Up in Court: Background and Remedies
Co-author, A Plan to Efficiently and Conveniently Unbundle Car Parking Cost
From the 2018 California Democratic Party (CDP) Platform

Transportation

- Support vehicle regulations to provide healthier air for all Californians, strong and workable low-emission and zero-emission vehicle standards that will continue to be a model for the country, and Clean Vehicle Incentive programs to include the installation of charging infrastructure, and provide assistance to small businesses to meet the low-emission standards;

- Demand Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) driving-reduction targets, shown by science to support climate stabilization;

- Work for equitable and environmentally-sound road and parking operations; support strategies to reduce driving, such creating smart growth and “complete streets,” teaching bicycling traffic skills, and improving transit, from local systems to high-speed rail;

- Work for shared, convenient, and value-priced parking, operated with a system that provides financial support to those paying higher costs or receiving a reduced wage due to the cost of providing the parking;

- Demand a state plan outlining how cars and light-duty trucks can hit climate-stabilizing targets by defining enforceable measures to achieve necessary fleet efficiency and per-capita driving limits;

- Support policies, including tax policies and the use of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) grants, that empower business owners, especially small business owners, to make investments in transportation infrastructure to ensure that freight moves by lower-emission local, short-line freight railroads, instead of adding to highway congestion and pollution;

- Support the design and implementation of a single, environmentally-sound technology system that will collect and distribute fees for the use of roads, parking, and transit that is both economically fair and convenient and protects user privacy and the interests of low-income users;

- Work for the electrification of all trucking and transit systems; and,

- Work to ensure that freeway expansion projects are subordinate to more sustainable alternatives that will result in more jobs and more economic growth.
Climate-Stabilizing, California Light-Duty Vehicle Requirements, Versus Air Resource Board Goals

Paper 881

Mike R. Bullock
Retired Satellite Systems Engineer

ABSTRACT

An Introduction is provided, including the importance of light-duty vehicles (LDVs: cars and light duty trucks) and a definition of the top-level LDV requirements to limit their carbon dioxide ("CO2") emissions.

Anthropogenic climate change fundamentals are presented, including its cause, its potential for harm, California mandates, and a greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction road map to avoid disaster.

A 2030 climate-stabilizing GHG reduction target value is calculated, using statements by climate experts. The formula for GHG emissions, as a function of per-capita driving, population, fleet CO2 emissions per mile, and the applicable low-carbon fuel standard (LCFS) is given. The ratio of the 2015 value of car-emission-per-mile to the 2005 value of car-emission-per-mile is obtained.

Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) mileage values from 2000 to 2030 are identified, as either mandates or new requirements. A table is presented that estimates 2015 LDV fleet mileage.

Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) parameters are given. A table is shown that uses 2030 ZEV and ICE (ICE LDVs) requirements, named the "Heroic Measures" case, to compute the LDV fleet-equivalent mileage. That equivalent fleet mileage is used, with population and the required emission reduction, to compute a required per-capita driving reduction, with respect to 2005. Measures to achieve this per-capita driving reduction are described, with reductions allocated to each measure. The energy used per year for the Heroic Measures case is estimated.

The "Heroic Measures" set of fractions of ZEV's purchased, as a function of year, is compared to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) goals.

INTRODUCTION

Within the context of working the anthropogenic-climate-change problem and from a systems engineering perspective, the top-level requirement is to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions enough to support stabilizing our climate at a livable level. This top-level requirement must flow down to the subsystem of LDVs, especially due to the magnitude of their emissions. (As an example, LDVs emit 41% of the GHG in San Diego County.)

More specifically, LDV requirements will be identified that, taken together, will result in GHG emission reductions sufficient to "support climate stabilization". "Support climate stabilization" means that the LDV emission level will be equal to a climate-stabilizing target. Such a target is expressed as an emission level in some target year. The target is based on climate science.
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From a systems engineering perspective, at the top level, the needed LDV requirements are

- LDV fleet efficiency, meaning the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per mile driven, applicable to the entire fleet, on the road in the year of interest and
- an upper bound on per-capita driving, given the derived fleet efficiency and the predicted population growth.

The fleet efficiency requirement will be developed as a function of lower-level requirements, such as Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency (CAFÉ) requirements, requirements on how fast Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs) must be added into the fleet each year, and requirements to get low-efficiency vehicles off the roads. The second top-level requirement, the upper bound on per-capita driving, will spawn transportation-system requirements designed to result in less driving, such as better mass transit. This paper will derive a formulae to compute the required per-capita driving levels, based on fleet efficiency, predicted population growth, and the latest, science-based, climate-stabilizing GHG emission target.

In this work, three categories of LDV emission-reduction strategies will be considered: cleaner cars, cleaner fuels, and less driving.

**BACKGROUND: OUR ANTHROPOGENIC CLIMATE CHANGE PROBLEM**

**Purpose of This Section**

Before going to work to solve a systems-engineering problem, it is important to understand the nature of the problem. How complex is the problem? How much is at stake if the problem is not solved? Is it reasonable to take a chance and only solve the problem with a reasonably high probability or is there too much at stake to gamble? This section is an attempt to answer these questions.

**Basic Cause**

Anthropogenic climate change is driven by these two processes: First, our combustion of fossil fuels is adding “great quantities” of CO₂ into our atmosphere. Second, that additional atmospheric CO₂ is trapping additional heat.

**California’s First Three Climate Mandates**

California’s Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05 is similar to the Kyoto Agreement and is based on the greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions that were recommended by climate scientists for industrialized nations back in 2005. In 2005, many climate scientists believed that the reduction targets of S-3-05 would be sufficient to support stabilizing Earth’s climate at a livable level, with a reasonably high level of certainty. More specifically, this executive order aims for an average, over-the-year, atmospheric temperature rise of “only” 2 degree Celsius, above the preindustrial temperature. It attempts to do this by limiting our earth’s level of atmospheric CO₂ e to 450 PPM by 2050 and then reducing emissions further, so that atmospheric levels would come down to more tolerable levels in subsequent years. The S-3-05 emission targets are 2000 emission levels by 2010, 1990 levels by 2020, and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.
It was thought that if the world achieved S-3-05, there might be a 50% chance that the maximum temperature rise will be less than 2 degrees Celsius, thus leaving a 50% chance that it would be larger than 2 degrees Celsius. A 2 degree increase would put over a billion people on the planet into a condition described as “water stress” and it would mean a loss of 97% of the earth’s coral reefs.

There would also be a 30% chance that the temperature increase would be greater than 3 degrees Celsius. A temperature change of 3 degree Celsius is described in Reference 3 as being “exponentially worse” than a 2 degree Celsius increase.

The second California climate mandate is AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. It includes provisions for a cap and trade program, to ensure meeting S-3-05’s 2020 target of the 1990 level of emissions. It continues after 2020. AB 32 requires CARB to always implement measures that achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective (words taken from AB 32) greenhouse-gas-emission reductions.

In 2015 Governor Brown signed Executive Order B-30-15. This Executive Order established a mandate to achieve an emission level of 40% below 2020 emissions by 2030, as can be seen by a Google search. If Executive Order S-3-05 is interpreted as a straight line between its 2020 target and its 2050 target, then the B-30-15 target of 2030 is the same as S-3-05’s implied target of 2035, because 2035 is halfway between 2020 and 2050 and 40% down is halfway to 80% down.

California is on track to achieve its S-3-05 second (2020) target. However, the world emission levels have, for most years, been increasing, contrary to the S-3-05 trajectory. In part because the world has been consistently failing to follow S-3-05’s 2010-to-2020 trajectory, if California is still interested in leading the way to stabilizing the climate at a livable level, it must do far better than S-3-05, going forward, as will be shown.

Failing to Achieve these Climate Mandates

What could happen if we fail to achieve S-3-05, AB 32, and B-30-15 or if we achieve them but they turn out to be too little too late and other states and countries follow our example?

It has been written\(^4\) that, “A recent string of reports from impeccable mainstream institutions-the International Energy Agency, the World Bank, the accounting firm of PricewaterhouseCoopers-have warned that the Earth is on a trajectory to warm by at least 4 Degrees Celsius and that this would be incompatible with continued human survival.”

It has also been written\(^5\) that, “Lags in the replacement of fossil-fuel use by clean energy use have put the world on a pace for 6 degree Celsius by the end of this century. Such a large temperature rise occurred 250 million years ago and extinguished 90 percent of the life on Earth. The current rise is of the same magnitude but is occurring faster.”

Pictures That Are Worth a Thousand Words

Figure 1 shows (1) atmospheric CO\(_2\) (in blue) and (2) averaged-over-a-year-then-averaged-over-the surface-of-the-earth world atmospheric temperature (in red). This temperature is with respect to a recent preindustrial value. The data starts 800,000 years ago. It shows that the current value of atmospheric CO\(_2\), which is now over 400 PPM, far exceeds the values of the last 800,000 years. It
also shows that we should expect the corresponding temperature to eventually be about 12 or 13 degrees above preindustrial temperatures. This would bring about a human disaster.

Figure 2 shows the average yearly temperature with respect to the 1960-to-1990 baseline temperature (in blue). It also shows atmospheric levels of CO₂ (in red). The S-3-05 goal of 450 PPM is literally “off the chart”, in Figure 2. Figure 2 shows that, as expected, temperatures are starting to rise along with the increasing levels of CO₂. The large variations in temperature are primarily due to the random nature of the amount of solar energy being received by the earth.

FURTHER BACKGROUND: CALIFORNIA’S SB 375 AND AN IMPORTANT DATA SET

As shown in the Introduction, LDVs emit significant amounts of CO₂. The question arises: will driving need to be reduced or can cleaner cars and cleaner fuels arrive in time to avoid such behavioral change? Steve Winkelman, of the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP), worked on this problem.

SB 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008

Under SB 375, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has given each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in California driving-reduction targets, for the years 2020 and 2035. “Driving” means yearly, per capita, vehicle miles travelled (VMT), by LDVs, with respect to 2005. The CARB-provided values are shown at this Wikipedia link, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SB_375. It is important to note that although this link and many other sources show the targets to be “GHG” and not “VMT”, SB 375 clearly states that the reductions are to be the result of the MPO’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), or, more specifically, the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) portion of the RTP. Nothing in the SCS will improve average mileage. That will be done by the state and federal government by their Corporate Average Fleet Efficiency (CAFÉ) standards. The SCS can only reduce GHG by reducing VMT. The only way an SCS can reduce GHG by 12%, for example, is to reduce VMT by 12%.

Under SB 375, every Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) must include a section called a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The SCS must include driving reduction predictions corresponding to the CARB targets. Each SCS must include only feasible transportation, land use, and transportation-related policy data. If the SCS driving-reduction predictions fail to meet the CARB-provided targets, the MPO must prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS). An APS uses infeasible transportation, land use, and transportation-related policy assumptions. The total reductions, resulting from both the SCS and the APS, must at least meet the CARB-provided targets.

Critical Data: Useful Factors from Steve Winkelman’s Data

Figure 3 shows 6 variables as a percent of its 2005 value. The year 2005 is the baseline year of SB 375. The red line is the Caltrans prediction of VMT. The purple line is California’s current mandate for a Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS). As shown, by 2020, fuel in California must emit 10% less per gallon than in 2005. The turquoise line is the 1990 GHG emission in California. As shown, it is 12% below the 2005 level. This is important because S-3-05 specifies that in 2020, state GHG emission levels must be at the
1990 level. The green line is the CO2 emitted per mile, as specified by AB 1493, also known as “Pavley 1 and 2” named after Senator Fran Pavley. The values shown do not account for the LCFS. The yellow (or gold) line is the S-3-05 mandate, referenced to 2005 emission levels. The blue line is the product of the red, the purple, and the green line and is the percentage of GHG emissions compared to 2005. Since VMT is not being adequately controlled, the blue line is not achieving the S-3-05 line. Figure 3 shows that driving must be reduced. For this reason, Steve Winkelman can be thought of as the true father of SB 375.

Figure 1. Atmospheric CO2 and Mean Temperature from 800,000 Years Ago

Figure 2. Atmospheric CO2 and Mean Temperature, Over the Last 1,000 Years

CO2 currently over 400

S-3-05’s Goal is to cap CO2 at 450 PPM
Current level > 400 PPM
This table provides inspiration for a road map to climate success for LDVs. Climate stabilization targets must be identified and achieved by a set of requirements to define fleet efficiency and per-capita driving.

**Figure 3** The S-3-05 Trajectory (the Gold Line) AND the CO₂ Emitted from Personal Driving (the Blue Line), where that CO₂ is a Function (the Product) of the California-Fleet-Average CO₂ per Mile (the Green Line), The Predicted Driving (VMT, the Red Line), and the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard (the Purple Line)

---

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF CALIFORNIA’S TOP-LEVEL LDV REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT CLIMATE STABILIZATION**

It is also clear that cleaner cars will be needed and can probably be achieved. As will be seen, much cleaner cars will be needed if driving reductions are going to remain within what many people would consider achievable. Mileage and equivalent mileage will need to be specified. A significant fleet-fraction of Zero-Emission Vehicles (ZEVs, either Battery-Electric LDVs or Hydrogen Fuel Cell LDVs) will be needed. Since mileage and equivalent mileage is more heuristic than emissions per mile, they will be used instead of CO₂ per mile driven.

Since the SB-375 work used 2005 as the reference year, it will remain the reference year here.

**GHG Target to Support Climate Stabilization**

The primary problem with S-3-05 is that California’s resolve and actions have been largely ignored by other states, our federal government, and many countries. Therefore, rather than achieving 2000 levels by 2010 and being on a track to achieve 1990 levels by 2020, world emission have been increasing. Reference 7 states on Page 14 that the required rate of reduction, if commenced in 2020,
would be 15%. That rate means that the factor of 0.85 must be achieved, year after year. If this were done for 10 years, the factor would be $(0.85)^{10} = 0.2$. We don’t know where world emissions will be in 2020. However, it is fairly safe to assume that California will be emitting at its 1990 level in 2020, in accordance with S-3-05. This situation shows that the correct target for California is to achieve emissions that are reduced to 80% below California’s 1990 value by 2030. Note that if the reductions start sooner, the rate of reduction of emissions can be less than 15% and the 2030 target could be relaxed somewhat. However, it is doubtful that the world will get the reduction rate anywhere near the needed 15% by 2020. Therefore, the target, of 80% below 1990 levels by 2030 is considered to be correct for California. Reference 7 also calls into question the advisability of aiming for a 2 degree Celsius increase, given the possibilities of positive feedbacks that would increase warming. This concern for positive feedbacks is another reason that this paper will work towards identifying LDV requirement sets that will support achieving 80% below 1990 values by 2030.

**Notes on Methods**

The base year is 2005. An intermediate year of 2015 is used. The car efficiency factor of 2015 with respect to 2005 is taken directly from Figure 3. The car efficiency factor of 2030 with respect to 2015 is derived herein, resulting in a set of car-efficiency requirements. It is assumed that cars last 15 years.

**Primary Variable Used**

Table 1 defines the primary variables that are used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Variable Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable Definitions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e_k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L_k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c_k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p_k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d_k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D_k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M_k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m_k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fundamental Equations

The emissions are equal to the CO2 per mile multiplied by the per-capita driving multiplied by the population, since per-capita driving multiplied by the population is total driving. This is true for any year.

Future Year $k$: 
$$ e_k = c_k \cdot d_k \cdot p_k \quad \text{(Eq. 1)} $$

Base Year $i$: 
$$ e_i = c_i \cdot d_i \cdot p_i \quad \text{(Eq. 2)} $$

Dividing both sides of Equation 1 by equal values results in an equality. The terms on the right side of the equation can be associated as shown here:

$$ \frac{e_k}{e_i} = \frac{c_k}{c_i} \cdot \frac{d_k}{d_i} \cdot \frac{p_k}{p_i} \quad \text{(Eq. 3)} $$

Since carbon dioxide emitted per gallon is just a constant (about 20 pounds per gallon), the constant cancels out of the ratio of emissions per mile, leaving the following relationship.

To work with mileage: 
$$ \frac{m_i}{m_k} = \frac{c_k}{c_i} \quad \text{(Eq. 4)} $$

Putting Equation 4 into Equation 3 results in the following equation:

$$ \frac{e_k}{e_i} = \frac{m_i}{m_k} \cdot \frac{d_k}{d_i} \cdot \frac{p_k}{p_i} \quad \text{(Eq. 5)} $$

Showing the base year of 2005, the future year of 2030, introducing the intermediate year of 2015 and the year of 1990 (since emissions in 2030 are with respect to the 1990 value) results in Equation 6.

$$ \frac{e_{2030}}{e_{1990}} \cdot \frac{e_{1990}}{e_{2005}} = \frac{c_{2030}}{c_{2015}} \cdot \frac{c_{2015}}{c_{2005}} \cdot \frac{d_{2030}}{d_{2005}} \cdot \frac{p_{2030}}{p_{2005}} \quad \text{(Eq. 6)} $$

The ratio on the far left is the climate-stabilizing target, which is the factor of the 2030 emission to the 1990 emission. It is shown to be 0.20 or 80% less. The next ratio is the emission of 1990 compared to 2005. It is the turquoise line of Figure 3, which is 0.87. The first ratio on the right side of the equation is the fleet emission per mile in 2030 compared to the value in 2015. This ratio will be derived in this report and it will result in a set of car efficiency requirements.

Moving to the right, the next ratio is the car efficiency in 2015 compared to 2005. It can obtained by multiplying the purple line 2015 value times the green line 2015 value, which is 0.90 * 0.93. The next term is the independent variable. It is the driving reduction required, compared to the 2005 level of driving. The final term on the far right is the ratio of the population in 2030 to the population in 2005. Reference 8 shows that California’s population in 2005 was 35,985,582. Reference 9 shows that California’s population in 2030 is predicted to be 44,279,354. Therefore,

$$ \frac{p_{2030}}{p_{2005}} = \frac{44279354}{35985582} = 1.2305 \quad \text{(Eq. 7)} $$

Putting in the known values results in Equation 8:

$$ 0.20 \times 0.87 = \frac{c_{2030}}{c_{2015}} \cdot 0.90 \cdot 0.93 \cdot \frac{d_{2030}}{d_{2005}} \cdot 1.2305 \quad \text{(Eq. 8)} $$
Combining the values, solving for the independent variable (the per-capita driving ratio), and changing from emission-per-mile to equivalent-miles-per-gallon results in the following:

\[
\frac{d_{2030}}{d_{2005}} = 0.1689 \times \frac{m_{2030}}{m_{2015}}
\]  

(Eq. 9)

With the coefficient being so small, it is doubtful that we can get the equivalent mileage in 2030 to be high enough to keep the driving ratio from falling below one. The mileage of the 2005 fleet will be based on the best data we can get and by assuming cars last 15 years. The equivalent mileage in 2030 will need to be as high as possible to keep the driving-reduction factor from going too far below 1, because it is difficult to reduce driving too much. The equivalent mileage will be dependent on the fleet-efficiency requirements in the near future and going out to 2030. Those requirements are among the primary results of this report.

**Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) Mileage, from Year 2000 to Year 2030**

The years from 2000 to 2011 are taken from a plot produced by the PEW Environment Group, [http://www.pewenvironment.org/uploadedFiles/PEG/Publications/Fact_Sheet/History%20of%20Fuel%20Economy%20Clean%20Energy%20Factsheet.pdf](http://www.pewenvironment.org/uploadedFiles/PEG/Publications/Fact_Sheet/History%20of%20Fuel%20Economy%20Clean%20Energy%20Factsheet.pdf)

The plot is shown here as Figure 4. The “Both” values are used.

![Figure 4 Mileage Values From the PEW Environment Group](image)

The values from 2012 to 2025 are taken from the US Energy Information Agency (EIA) as shown on their website, [http://www.c2es.org/federal/executive/vehicle-standards#ldv_2012_to_2025](http://www.c2es.org/federal/executive/vehicle-standards#ldv_2012_to_2025). They are the LDV Corporate Average Fleet Efficiency (CAFÉ) values enacted into law in the first term of President Obama. From 2025 to 2030, it is assumed that the yearly ICE improvement in CAFÉ will be 2.5 MPG.

**Mileage of California’s LDV Fleet in 2015**
Table 2 uses these values of the Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) LDV mileage to compute the mileage of the LDV fleet in 2015. It assumes that the fraction of ZEVs being used over these years is small enough to be ignored. The 100 miles driven, nominally, by each set of cars, is an arbitrary value and inconsequential in the final calculation, because it will divide out. It is never-the-less used, so that it is possible to compare the gallons of fuel used for the different years. The “f” factor could be used to account for a set of cars being driven less. It was decided to not use this option by setting all of the values to 1. The Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) values are taken from Figure 3. The gallons of fuel are computed as shown in Equation 10, using the definition for $L_k$ that is shown in Table 1.

Table 2 Calculation of the Fleet MPG for 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDV Set</th>
<th>Years Old</th>
<th>Model Year</th>
<th>CAFE MPG</th>
<th>LCFS Factor $L_{Year}$</th>
<th>Factor Driven f</th>
<th>Gallons Used Per f*100 Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>.9933</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>.9867</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>.9800</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>.9733</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>.9667</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>.9600</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>.9533</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>.9467</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>.9400</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>.9333</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Gallons: 54.29
Miles = 100*Sum(f’s): 1500
MPG = Miles/(Sum of Gallons): 27.63

\[
\text{Gallons Used per } f \times 100 \text{ miles} = \frac{fx100}{(CAFE \text{ MPG})/L_k} \quad \text{(Eq. 10)}
\]

How ICE Mileage Values Will Be Used with ZEV Equivalent Mileage Values
As will be seen, after 2015, the net (computed using both ICEs and ZEVs) mileage values for each year are assumed to greatly improve by having a significant fraction of ZEVs. The ICE CAFÉ standards are used in this report as just the ICE contribution to fleet MPG. The ICE MPG values are inadequate by themselves and will therefore need to become less important because ZEVs will need to quickly take over the highways.

Federal requirements will need to change dramatically. Currently, federally-mandated corporate average fuel efficiency (CAFÉ) standards have been implemented, from 2000 to 2025. These standards require that each corporation produce and sell their fleet of cars and light-duty trucks in the needed proportions, so that the combined mileage of the cars they sell, at least meet the specified mileage.

The car companies want to maximize their profits while achieving the required CAFÉ standard. In California, the car companies will already be required to sell a specified number of electric vehicles, which have a particularly-high, equivalent-value of miles-per-gallon. If the laws are not changed, this will allow these companies to sell more low-mileage, high profit cars and light-duty trucks, and still achieve the federal CAFÉ standard.

It will be better to apply the CAFÉ standards to only the ICEs and then require that the fleet of LDVs sold achieve some mandated fraction of ZEVs. The ZEVs will get better and better equivalent mileage, as our electrical grid is powered by more renewable sources of energy. Therefore, their equivalent mileage is not fixed, but will improve over the years. Requirements developed here are for 2030. Therefore a high percentage of all the electricity generated in the state, including both the “in front of the meter” (known as the “Renewable Portfolio Standard” or “RPS”) portion and the “behind the meter” portion is assumed to come from sources that do not emit CO2. More specifically, he value of 80% is assumed. This therefore becomes a fleet-efficiency requirement.

**ZEV Equivalent Mileage Values**

To calculate the mileage of the 2030 fleet of LDVs, it is necessary to derive a formula to compute the equivalent mileage of ZEVs, as a function of the percent of electricity generated without emitting CO2, the equivalent ZEV mileage if the electricity is from 100% fossil fuel, and the equivalent ZEV mileage if the electricity is from 100% non-CO2 sources. The variables defined in Table 3 are used.

The derivation of the equation for equivalent ZEV mileage is based on the notion that the ZEV can be imagined to travel “r” fraction of the time on electricity generated from renewables and “(1-r)” fraction of the time on fossil fuel. If the vehicle travels “D” miles, then, using the definitions shown in Table 3, the following equation can be written.

\[
G = \frac{r \times D}{m_{zr}} + \frac{(1-r) \times D}{m_{zf}} \quad \text{(Eq. 11)}
\]

\[
m_z = D/G = D/\left(\frac{r \times D}{m_{zr}} + \frac{(1-r) \times D}{m_{zf}}\right) \quad \text{(Eq. 12)}
\]

Dividing the numerator and the denominator by D and multiplying them both by the product of the two equivalent mileage values results in Equations 13.

\[
m_z = m_{zr} \times m_{zf}/\left(r \times m_{zf} + (1-r) \times m_{zr}\right) \quad \text{(Eq. 13)}
\]

Again, using the definitions in Table 3 results in the following.

\[
m_z = \text{Num}/(\text{Den}) \quad \text{(Eq. 14)}
\]
Table 3  Variables Used in the Calculation of ZEV Equivalent Mileage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$m_z$</td>
<td>ZEV Equivalent mileage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{zr}$</td>
<td>ZEV Equivalent mileage if the electricity is from renewables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{zf}$</td>
<td>ZEV Equivalent mileage if the electricity is from fossil fuels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>fraction of electricity generated from sources not emitting CO2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>Gallons of equivalent fuel used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>Arbitrary distance travelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Num$</td>
<td>$m_{zr} \times m_{zf}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Den$</td>
<td>$r \times m_{zf} + (1 - r) \times m_{zr}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows an assignment of assumed values and the result of a calculation, using Equations 13, 14, and the definitions in Table 3, to produce a ZEV equivalent mileage.

Table 5  Additional Variables Used in the Calculation of 2030 LDV Mileage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m_{zr}$</th>
<th>$m_{zf}$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>1-r</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Den</th>
<th>$m_z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>350000.00</td>
<td>1056.00</td>
<td>331.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Computing an LDV Fleet Mileage Assuming Heroic Measures (HM)**

Table 5 shows the additional definitions that will be used in this calculation. Table 6 computes the 2030 LDV mileage, assuming “Heroic Measures” to reduce the miles driven in poor-mileage ICE’s, in building and selling a significant fraction of ZEVs, and in getting the Low Carbon Fuel Standards to continue to improve beyond the Figure 3 minimum of 0.90.

Table 5  Additional Variables Used in the Calculation of 2030 LDV Mileage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$D_i$</td>
<td>Distance travelled by ICE vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_z$</td>
<td>Distance travelled by ZEVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_i$</td>
<td>Gallons of Equivalent fuel used by ICE vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_z$</td>
<td>Gallons of Equivalent fuel used by ZEVs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown by the values for “f”, government policies must be adopted, in 2030, to reduce the miles driven by the ICE’s, from model years 2016 to 2023. The 2016 model ICE’s are driven only 30% as much as the nominal amount. The 2017 year ICE’s can be driving 10% more. This rate of change continues up to 2023, when the ICE’s are doing less damage, due to the large fraction of ZEVs on the road.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ICE Parameters and Calculations</th>
<th>ZEVs</th>
<th>Yearly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAFÉ MPG</td>
<td>LCFS</td>
<td>Eq. MPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>.9267</td>
<td>37.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>.9200</td>
<td>38.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>.9133</td>
<td>39.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>.9000</td>
<td>40.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>.8500</td>
<td>42.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>47.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>52.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>55.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>58.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>60.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>67.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>70.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>73.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>76.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Miles and then Gallons of Equivalent Fuel: 1259.00  11.34

Equivalent MPG of LDV Fleet in 2030: 111.03

Sum of ZEV Miles = 865. Fraction of Miles Driven by ZEVs = 68.7%

As shown, the ZEV fraction of the fleet assumes the value of 12%, just 2 years from now (shown in the green field.) It then proceeds upward, to 18% in 2019; 24% in 2020; 34% in 2021; and so on, until it reaches 99% by 2028.

Achieving these fractions of ZEVs might be compared to what was done during World War II, when automobile production lines were rapidly converted to produce tanks. This reduced the new cars that could be purchased. Besides this, rationing gasoline made it difficult to drive at times and, due to shortages of leather, which was being used to produce boots for soldiers, some citizens found it hard to even buy shoes. These rapid and inconvenient changes were tolerated, because most people agreed that the war needed to be won. The heroic measures assumed here may not be possible unless citizens and the political leaders they elect understand the dire consequences of climate destabilization and therefore accept, and even demand, the measures that are needed to support climate stabilization.

The equivalent miles per gallon of the LDV fleet in 2030, specifically 111.03 miles per gallon, will be considered as a potential 2030 LDV requirement.
Computing the Heroic-Measures (HM) Case Per-Capita and Net Driving Factor Requirements, Based on the Result Shown in Table 6

Plugging the
- equivalent MPG of the LDV fleet in Year 2030, taken from the bottom of Table 6, which is 111.03 MPG (m_{2030}), and
- the MPG of the LDV fleet in Year 2015, taken from the bottom of Table 2, which is 27.63 MPG (m_{2015}),

into Equation 9, gives the following result:

\[
\frac{d_{2030}}{d_{2005}} = 0.1687 \times \frac{m_{2030}}{m_{2015}} = 0.1687 \times \frac{111.03}{27.63} = 0.68 \quad \text{(Eq. 14)}
\]

This means that the per-capita driving in 2030 will need to be about 32% less than in year 2005. The net driving can be computed by multiplying the per-capita driving, 0.68, by the population factor of 1.2305, computed in Equation 7, resulting in 0.84 (since 0.68 x 1.2305 = 0.84.) This means that, even with the 23% increase in California’s population, the net driving will have to drop by 16%. If this LDV requirement set is selected, all of California’s transportation money can be used to improve transit, improve active transportation (mainly walking and biking), and maintain, but not expand, roads. The good news is that there can be little or no congestion because highway capacity now is larger than it was in 2005. Policies will be needed to achieve the required reduction in driving.

Case 2: Computing LDV Requirements that Support Climate Stabilization but Still Allow 2005 Per-Capita Driving

The first step is to use Equation 9 and the value of the mileage in 2015 to compute the needed LDV equivalent fleet mileage for 2030 if the left side of the equation is equal to 1.0.

\[
m_{2030} = 1.0 \times m_{2015} / 0.1689 = 27.63 / 0.1689 = 163.59 \text{ MPG} \quad \text{(Eq. 15)}
\]

Table 7 is constructed, with the fraction of ZEVs selected to achieve the needed equivalent fleet mileage of about 163.59 MPG. Since its ZEV fractions are larger and sooner than in the “Heroic Measures” table, Table 7 is showing what has been called the “Extra-Heroic Measures” (EHM) case. The ICE “f” values are unchanged; as are the LCFS values. The EHM ZEV differences from the HM case are the highlighted “z” values.

This means that with the 23% increase in California’s population, computed in Equation 7, the net driving would also increase by 23%. If this LDV requirement set were to be implemented, a lot of California’s transportation money would be needed to expand the highway system, leaving less to improve transit, improve active transportation (mainly walking and biking), and maintain roads.
### Table 7  Calculation of 2030 LDV Mileage Assuming Extra-Heroic Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ICE Parameters and Calculations</th>
<th>ZEVs</th>
<th>Yearly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAFÉ MPG</td>
<td>LCFS</td>
<td>Eq. MPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>.9267</td>
<td>37.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>.9200</td>
<td>38.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>.9133</td>
<td>39.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>.9000</td>
<td>40.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>.8500</td>
<td>42.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>47.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>52.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>55.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>58.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>60.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>67.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>70.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>73.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>76.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Miles and then Gallons of Equivalent Fuel: 1304.30, 7.97

Equivalent MPG of LDV Fleet in 2030: 163.59

### Comparing the ZEV Fraction Values of the “Heroic-Measures” (HM) Case to the “Extra-Heroic Measures” (EHM) Case

Table 8 shows the direct comparison of the ZEV fractions that are ZEV requirements for the HM Case and the EHM Case. The largest differences are highlighted. The EHM case does not appear to be achievable.

### Table 8  HM Case and the EHM Case Which Supports 2005 Per-Capita Driving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHM</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACHTING THE REQUIRED DRIVING REDUCTION OF THE HEROIC-MEASURES (HM) CASE

As shown in Equation 14, in 2030, the per-capita driving will need to at least 32% below the 2005 value. As shown in this link, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SB_375, California’s Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are adopting Region Transportation Plans (RTPs) that will achieve reductions in year 2020 and 2035. As also shown there, the targets, for year 2035, range from 0% for Shasta to 16% for Sacramento Area Council of Governments. Since this is for 2030 instead of 2035, and to be reasonably conservative, it is assumed here that the state will achieve a 10% reduction in per-capita driving, in 2030, compared to 2005. This leaves 22% to be achieved by new programs.

The title of each of the following subsections contains the estimated per-capita driving reduction each strategy will achieve, by 2030.

Reallocate Funds Earmarked for Highway Expansion to Transit and Consider Transit-Design Upgrades (3%)

San Diego County has a sales tax measure called “TransNet”, which allocates one-third for highway expansion, one-third for transit, and one-third for road maintenance. It has a provision that allows for a reallocation of funds, if supported by at least two-thirds of SANDAG Board members, including a so-called weighted vote, where governments are given a portion of 100 votes, proportional to their population. It is hereby proposed to reallocate the TransNet amount, earmarked for highway expansion, to transit and to do similar reallocations throughout California.

This money could be used to fund additional transit systems; improve transit operations; and/or the redesign and implementation of the redesign of existing transit systems. The redesign could include electrification and automation or even upgrading to a different technology.

A Comprehensive Road-Use Fee Pricing and Payout System to Unbundle the Cost of Operating Roads (7.5%)

Comprehensive means that pricing would be set to cover all costs (including road maintenance and externalities such as harm to the environment and health); that privacy and the interests of low-income drivers doing necessary driving would be protected; that the incentive to drive fuel-efficient cars would be at least as large as it is under the current fuels excise tax; and, as good technology becomes available, that congestion pricing is used to protect critical driving from congestion.

The words payout and unbundle mean that some of the money collected would go to people that are losing money under the current system.

User fees (gas taxes and tolls) are not enough to cover road costs and California is not properly maintaining its roads. Reference 10 shows that in California user fees amount to only 24.1% of what is spent on roads. Besides this, the improved mileage of the ICEs and the large number of ZEVs needed mean that gas tax revenues will drop precipitously.

This system could be used to help reduce the ICE LDV miles driven in 2016 to 2022, as shown in the “f” column of Tables 6 and 7. This system could probably be implemented in less than 5 years.
**Unbundling the Cost of Car Parking (7.5%)**

Unbundling the cost of car parking\(^\text{11}\) throughout California is conservatively estimated to decrease driving by 7.5%, based on Table 1 of Reference 11. That table shows driving reductions resulting from introducing a price for parking, for 10 cases. Its average reduction in driving is 25% and its smallest reduction is 15%.

**Good Bicycle Projects and Bicycle Traffic Skills Education (3%)**

The best criterion for spending money for bicycle transportation is the estimated reduction in driving per the amount spent. The following strategies may come close to maximizing this parameter.

**Projects to Improve Bicycle Access**

All of the smart-growth neighborhoods, central business districts, and other high trip destinations or origins, both existing and planned, should be checked to see if bicycle access could be substantially improved with either a traffic calming project, a “complete streets” project, more shoulder width, or a project to overcome some natural or made-made obstacle.

**League of American Bicyclist Certified Instruction of “Traffic Skills 101”**

Most serious injuries to bike riders occur in accidents that do not involve a motor vehicle\(^\text{12}\). Most car-bike accidents are caused by wrong-way riding and errors in intersections; the clear-cut-hit-from-behind accident is rare\(^\text{12}\).

After attending *Traffic Skills 101*, students that pass a rigorous written test and demonstrate proficiency in riding in traffic and other challenging conditions could be paid for their time and effort.

As an example of what could be done in San Diego County, if the average class size was 3 riders per instructor and each rider passes both tests and earns $100 and if the instructor, with overhead, costs $500 dollars, for a total of $800 for each 3 students, that would mean that $160M could teach $160M/$800 = 200,000 classes of 3 students, for a total of 600,000 students. The population of San Diego County is around 3 million.

**Eliminate or Greatly Increase the Maximum Height and Density Limits Close to Transit Stops that Meet Appropriate Service Standards (2%)**

As sprawl is reduced, more compact, transit-oriented development (TOD) will need to be built. This strategy will incentivize a consideration of what level of transit service will be needed, how it can be achieved, and what levels of maximum height and density are appropriate. Having no limits at all is reasonable if models show that the development can function without harming the existing adjacent neighborhoods, given the level of transit service and other supporting transportation policies (such as car parking that unbundles the cost and supports the full sharing of parking\(^\text{11}\)) that can be assumed.

**Net Driving Reduction from All Identified Strategies**

By 2030, the sum of these strategies should be realized. They total 23%, resulting in a 1% margin over the needed 22% (which is added to the existing 10% to get the needed 32%).
ADDITIONAL ELECTRICITY REQUIRED

The URL http://www.energy.ca.gov/2013_energypolicy/documents/2013-06-26_workshop/presentations/09_VMT-Bob_RAS_21Jun2013.pdf shows that Californians drove about 325 Billion miles per year, from 2002 to 2011. This value can be multiplied by the 0.84 factor reduction of driving, computed right after the calculation shown in Equation 14, and the fraction of miles driven by ZEVs, shown at the bottom of Table 6, of 0.687 (from 68.7%), to give the 2030 miles driven by ZEVs = 325 Billion x 0.84 x 0.687 = 188 Billion miles per year.

Using the Tesla information here http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tesla_Roadster, it is assumed that 21.7 kW-h is used per 100 miles, or 0.217 kW-h per mile. The total energy used per year is therefore 188 Billion miles x 0.217 kW-h = 40,699 GW-h.

http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/cfaq5/howhighiscaliforniaselectricitydemandandwheredoesthepowe rcomefrom.htm, shows that California is using about 265,000 GW-h per year. Therefore the electricity needed to power California’s HM ZEV LDF fleet in 2030 is 100% x 40,648/265,000 = 15.34% of the amount of electricity California is currently using. Table 4 shows that 80% (r = 0.80, with “r” defined in Table 3) of electricity must generated without producing CO2. This estimated 15.34% increase in demand should help the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the California Energy Commission (CEC) with their planning.

COMPARISON WITH CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (CARB) PLANNING

The following quote\(^{13}\) allows us to compare the CARB plan for LDVs with what would be required to stabilize the climate at a livable level, in the form of the Heroic Measures case:

> Regulations on the books in California, set in 2012, require that 2.7 percent of new cars sold in the state this year be, in the regulatory jargon, ZEVs. These are defined as battery-only or fuel-cell cars, and plug-in hybrids. The quota rises every year starting in 2018 and reaches 22 percent in 2025. Nichols wants 100 percent of the new vehicles sold to be zero- or almost-zero-emissions by 2030

Table 9 shows the values implied by this statement and compares them to the HM values. Table 10, which is similar to Tables 6 and 7, computes the overall mileage of the 2030 fleet, using the CARB values.

Computing the Heroic-Measures (HM) Case Per-Capita and Net Driving Factor Requirements, Based on the Result Shown in Table 10

Plugging the

- equivalent MPG of the LDV fleet in Year 2030, taken from the bottom of Table 10, which is 74.25 MPG, and
- the MPG of the LDV fleet in Year 2015, taken from the bottom of Table 2, which is 27.63 MPG,

into Equation 8, gives the following result:

\[
\frac{d_{2030}}{d_{2005}} = 0.1687 \times \frac{m_{2030}}{m_{2015}} = 0.1687 \times \frac{74.25}{27.63} = 0.45
\]

(Eq. 16)
### Table 9  Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) % of Fleet, for Two Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CARB</th>
<th>Heroic Measures</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CARB</th>
<th>Heroic Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This means that the per-capita driving will need to be about 55% less in 2030 than in year 2005. The net driving can be computed by multiplying the per-capita driving, 0.45, by the population factor of 1.2305, computed in Equation 7, resulting in 0.55. This means that, even with the 23% increase in California’s population, the net driving will have to drop by 45%. If CARB wants the LDV sector to achieve a reasonable climate-stabilizing target, it will need to require ZEV adoption profile closer to the Heroic Measures Case. The adoption profile they have now will required a reduction in driving that will probably be very difficult to achieve.

### CONCLUSION

A requirement set named “Heroic Measures” (HM) is quantified. Table 8 shows that the HM LDV efficiency requirements are much easier to achieve than those needed to allow per-capita driving to remain close to its 2005 level, which has been quantified as the “Extra Heroic Measures Case”. Strategies to achieve the required HM driving reductions are also allocated and described. They are perhaps about as difficult as achieving the HM LDV fleet efficiency. It is computed that the 2030 fleet of LDV HM ZEVs would require an amount of electricity which is equal to about 15% of what California is using today. The current CARB plan for ZEV adoption is shown to require a very large reduction in driving if LDVs are to achieve a climate-stabilizing target.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ICE Parameters and Calculations</th>
<th>ZEVs</th>
<th>Yearly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAFÉ MPG</td>
<td>LCFS</td>
<td>Eq. MPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>.9267</td>
<td>37.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>.9200</td>
<td>38.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>.9133</td>
<td>39.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>.9000</td>
<td>40.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>.8500</td>
<td>42.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>47.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>52.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>55.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>58.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>60.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>67.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>70.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>73.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>76.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Miles and then Gallons of Equivalent Fuel: 1236.00 16.65
Equivalent MPG of LDV Fleet in 2030: 74.25
ABREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1493</td>
<td>California’s Assembly Bill 1493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 32</td>
<td>California’s Assembly Bill 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS</td>
<td>Alternative Planning Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFE</td>
<td>Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Center for Biological Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPUC</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAP</td>
<td>Center for Clean Air Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNFF</td>
<td>Cleveland National Forest Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 375</td>
<td>California’s Senate Bill 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>Carbon Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2_e</td>
<td>Carbon Dioxide Equivalent GHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHM</td>
<td>“Extra Heroic Measures” LDV Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>Governor’s Executive Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW-h</td>
<td>Giga Watt-Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>“Heroic Measures” LDV Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>Internal Combustion Engine LDV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kW-h</td>
<td>Kilo Watt-hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCFS</td>
<td>Low Carbon Fuel Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDV</td>
<td>Light-Duty Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavley</td>
<td>Senator Pavley’s AB 1493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM</td>
<td>Parts per Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>Renewable Portfolio Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEQ</td>
<td>Sustainable Community Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>San Diego County sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URL</td>
<td>Universal Resource Locator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Travelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEV</td>
<td>Zero Emission Vehicle LDV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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On Road Transportation: 46%

**Cars and light-duty trucks: 41%**

Heavy Duty Vehicles: 5%
The Climate Problem

Any Earth Science text book* contains the following facts:

• Atmospheric CO2 traps heat
  – CO2 Molecules absorb and then emit, in a random direction, infrared radiation, heat given off by the Earth’s surface
  – This effect is significant
• Combustion of fossil fuels adds great quantities of CO2 to our Earth’s atmosphere
  – The amount of CO2 in the atmosphere is well known
  – Our yearly emissions are well known

How Bad Could It Get?

- *Scientific American* June 2008 issue
  - 550 PPM CO2 possible in several decades
  - This could (5% probability) lead to 8 Deg. Celsius of warming
  - 8 Deg. Celsius could lead to “a devastating collapse of the human population, perhaps even to extinction”

- December 24/31 2012 Issue of Nation magazine:

  A recent string of reports from impeccable mainstream institutions—the International Energy Agency, the World Bank, the accounting firm of PricewaterhouseCoopers—have warned that the Earth is on a trajectory to warm by at least 4 Degrees Celsius. [4 Degrees Celsius] would be *incompatible with continued human survival.*

  Winter, *UU World* magazine (p. 57) “Lags in the replacement of fossil-fuel use by clean energy use have put the world on a pace for 6 degree Celsius by the end of this century. Such a large temperature rise occurred 250 million years ago and extinguished 90 percent of the life on Earth. The current rise is of the same magnitude but is occurring faster. We must reduce or eliminate all uses of fossil fuels.
California's S-3-05 CO2_e Emissions, MMT Per Year

- 2000 Value by 2010
- 1990 Value by 2020

Area 1 is the net CO2_e emitted from Year 2010 to 2020.

Area 2 is the net CO2_e emitted from Year 2020 to 2050.

80% Below 1990 Value by 2050
Climate Data

- Keeling Curve:
  

Currently 400 PPM!

Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide
Measured at Mauna Loa, Hawaii

Burning a gallon of gasoline releases about 19 #’s of CO2!

Likewise
A barrel of oil, about 700 #’s
A ton of coal, about 3 tons
Etc.
Our Climate Crisis

Earth & Space Research (ESR) website: http://www.esr.org/outreach/climate_change/mans_impact/man1.html

Current level = 400 PPM

S-3-05’s Goal is to cap CO2 at 450 PPM, which is off this chart.

Start of Industrial Revolution
Our Climate Crisis


**Temperature and CO₂ Records**

- Current Level of CO₂ is 400 PPM
- S-3-05’s goal is to cap CO₂ at 450 PPM

**S-3-05 Achievement Outcomes**

- X% chance > 4 (Extinction?)
- 30% chance > 3 (very bad)
- 50% chance > 2 (bad)
A. Parties and Amici. Except for the following, all parties, intervenors, and amici appearing before the district court and in this Court are listed in the Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants. James Hansen, David Beerling, Paul J. Hearty, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, Pushker Kharecha, Valérie Masson-Delmotte, Camille Parmesan, Eelco Rohling, Makiko Sato, Pete Smith, and Lise Van Susteren are amici curiae in this appeal (referred to hereinafter as “Amici Scientists.”).
From Page 21: . . . the required rate of emissions reduction would have been about 3.5% per year if reductions had started in 2005, while the required rate of reduction, if commenced in 2020, will be approximately 15% per year.

• My math:
  – 15% means a factor of 0.85, year after year
  – Consider the 10 years from 2020 to 2030
  – \((0.85)^{10} = 0.20\), which is 80% down
  – Other articles, describing Hansen’s work: “decarbonization by 2030”
New Prescription for Climate Stabilization

California's S-3-05 CO2_e Emissions, MMT Per Year

- 2000 Value by 2010
- 1990 Value by 2020
- Area 1 is the net CO2_e emitted from Year 2010 to 2020.
- Area 2 is the net CO2_e emitted from Year 2020 to 2050.
- Climate Stabilization Supporting Target
- 80% Below 1990 Value by 2050
How, for LDVs:
Notes on Methods

• Base year 2005
• Intermediate year 2015
• Car Efficiency Factor from 2005 to 2015
  – Steve Winkelman’s data
• Car Efficiency Factor, 2015 to 2030
  – Derived in paper
  – Results in car-efficiency requirements
• Cars last 15 years

From a California law (SB 375) giving per-capita driving reduction targets to be achieved in Regional Transportation Plans

Older cars are so few in number that they can be ignored.

Report on SB 375 See its Table 1.
Data Relating 1990, 2005, & 2015 Data

Purple (Low carbon fuel),
Green (CO2/Mile), & Gold (S-3-05)

Figure 1, from: http://www.ecovote.org/sites/default/files/pdf/sb375.pdf
### Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$e_k$</td>
<td>LDV Emitted C02, in Year “k”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_k$</td>
<td>Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) Factor that reduces the Per-Gallon CO2 emissions, in Year “k” (k is denotes Year 2030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_k$</td>
<td>LDV CO2 emitted per mile driven, average, in Year “k”, not accounting for the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_k$</td>
<td>LDV CO2 emitted per mile driven, average, in Year “k”, accounting for the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_k$</td>
<td>Population, in Year “k”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_k$</td>
<td>Per-capita LDV driving, in Year “k”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_k$</td>
<td>LDV Driving, in Year “k”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_k$</td>
<td>LDV Mileage, miles per gallon, in Year “k”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_k$</td>
<td>LDV Equivalent Mileage, miles per gallon, in Year “k” accounting for the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) Factor, so this is $M_k/L_k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Number of pounds of CO2 per gallon of fuel but not accounting for the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) Factor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fundamental Equations

Future Year $k$: \[ e_k = c_k \times d_k \times p_k \]
\[ e_i = c_i \times d_i \times p_i \]

\[ \frac{e_k}{e_i} = \frac{c_k}{c_i} \times \frac{d_k}{d_i} \times \frac{p_k}{p_i} \]

To work with mileage: \[ \frac{m_i}{m_k} = \frac{c_k}{c_i} \]
“k” denotes Year 2030  
“i” denotes Year 2005

**Solution Overview**

**Car Efficiency Factor**  
From existing mileage requirements and the requirements defined herein

\[ \frac{e_k}{e_i} = \frac{m_i}{m_k} \times \frac{d_k}{d_i} \times \frac{p_k}{p_i} \]

**The Independent Variable**  
It becomes the **required per-capita driving reduction with respect to 2005 driving**

From the known 1990-to-2005 factor and the **Climate-Stabilizing Target**, which is the factor of 2030 emissions to 1990 emissions

From existing and predicted population
Solution Using Intermediate Year of 2015

From the **Climate-Stabilizing-Target**, which is the factor of 2030 emissions to 1990 emissions

\[ \frac{e_{2030}}{e_{1990}} \times \frac{e_{1990}}{e_{2005}} = \frac{c_{2030}}{c_{2015}} \times \frac{c_{2015}}{c_{2005}} \times \frac{d_{2030}}{d_{2005}} \times \frac{p_{2030}}{p_{2005}} \]

Taken from the Winkelman data: the known 1990-to-2005 factor of emissions (the light blue line)

**Car Efficiency Factor**
From existing mileage requirements and the **requirements defined herein**

From Winkelman. It is the product of the factor from the green line and the purple line.

From known and predicted populations

**The Independent Variable**
It becomes the **required 2030 per-capita driving reduction with respect to 2005 driving**
Putting In the Easy-to-Get Values

From the Climate-Stabilizing-Target, which is the factor of 2030 emissions to 1990 emissions

\[ 0.2 \times 0.87 = \frac{c_{2030}}{c_{2015}} \times [0.9 \times 0.93] \times \frac{d_{2030}}{d_{2005}} \times 1.2305 \]

The Independent Variable
It becomes the required per-capita 2030 driving reduction with respect to 2005 driving

Taken from the Winkelman data: the known 1990-to-2005 factor of emissions (the light blue line)

Car Efficiency Factor
From existing mileage requirements and the requirements defined herein

From Winkelman. It is the product of the factor from the green line and the purple line.

From known and predicted populations
Combining the Easy-to-Get Values, Solving for the Independent Variable, and Changing the 2015-to-2030 Car Efficiency from CO2-Per-Mile to Equivalent-Miles-Per-Gallon

\[ \frac{d_{2030}}{d_{2005}} = .1689 \times \frac{m_{2030}}{m_{2015}} \]

\[ .1689 = \frac{c_{2030}}{c_{2015}} \times \frac{d_{2030}}{d_{2005}} \]

\[ \frac{d_{2030}}{d_{2005}} = .1689 \times \frac{c_{2015}}{c_{2030}} \]

Equivalent Mileage in 2030 is what we make it. It better be as high as possible, because a large driving reduction will be difficult.

= “NUMERATOR MILEAGE”

2015 Fleet Mileage is computed

= “DENOMINATOR MILEAGE”

The required per-capita 2030 driving with respect to 2005 driving
Some **Requirements** Defined to Achieve 2030 Fleet Equivalent-Mileage

- Low-Carbon Fuel Standards (LCFS)
- Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency (CAFÉ) Standards from 2015 to 2030
- Driving Reduction Factors \( (f_n) \) for bad-mileage years (Year \( n \))
  - For example, 0.75 means 25% less driving
  - **Cash for Gas-guzzlers?**

---

Both California’s existing and extended, “\( L_k \)”

Existing, to 2025 *Specified to 2030*
Three More Requirements Defined to Achieve 2030 Fleet Equivalent-Mileage

• CAFÉ Standards only apply to Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) LDVs

• New Requirement: Fraction of fleet sold that must be Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEVs)

• In 2030, only 20% of electricity is from fossil fuels

Define “z” to be the fraction of fleet sold that must be ZEVs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDV Set</th>
<th>Years Old</th>
<th>Model Year</th>
<th>CAFE MPG</th>
<th>LCFS Factor $L_{Year}$</th>
<th>Factor Driven $f$</th>
<th>Gallons Used Per 100 Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>.9933</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>.9867</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>.9800</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>.9733</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>.9667</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>.9600</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>.9533</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>.9467</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>.9400</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>.9333</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Gallons: 54.29

Miles = 100*Sum($f$’s): 1500

MPG = Miles/(Sum of Gallons): **27.3**
### ZEV Derivation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$m_z$</td>
<td>ZEV Equivalent mileage (miles per equivalent gallon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{zr}$</td>
<td>ZEV Equivalent mileage if the electricity is from renewables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{zf}$</td>
<td>ZEV Equivalent mileage if the electricity is from fossil fuels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>fraction of electricity generated from sources not emitting CO2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>Gallons of equivalent fuel used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>Arbitrary distance travelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>$m_{zr} \times m_{zf}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den</td>
<td>$r \times m_{zf} + (1 - r) \times m_{zr}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ZEV Derivation

\[
G = \frac{r \times D}{m_{zr}} + \frac{(1 - r) \times D}{m_{zf}}
\]

\[
m_z = D / G = D / \left( \frac{r \times D}{m_{zr}} + \frac{(1 - r) \times D}{m_{zf}} \right)
\]

\[
m_z = m_{zr} \times m_{zf} / \left( r \times m_{zf} + (1 - r) \times m_{zr} \right)
\]

\[
m_z = \text{Num} / (\text{Den})
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(m_{zr})</th>
<th>(m_{zf})</th>
<th>(r)</th>
<th>1-(r)</th>
<th>(\text{Num})</th>
<th>(\text{Den})</th>
<th>(m_z)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>350000.00</td>
<td>1056.00</td>
<td>331.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>CAFÉ MPG</td>
<td>LCFS</td>
<td>Eq. MPG</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>D&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>G&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>0.9267</td>
<td>37.01</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>0.7781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>0.9200</td>
<td>38.15</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>0.9750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>0.9133</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>1.1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>0.9067</td>
<td>40.92</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>1.2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>0.9000</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>1.2501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>47.41</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>1.1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>52.88</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>0.8851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>55.38</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>0.6862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>58.13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.4129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>60.88</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.1643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>67.13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>70.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>73.38</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Miles and then Gallons of equivalent fuel: 1259.00  11.34

Equivalent MPG of LDV Fleet in 2030: **111.03**

ZEV Miles Driven = 865.0  Fraction of Miles Driven by ZEVs = **68.7%**
Computing the Ratio of Per-Capita 2030 Driving to Per-Capita 2005 Driving

Equivalent Mileage in 2030 is what we made it. It is as high as possible, because a large driving reduction will be difficult.

\[ = \text{“NUMERATOR MILEAGE”} \]

\[
\frac{d_{2005}}{} = \frac{111.03}{27.30} = 0.68
\]

The factor of 0.68 means there is a 32% reduction in per-capita driving, from 2005 to 2030.

2015 Fleet Mileage was computed

\[ = \text{“DENOMINATOR MILEAGE”} \]
(Per-Capita Driving Factor) \times (Population Factor) = \text{Net Driving Factor}

(0.68) \times (1.23) = 0.84

Even though the population will grow 23%, net driving must decrease by 16%.

Therefore, why add highway lanes?
Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Fleet Per-Cent & Required Driving Reduction, Per-Cent

"Heroic Measures" Case Versus the "Extra Heroic Measures"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heroic Measures</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Heroic Measures</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028 to 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heroic Measures</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Heroic Measures</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Reduction in Per-Capita Driving, with Respect to 2005

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heroic Measures</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Heroic Measures</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CARB Plan

Regulations on the books in California, set in 2012, require that 2.7 percent of new cars sold in the state this year be, in the regulatory jargon, ZEVs. The quota rises every year starting in 2018 and reaches 22 percent in 2025. Nichols wants 100 percent of the new vehicles sold to be zero- or almost-zero-emissions by 2030.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bloomberg News</th>
<th>&quot;Heroic Measures&quot; Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1August 8, 2015
2Requires a 32% reduction in per-capita driving with respect to 2005

The CARB Plan results in an equivalent 2030 Fleet Mileage of only 69.2 MPG, which would require a per-capita driving reduction of 58%, compared to 2005 driving, to achieve the climate-stabilizing target.
Measures to Get 32%

• Predictions, Regional Transportation Plans 10%
• Stop expanding most roads and all freeways 2%
  – No need, Eliminate congestion with less driving
• Reallocate freeway-expansion $$$ to transit 2%
• Payment methods, to increase fairness & choice 2%
  – Demonstration projects: unbundle parking cost
  – Legislation
    • Unbundle the cost of most “free” or underpriced parking 8%
    • Equitable and environmentally-sound road-use fees 8%
• Smarter growth, complete streets, bike classes 2%
An Important Pricing Strategy

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Democratic Club of Carlsbad and Oceanside (DEMCCO) supports a road-usage charge (RUC) pricing & payout system that (1) covers all road-use costs, including the environmental & health costs caused by driving; (2) could still include a fuel tax or fee; (3) would mitigate impacts on low-income users; (4) would protect privacy; (5) would include congestion pricing when that technology becomes feasible; (6) would keep the per-mile price incentive to drive energy-efficient cars at least as large as it is with today’s fuel excise tax; and (7) would send its earnings to all citizens and institutions that are currently losing money.
Another Important **Pricing** Strategy


- **Work for shared, convenient & value-priced parking, operated with a system that provides earnings to those paying higher costs or getting a reduced wage, due to the cost of providing parking**

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that DEMCCO supports funding the development and prototype installation of car-parking systems with at least the last two features (numbered 7 and 8), so as to demonstrate useful feasibility, with the full set of features as follows: (1) have full-cost base pricing; . . . . . . (7) have automatic car detection; and (8) will do efficient mailing of invoices, containing both parking charges and parking earnings.
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Thank you for being here.

I would be happy to email you what I present.

[Slide 1] Climate-Stabilizing California Light-Duty-Vehicle (LDV) Requirements, Versus Air Resource Board Goals

We need to stabilize the climate. The problem here is for light-duty vehicles (LDVs), in California. I develop a set of LDV requirements. I need to understand the nature of the climate problem.

[2] In San Diego County, cars and light-duty trucks (LDVs) emit 41% of the greenhouse gas, the largest category.

[3] Earth Science text books explain that we have a problem. Atmospheric CO2 traps heat and we are adding great quantities of CO2 to our atmosphere.

[4] This shows 3 sources of information, regarding potential for harm. One says, “the Earth is on a trajectory to warm by more than 4 degrees Celsius [and this] would be incompatible with continued human survival”

[5] This is the Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05, in million metric tons per year. It is based on 2005 Science and conditions. Its greenhouse gas emission targets are

- the 2000 Emission Value by 2010,
- the 1990 Value by 2020, and
- 80% below the 1990 value, by 2050.
This is the world-famous Keeling Curve of atmospheric CO2 over the last 50 years.

This shows global average atmospheric temperature, in blue, with the scale on the right side, and CO2, in red, with the scale on the left side, over the last thousand years. It shows our industrial revolution, with the steep run up in CO2, starting in the 1800’s.

This is the plot from the movie *Inconvenient Truth*, with added notes. The temperature scale is on the left; the Atmospheric CO2 scale is on the right. The plotted blue line is atmospheric CO2, from ice-core samples. The plotted red line is temperature from a study of isotopes. The data starts 800,000 years ago.

To solve the LDV, climate-stabilization problem, we need a climate-stabilizing target. This document is an amicus brief, filed in a court case about climate stabilization. The list of authors includes Dr. James Hansen. The document supports the calculation of a climate-stabilizing target, as follows.

For most years, the world has been breaking its greenhouse gas emission records. Perhaps the world will start to get significant reductions, by year 2020. 15% per year means that the factor of point-eight-five is applied, year after year. Over 10 years, the factor is: point two, or 80% down. In 2020, California’s greenhouse gas emission will be at its 1990 level, as required by AB 32.

Therefore, California needs to achieve the indicated target.

The paper develops the LDV requirements to do that.

Here are some methodology notes. The base year of 2005 conforms to the base year convention of SB 375. SB 375 specifies driving reductions, to be achieved in Regional Transportation...
Plans, with respect to 2005. An intermediate year of 2015 was selected. **Car efficiency**, from 2005 to 2015, is taken from the Steve Winkelman’s report, found at the indicated link. The factor between emissions in 2005 and 1990 is taken from the same report. The car efficiency factor, from 2015 to 2030, will be derived. The derivation results in the car-efficiency-related requirements, over those 15 years. It is assumed that cars last 15 years.

[14] Here is the key plot from Steve Winkelman’s report.

[15] Here are most of the variables used. More will follow. “e” is emission of CO2, “L” is Low Carbon Fuel Standard factor; “C” is “C” “O” “2” per mile driven, for a fleet of all LDVs on the road in a given year; “p” is population; “D” is per-capita driving; “m” is miles per gallon and “N” is the pounds of ‘C” “O” “2” per gallon of fuel. The subscripts denote the year.

[16] Here are the fundamental equations. The emission, “e”, is “C”, which is CO2 per mile driven, multiplied by the per-capita driving, multiplied by the population, for any year. The ratios, or factors, can be used as shown. Mileage (miles per equivalent gallon), or equivalent mileage, will be used, to keep things heuristic, or intuitive. For the mileage factor, the base year is in the numerator and the future year is in the denominator, opposite of the factor for the CO2 per mile driven.

[17] Here’s the solution overview. The emission factor is a product of the mileage factor, multiplied by the per-capita driving factor, multiplied by the population factor. The per-capita driving factor is the independent variable and becomes a key reported
requirement. The population factor is from the California Department of Finance.

[18] Here, the equations are expanded to show how the intermediate year of 2015 is used for the car-efficiency factor and how the intermediate year of 1990 is used for the needed emission factor. The car efficiency ratio, of 2030 to 2015, is needed. They will lead to the car efficiency requirements. The independent variable is the per-capita driving in 2030 compared to 2005.

[19] The easy-to-get values are inserted. Note the use of the Steve Winkelman data.

[20] The kernel equation is derived, using two simple manipulations of the equation. We don’t want the per-capita driving factor to be too small, because we are rather dependent on driving. We also have to be realistic about how efficient our fleet could really be in 2030. As it says, Equivalent Mileage in 2030 is what we make it. It needs to be as high as possible, because a large driving reduction will be difficult to achieve. We must compute the “numerator mileage” and the “denominator” mileage.

[21] Here are some important values to be specified in the developed requirements: Low Carbon Fuel Standards; Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency (CAFÉ) standards; and driving reduction factors, for poor-mileage years. The low carbon fuel standard will increase the equivalent mileage, for internal combustion engine vehicles.

[22] Here are three more critical requirements: First, Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency (CAFÉ) standards will only apply to Internal Combustion Engine, light-duty vehicles. Second, each
corporation’s yearly sold fleet of LDVs must include a specified fraction of Zero-Emission Vehicles, or ZEVs. As shown, this factor is represented by the variable “z”. Third, only 20% of electricity in 2030 can come from fossil fuel.

[23] Here is the calculation of the fleet mileage for 2015. It only uses current California mandates. It is assumed that all the cars in any given year, collectively; travel a selected and arbitrary amount of 100 miles. Although this is preposterously low, it doesn’t matter, because this assumed distance is cancelled out of the final mileage calculation, which is equivalent gallons used, which is proportional to distance, divided by total miles. The 2015 fleet equivalent mileage is over twenty seven miles per gallon.

[24] Here are the variables used in the needed derivation of the ZEV’s equivalent mileage as a function of the variables shown.

[25] This shows the derivation and use of the formulae for the equivalent ZEV mileage. The final result is over three hundred and thirty three miles per equivalent gallon.

[26] This shows a case I have named Heroic Measures. The driving reduction factors “f” are significant and critical. The green area shows the ZEV calculations, where the lower case “z” is the fraction of purchased new cars that is ZEVs, for that year. For both the brown and the green, the key calculation is that the number of gallons of equivalent-fuel-used is computed as the distance, divided by the equivalent miles per gallon. The yellow is the total. The 2030 mileage of the different years may be of interest but is not used. The total miles and total gallons, shown in the blue field, are used to compute the 2030 mileage of the entire fleet of LDVs.
The most critical requirements are for the “z” values. The “z” value increases to 95% by 2026, for example.

[27] This shows a significant result. The factor of point six eight means that we will need a 32% reduction in per-capita driving, in 2030, compared to 2005.

[28] The per-capita driving factor 0.68, multiplied times the population growth factor, 1.23, gives the net driving factor. This calculation shows that the “Heroic Measures” Case per-capita driving reduction is large enough that the net miles driven in California must be reduced by 16%, compared to 2005 levels. This shows that increasing highway capacity is a waste of money.

[29] This shows some of the significant results. Besides the “Heroic Measures Case” it shows the results of another case that is shown in the paper, called the “Extra-Heroic Measures” case. The case is designed to allow 2005 per-capita driving in 2030. For the Heroic Measures case, we need 24% of new LDVs to be ZEVs 2020. That will be difficult. However, for the “Extra Heroic Measures” case, 62% is needed. The Extra Heroic Measures case appears to be nearly impossible.

[30] The California Air Resource Board’s current plan, as best we know it, is based on the Chair’s statement, shown on the left. It results in the column shown in brown. Those values can be compared to the “Heroic Measures” values. Using the methods of this presentation it has been found that if the CARB-specified fleet was on the road in 2030, we would have to reduce per-capita driving by 58%, compared to 2005, if LDVs were to achieve the needed climate-stabilizing target.
Here’s a list of measures that might achieve the needed per-capita driving reduction. By 2030, most California RTPs will achieve about a 10% reduction in per-capita driving, compared to 2005. Since most RTPs include road expansions, driving can be reduced by an estimated 2-percent by not building those expansions, as shown in the second bullet. Reallocating that money to transit is estimated to do the same. Payment methods, that increase fairness and choice, for road and parking use, have the most potential.

This describes the kind of Road Usage Charge that we need. California’s Senate Bill 1077 resulted in a Road Usage Charge Pilot Project. To maintain roads, with declining gas tax revenues, and to increase fairness by reducing hidden costs and taxes, California will need to enact a Road User Charge (RUC). This resolution shows some of the needed features.

We need to have parking policies that increase fairness and choice. Most parking for employees is a bundled benefit. It is expensive to provide. The problem is that employees, when they don’t drive to work, get zero benefit. The solution is to operate the parking as a business for the financial benefit of all employees. The bullet shown is from the California Democratic Party Platform. The next item is a resolution calling for automatic car detection and invoice mailing.

That concludes my presentation. I hope there are some questions.
Since most RTPs include road expansions, driving can be reduced some by not building those expansions, as shown in the second bullet. The next bullet is reallocating that money to transit. This assumes the federal government will recognize our climate crisis and allow this. (The 2016 election comes to mind.) The fourth bullet says we will improve the way we pay for roads and for car parking. These measures can increase fairness, besides reducing driving. The final bullet is to do more of what many Regional Transportation Plans are already doing in California. We must increase density and height around good transit stations, for example.

Thank you. Are there any questions?

******************************************************************************

[xx] Here’s an important pricing policy. The resolution was approved by about forty political club members, who had managed to educate themselves about our climate crisis, to the point, where they knew that substantial change was needed.

[Quote] DEMCCO supports a road-use fee pricing and payout system that (1) would cover all road-use costs, including the environmental and health costs caused by driving; (2) could still include a fuel tax or fee; (3) would mitigate impacts on low-
income users; (4) would protect privacy; (5) would include congestion pricing when that technology becomes feasible; (6) would keep the per-mile price incentive to drive energy-efficient cars at least as large as it is with today’s fuel excise tax; and (7) would send its earnings to all citizens and institutions that are losing money under the current system, with the goal being to achieve a full and just compensation.

Recently, SB 1077 became law in California. It establishes a Technical Advisory Committee to prepare a recommendation on how to do a pilot project Road Usage Charge, which could have all the features described in this resolution. They had their first meeting on January 23rd.

[27] Here’s another important pricing policy. This resolution was passed by the same political club that approved the last resolution.

DEMCCO supports funding the development and prototype installation of car-parking systems with at least the last two features (numbered 7 and 8), so as to demonstrate useful feasibility, with the full set of features as follows: (1) have full-cost base pricing; (2) have congestion pricing; (3) have charge and payout policies that will minimize money lost by non-drivers, due to parking facilities; (4) will support sharing of parking facilities; (5) will provide retrievable knowledge of the use of each parking space; (6) have a data interface that will support on-demand predictions of parking-space price and availability; (7) have automatic car detection; and (8) will do efficient mailing of invoices, containing both parking charges and parking earnings.
By the way, unbundling the cost of parking is an important measure of Carlsbad’s Climate Action Plan.

I end this talk summarizing the results in the following two slides

[28] Measures to get LDVs to support climate stabilization can be thought of as a 3-legged stool:

- Cleaner cars,
- Cleaner fuels, and
- Less driving.

[29] Likewise, measures to get the needed driving reduction can be thought of as a 3-legged stool:

- Great transit;
- Great land use; and
- Pricing-and-payout systems, related to driving and parking.

The first two require money; the third will produce money.

I hope there will be questions.

[30] Thank you
Eliminating the Harm of Bundled-Cost or Bundled-Benefit Parking

- Definitions of Parking Systems
- New System: Dividend-Account Parking
- Motivations for change
- An example of a demonstration project
A Bundled-Cost Parking System

The most common of all parking systems. Erroneously called “free”
A Bundled-Benefit Parking System

The 2\textsuperscript{nd} most common of all parking systems. Erroneously called “free”
The harm of a Bundled-Cost or a Bundled-Benefit car-parking system is that they take money from people without their knowledge or consent.
Bundled-Cost or Bundled-Benefit car-parking systems should be replaced with Dividend-Account Parking systems.
From the California Democratic Party (CDP) Platform:

Motivation for Change, 1 of 7

1. Cars and Light-duty vehicles (LDVs) emit the most GHG of any category

![Pie chart showing GHG emissions sources](chart.png)

- **On Road Transportation:** 46%
  - Cars and light-duty trucks: 41%
  - Heavy Duty Vehicles: 5%
Motivation for Change, 2 of 7

2. Fleet Efficiency Will Not Come Soon Enough, as shown in peer-reviewed report:

**Air & Waste Management Association (AWMA) 2016 Paper**

*Climate-Stabilizing California Light-Duty-Vehicle (LDV) Requirements*
Motivation for Change, 3 of 7

AWMA 2016 & EUEC 2017 Paper

*Climate-Stabilizing California Light-Duty-Vehicle (LDV) Requirements*

- Percent reduction in emission from some baseline, for the target year
2. Fleet Efficiency Will Not Come Soon Enough, as shown in the peer-reviewed report:

**AWMA 2016 & EUEC 2017 Paper**

**Climate-Stabilizing California Light-Duty-Vehicle (LDV) Requirements**

1. Programs to remove gas guzzlers
2. Yearly Fractions of Sales that are Zero-Emission Vehicles (ZEVs, or Battery Electric)
3. Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency (CAFÉ) for internal combustion engine cars sold, by year
4. Target Year Percent of Electricity that is renewable
### Motivation for Change, 5 of 7

#### 15 years of ZEV %, for two Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First 5 Years</th>
<th>Middle 5 Years</th>
<th>Last 5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heroic</td>
<td>Extra Heroic</td>
<td>Heroic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### % Reduction in Per-Capita Driving, with Respect to 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heroic</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Heroic</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many prefer the “Extra Heroic” case because they want to believe we won’t need to reduce driving.

However, the “Extra Heroic Case” percentages are not reasonable.
Motivation for Change, 6 of 7

We must achieve a **significant reduction** in per-capita driving, by 2030, with respect to 2005, if we are going to **stabilize the climate at a livable level.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Reduction in Per-Capita Driving, with Respect to 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heroic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Heroic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• A big part of the needed 32% reduction will need to come from car-parking reform.

• The first step will be a simplified demonstration project of a Dividend-Account Parking System at a work location.

• Such a proposal will now be presented.
A Dividend-Account Parking System for Oceanside

A System to Eliminate the Harm of Bundled-Benefit Car Parking for City Employees
300 North Coast Highway

- Top-Level Outcome & Overview
- Calculations
- Who gets to use the system and how
- Overcoming problems and perceptions
- Outcomes of a new incentive

Mike Bullock
Top-Level Outcomes

• Employees that drive every day break even (lose no money)

• Employees that don’t drive every day get paid to not drive

• Fewer employees drive, reducing Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions
Overview

• Fully-automated parking system, operated for the financial gain of employees
  – Earnings = revenue minus expense
  – All earnings go to employees

• Price is cost per minute
  – Such as 2.3 cents per minute (= $1.38 per hour)

• An employee’s earnings (“Dividend”) is proportional to their time spent at work
Calculations of an Employee’s Earnings

- An employee’s earning is proportional to time spent at work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions to Compute an Employee's Monthly Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T_{\text{Employee}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{\text{AllEmployees}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{\text{AllEmployees}}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Payment so Those that Drive Every Day Will Lose No Money

Note: This is for an individual employee, “Joe”

Joe’s Parking Payment =

Joe’s Earnings – Price per Minute x Minutes Joe Parked + “(Joe’s) Add In”

“Add In” is zero, unless it must take on a positive value so that Joe loses no money
Charge, Earnings, & Add-In, Payment

For Each Employee

• **Charge**
  – Total Minutes Parked x Cost per Minute

• **Earnings**
  – As shown on earlier slide (proportional to employee’s time spent at work)

• **Add-In**
  – Zero, unless Charge > Earnings
  – If Charge > Earnings, Add-In = Charge – Earnings

• **Payment** = Earnings – Charge + Add-In
Who Gets To Use Dividend-Account Parking

• **Anyone** (not necessarily an employee) driving a car registered in the system
  – There is a person with an account associated with the car
  – The car can be identified
    • RFID attached to the car
    • License plate reader
    • Any other method
Employee Behavior

Employees Must Park in Their Parking Lot if they Drive to Work

Measures to Reduce “Cheating” = Parking in the Neighborhood

• Soft, pre-emptive measure: messaging
  – Perceived integrity is every employee’s responsibility
  – Insufficient perceived integrity can cost employees
    • Reduced chance of promotion
    • Smaller pay raises
    • More chance of terminated employment
  – Empty spaces in the employee parking garage cost all employees money
  – Parking free in the neighborhood will not be tolerated
  – The City wants to be a good neighbor: this is the reason for off-street parking ordinances

• Soft, pre-emptive measure: data collection
  – Operate the system for a time, perhaps even a year, before actually collecting or distributing money
  – Non drivers are identified, thanked, and asked to provide details as to how they are getting to work without driving

• Soft, In-Operational Mode: Non drivers are thanked and interrogated

• Hard: cameras or RFID sensors can identify employees walking into the work perimeter from the neighborhoods
Hard-to-Not-Drive Example
Fictional, Simplified Case with Pricing and Payout Considered per Day, Page 1

• Employment Center (factory and office)
• Outside Hemet, California
• 100 employees; parking lot has 100 spaces
• No Transit, 110 degree temperature with poor roads for biking, culture of not car-pooling
• Before installing
  – 99 drive
  – 1 bikes
Hard-to-Not-Drive Example
Fictional, Simplified Case with Pricing and Payout Considered per Day, Page 2

- Dividend-Account Parking charges $10/day
- After installing
  - 99 drive
  - 1 bikes
- Total collected each day: $990
- Each employee gets $9.90 earnings per day
- Each driver loses 10 cents per day
- The “crazy” bike rider gets $9.90 per day extra

Hey, isn’t this an improvement? I would say the “crazy” bike rider is earning his money!

If another employee bikes, the drivers would lose 20 cents per day and the bike riders would get $9.80 per day. If the company president rented out the 2 extra spaces for $10 per day, the drivers would lose nothing and the bike riders would get $10 per day. Biking would increase by 100%! What’s wrong with that?
Results of 3 Actions, Including Cash-out

Case (#1), Reference Patrick Siegman’s article in Bicycle Pedestrian Federation

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

• Actions
  – $54/month (1995 $’s), to not drive
  – Improved Transit
  – Improved Bike/Ped facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CH2M Hill Work Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike, Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since these changes are brought about by more than just cashout, this case is not used in the tabulation of cashout results (next chart)
Cash-Out Results
(11 Locations, 3 Groups, 1995 Dollars)


• 3 Largest Responses — 38%, 36%, 31%

• 3 Smallest Responses — 15%, 18%, 24%

• Responses are the *change*; car vacancy rates would be larger

---

### Impact of Financial Incentives on Parking Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>1995 dollars per mo.</th>
<th>Parking Use Decrease&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A: Areas with little or no public transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century City District, West Los Angeles</td>
<td>3500 employees at 100+ firms</td>
<td>$81</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University, Ithaca, NY</td>
<td>9000 faculty &amp; staff</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles</td>
<td>1 employer, 850 employees</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Mesa, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average for Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B: Areas with fair public transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Civic Center</td>
<td>10000+ employees, several firms</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles</td>
<td>1 mid-size firm</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC Suburbs</td>
<td>5500 employees at 3 worksites</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Los Angeles</td>
<td>5000 employees, 118 firms</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average for Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group C: Areas with good public transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington, Seattle Wa.</td>
<td>50,000 faculty, staff &amp; students</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Ottowa, Canada</td>
<td>3500+ government staff</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>1 firm with 430 employees</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>39%&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average for Group, but not Bellevue Washington</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over All Average, Excluding Bellevue Washington</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Parking vacancy would be higher!   
<sup>2</sup> Not used, since transit & walk/bike facilities also improved.
Implementation Example

The City could have the vendor operate the system, for the first 10 years. Over those years, the vendor would be motivated to debug the system and continue to look for operational efficiencies. The vendor could receive 10% of the revenue, for the first 5 years; 5% of the revenue, for the next 3 years; and 2%, for the final 2 years. If 600 cars are parked for 8 hours, 200 days per year, at 50 cents per hour, then the yearly revenue would be $480,000. The vendor would collect $240,000 over the first 5 years, $72,000 over the next 3 years, and $28,800 over the last two years.
Back up Slides
## Measures to Get 32%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Estimated Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictions, Regional Transportation Plans</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop expanding most roads and all freeways</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– No need, Eliminate congestion with less driving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocate freeway-expansion $$$ to transit</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment methods, to increase fairness &amp; choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Demonstration projects: Dividend-Account Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace Bundled-Cost or Bundled-Benefit Parking</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equitable and environmentally-sound road-use fees</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarter growth, complete streets, bike classes</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*EUEC 2018*
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the California Democratic Party reinforces the need for all high school students to know, before they graduate, and elected officials to know, acknowledge, and address, as soon as possible, (1) both the existence of and the reason for anthropogenic climate change; (2) its potential for harm; (3) the difference between stabilizing the climate at a livable level and destabilization; (4) science-based, climate-stabilizing, GHG reduction targets; (5) the primary variables and considerations in identifying those targets and (6) the approximate amount of life style and technology change required to achieve those climate-stabilizing targets.
How Bad Could It Get?

Governor Brown to the Pope:

*Reverse Course*

or

Face Extinction
Climate Data

• Keeling Curve:
  http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/An_Inconvenient_Truth#Scientific_basis

Currently 400 PPM!

Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide
Measured at Mauna Loa, Hawaii

Burning a gallon of gasoline releases about 19 #'s of CO2!
Likewise
A barrel of oil, about 700 #'s
A ton of coal, about 3 tons
Etc.
Our Climate Crisis


Current Level of CO\textsubscript{2} is 400 PPM

S-3-05’s goal is to cap CO\textsubscript{2} at 450 PPM

S-3-05 Achievement Outcomes
- X% chance > 4 (Extinction?)
- 30% chance > 3 (very bad)
- 50% chance > 2 (bad)

Current Level of CO\textsubscript{2} is 400 PPM
Our Climate Crisis

- Earth & Space Research (ESR) website: http://www.esr.org/outreach/climate_change/mans_impact/man1.html

Current level = 400 PPM

S-3-05’s Goal is to cap CO2 at 450 PPM, which is off this chart.

Start of Industrial Revolution
We must stabilize the value of the earth’s atmospheric CO2_e

CO2_e Emissions

\[ E_N + E_A + E_{WFB} \]

Natural: rotting, fire, digestion, respiration
Anthropogenic: combustion of fossil fuel, methane, other
Warming Feed Back: such as methane from melting permafrost

The Warming Feed Back term is the wild card. It must not become dominant.

Sequestration (Photosynthesis)

\[ S \]

Growth of plants on Earth

\[ \begin{align*}
\geq & \rightarrow \text{Positive Slope} \\
\equiv & \rightarrow \text{Zero Slope} \\
\leq & \rightarrow \text{Negative Slope}
\end{align*} \]

If Anthropogenic emissions were to be sufficiently low (80% below 1990 levels has been allocated to developed countries), the slope would be zero, thus capping the value of the Earth’s atmospheric CO2_e.
Motivation for Change

• Fairness to individuals
  – Costs no longer hidden
  – Costs avoided or recovered, by not using parking

• Less driving, to reduce environmental harm
  – Motivates choosing alternative modes
  – Less driving to find parking

• Cost Effective Development
  – Less parking needed reduces land and building costs
Goals, 1 of 2

• One agency operates all parking
• Nearly all parking is shared
• Parking costs are effectively unbundled
  – From wages and rents
  – From costs of goods and services
• No change to how parking gets built
  – Generally, municipalities require & developers build
Goals, 2 of 2

• Priced right
  – Value Priced: Base price derived from costs
  – Driver demand determines a congestion price

• No need to search for parking
  – Directions to parking that meets user’s needs
  – Accurate price predictions

• Each parking space’s use is archived
  – Supports informed decisions

• Privacy and the needs of the disabled are supported
• **Definition & Examples of Parking Beneficiary Group**
  
  – Owners
    • Private investors or governments operating public parking
  – Those losing money due to provided parking
    • Employees
    • Apartment renters or condominium owners
    • Hotel or restaurant patrons
    • Shoppers
  – Those offered specific parking
    • Driving-age students at a school with parking
    • Driving-age train riders using a station with parking
Definitions and Methods 2 of 6

• How to Effectively Unbundle the Cost or the Benefit
  – Price charged per minute
    • Base price rate established to cover all costs
    • Congestion price rate
      – Dynamically set as a function of occupancy rate
      – Charge is time average, if rate changes, while car is parked
  – Parking generally available to all drivers
  – Earnings distributed to members of Beneficiary Group
    • Calculation of individual’s earnings depends on situation
Definitions and Methods, 3 of 6

• Calculation of monthly earnings
  – If parking is provided for several groups, each group’s portion of the earnings is proportional to its original contribution to cost (Mixed use case)
  – Each beneficiary group’s total is divided up among its members
    • Condominium owners: proportional to spaces effectively purchased
    • Renters: proportional to spaces effectively renting
    • Shoppers: proportional to money spent
    • Employees or students of driving age: proportional to time spent at work or school
    • Train riders of driving age: proportional to time spent on round trips
For congestion pricing, define **Cluster of Parking**
- 20 to 40 contiguous spaces nearly equal in desirability
- Assigned the same price

**Pricing**
- Base price
  - Covers all costs
  
    \[ r_{Baseline\text{Hourly}} = \frac{(r_{Investment} \times v_{Parking}) + c_{YOPD}}{(n_{Hours\text{PerYear}} \times f_{TO})} \]
  - Report’s Page 13 & 14 provides details
- Congestion price, for each cluster
  
    \[ r_{HourlyRate} = r_{Baseline\text{Hourly}} \times \left( B^{(30-v)/5} \right), for \ V < 30; \ r_{Baseline\text{Hourly}}, otherwise \]
  - \( B \) is nominally 2; adjusted to keep vacancy above 15%
  - \( V \) is the vacancy % rate (Report’s Eq. 2, Table 2, Pages 14 & 15)
Definitions and Methods, 5 of 6

• Pricing predictions
  – For any set of dates, start times, durations, and destinations
  – Availability of predictions
    • Broadcast into navigational units
    • Website or phone

• Help to find desired parking
  – Driver gives times and locations and stipulates . . .
    • Max price, to get space at minimum walk distance
    • Max walk distance, to get space at minimum price
  – Voice-activated navigational system for ease and safety
Definitions and Methods, 6 of 6

• Monthly statements
  – All parking charges and earnings
    • First, within state
    • Then, within nation
    • Finally, within North and South America
  – Customer selects presentation detail
    • Less detail for ease and more privacy
    • More detail to know and adjust parking decisions
  – Packaged with other statements
    • All utilities, transit use, road use
Implementation Plan, 1 of 3

• Prototype design
  – Most likely a Climate Action Plan Mitigation Measure
• Requirements document to support request for proposal (RFP)
• Winning proposal leads to design
  – Hardware selection and design
  – Software generation
• Prototype installation
  – Most likely a Climate Action Plan Mitigation Measure
  – Debug
  – Adjustments to satisfy stakeholders
Implementation Plan, 2 of 3

• Government agency develops and executes full installation strategy
  – To minimize impact on institutions
  – To maximize early success and driving reductions
    • Large employment centers with “free” parking
    • Train stations with large, “free” parking lots
  – Supported by new law that requires cooperation but very little effort, from . . .
    • Private and public institutions
    • Individuals
Implementation Plan, 3 of 3

• Basis for a new law supporting installations
  – To provide equal protection of the law
    • Government has required parking for 50 years
    • Those driving less than average often lose money
  – Prototype will have demonstrated feasibility
  – Global warming considerations show subsidized parking to be a public nuisance
    • Global warming will likely cause a human catastrophe
    • Short term strategies are critical
    • Electric cars and getting most electricity from renewables will take decades
    • Properly pricing parking is relatively cheap and quick (5 years)
## Unbundle Flow Diagram Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PINP</td>
<td>Company payroll if there were no parking costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P\textsubscript{cost}</td>
<td>Total parking cost. Price will be sized to recover this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P\textsubscript{earned}</td>
<td>Parking earnings equals parking cost minus collection cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v\textsubscript{i}</td>
<td>Employee value. Fraction of available pay. For the average employee, 1/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c\textsubscript{i}</td>
<td>Fraction of parking cost paid. Zero, if the employee never parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Parking earnings divided by parking cost. Close to 1 for efficient collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w\textsubscript{i}</td>
<td>time worked divided by total time worked of all employees. If average, this is 1/n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the average $i$th employee, $v_i = 1/n$ and $w_i = 1/n$. If this employee never parks, their pay is $(1/n)P_{INP} - (1/n)P_{cost}(1-f)$. If $f = 1$, the pay is what it would be with no parking.
Mike Bullock, 1 of 2

• Personal
  – Married, two daughters, 3 grand daughters, 1 grandson
    • Daughter Laura Bullock White (Berkeley)
    • Heidi Bullock (Oceanside)
  – Moved from Cupertino to Oceanside in April 2007
  – Oceanside home
  – Swims with and competes for Oceanside Swim Masters

• Education
  – BSEE, Lamar University
  – MSE, University of Texas at El Paso

• Professional
  – Lockheed Martin Systems Engineer, 1971 to 2007
    • Last 2 years, Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS, satellite to detect and track missiles)
    • 10 Years previous: Milstar (communication satellite)
      – Verification of antenna pointing accuracy
      – Antenna pointing calibration
Mike Bullock, 2 of 2

• Most Recent Activities
  – California Democratic Party
    • Delegate, 76TH AD
    • Elected member of the San Diego County Central Committee
    • CDP Resolutions and Platform
These entities or others may become interested in issuing a Request for Information as described herein

City of Encinitas in cooperation with the cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, Solana Beach, and Del Mar, the United States Marine Corps Base at Camp Pendleton, and North County Transit District

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) OR A REQUEST FOR AN INDICATION OF INTEREST (RFIOI) IN RESPONDING TO AN RFI

Design, Install, and Operate a Dividend-Account Car Parking System at Selected Work Locations for Employees

CM RFI 18-XX

Date Issued: Month j, 2018 or 2019
Questions Due: Month k, 2018, 5:00 PM
Proposals Due: Month l, 2018, 2:00 PM

IF YOU DID NOT DOWNLOAD, OR DIRECTLY RECEIVE THIS DOCUMENT FROM THE XXX WEBSITE AT WWW.xxx.GOV/BIDS, YOU ARE NOT LISTED AS AN OFFICIAL DOCUMENT HOLDER FOR THIS SOLICITATION AND WILL NOT BE NOTIFIED BY THE CITY OF ADDENDA ISSUED. YOU MUST ACKNOWLEDGE ANY ADDENDA ISSUED IN YOUR SUBMITTAL OR RISK BEING CONSIDERED NON RESPONSIVE. PLEASE BE SURE TO VISIT THE WEBSITE ABOVE TO REGISTER AS A DOCUMENT HOLDER FOR THIS SOLICITATION.
City of XXX
City Manager’s Department – Environmental Services
Attn: YYY
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I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Encinitas, or one of the other entities shown above, may want, at some future date, to request information that will aid in the selection of a vendor for a possible Dividend-Account Car-Parking System Demonstration pilot on behalf of the themselves and other entities, such as Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, and Del Mar, the United States Marine Corps Base at Camp Pendleton, and the North County Transit District (collectively referred to as "Partners"). The Partners may seek to evaluate the benefits, effectiveness, and popularity of a Dividend-Account Car Parking System for employees in the north coastal region of San Diego County through the operation of a temporary pilot program lasting from twelve (12) to thirty-six (36) months. It could become the goal of the Partners to determine whether permanent Dividend-Account Car-Parking systems would be successful in our region based on the outcome of a pilot program. Partners may decide to be actively coordinating with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), the agency that may be leading regional Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems coordination around topics including data collection and monitoring, public outreach, policy/regulations. The partners are more likely to want to proceed if there is an identified interest on the part of vendors to respond to an actual RFI. To save time, the rest of this document is written as if one of the Partners has already decided to issue an RFI. However, that is not currently the case. This document, perhaps best described as Request for Indication of Interest has been adapted from a dock-less bike share RFI. Thank you for considering this concept. Please indicate if you would be interested in designing and operating such a system.

Mike Bullock

A. Location

The study area includes the cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, and Del Mar, and the United States Marine Corps Base at Camp Pendleton, all of which are located in northern San Diego County along the coast. The region has a mild climate with average temperatures ranging from the mid-60s in the winter to mid-80s in the summer. The terrain is relatively flat along the coast, particularly when traveling in the north-south directions. Each of the cities have dense urban centers of varying sizes with grid street plans and relatively flat terrain. Generally, most of the cities in the study area have more hilly terrain and a suburban layout east of Interstate 5 (I-5). The combined population of the cities is approximately 365,000 and the combined geographical area of the cities is approximately 106 square miles. Highway 101 runs along the coast through each of the cities for a contiguous distance of approximately 20 miles. Highway 101 is one of the most popular bicycling routes in the San Diego region. North County Transit District (NCTD) operates two rail lines and 34 bus routes throughout North County. Thirteen rail and/or bus transit centers are located within the study area. Total annual NCTD ridership is approximately 10.7 million passengers. The Camp Pendleton Marine Corps base is located just north of Oceanside and serves as a major employer for both enlisted and non-enlisted personnel. The southwest corner of the base adjacent to Oceanside Harbor and west of I-5 features relatively flat terrain and could benefit from increased biking connections.

Table 1: General information about the region
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population¹</th>
<th>Employment²</th>
<th>Size (sq. mi.)</th>
<th>Coastline (mi.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>175,948</td>
<td>35,662</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>112,930</td>
<td>66,596</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>61,928</td>
<td>22,443</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>13,494</td>
<td>7,843</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹SANDAG Current Estimates, 2016
²U.S. Census Bureau, 2015

B. Background

The cities in the North County coastal region of San Diego County are increasingly aware of the need to reduce local greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to limit the effects of climate change.
while offering viable transportation alternatives to driving alone. Many of the cities have adopted Climate Action Plans (CAPs) or are in the process of developing CAPs. CAPs establish environmental initiatives by which cities aim to achieve GHG emissions reduction goals and targets. Transportation, especially travel via single occupancy vehicle, is a major source of GHG emissions in North County. Facilitating safe, convenient, and affordable alternative transportation options is often a component of these plans and initiatives. Car parking systems that increase economic fairness and choice, compared to bundled-employee-benefit car parking systems (erroneously called “free parking”) at places of employment will reduce single occupancy vehicle (SOV) commuting and increase the need for first/last mile solutions. For this reason, this RFI will be provided to those firms that would benefit from increasing the demand for first/last mile solutions.

The Marine Corps Mobility Transformation Strategy calls for demonstration projects at installations like Camp Pendleton to meet official business mobility with capabilities that are smarter, more efficient, more accessible, and cheaper.

Partners will seek to coordinate with SANDAG on Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems data analysis while ensuring the selected Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems vendor can meet data sharing requirements that assist in quantifying the impacts of Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems on vehicle miles traveled (VMT), access to transit, economic development, and other benefits.

Offering and promoting programs, like Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems, that replace vehicle trips with active transportation and/or transit trips, is one of the ways the Partners can help to reduce emissions while offering more efficient and more affordable transportation modes for residents, employees, and visitors. A Dividend-Account Car-Parking System is a system which operates employee car parking for the financial gain of the employees by value-pricing the parking and distributing the earnings, which are the revenue minus a fair cost of operation, among employees. The earnings are provided in proportion to the time an employee spends on the work premises. There may also be an “add in” payment provided by either the employer or from a grant, such as a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) grant, sized so that an employee that continues to drive every day will lose no money under the system. This system will in effect pay each employee an additional amount of income for each day they get to work without relying on the single occupancy vehicle (SOV) mode. See Reference 1 for more details on the Dividend-Account Car Parking System. The References are listed at the end of Section II, Request for Information.

C. Purpose and Objectives of the RFI

The purpose of this Request for Information (RFI) is to identify vendors with the resources to pilot a Dividend-Account Car-Parking System program in the Partners’ jurisdictions, in accordance with the objectives set forth in this RFI.

The Partners seek a qualified vendor to design, establish, implement, operate, and maintain an innovative, valuable, and mutually-beneficial Dividend-Account Car-Parking System pilot program. The pilot should enable and encourage residents, employees, and visitors to affordably and conveniently travel by car pool, transit, active transportation or some combination of these modes. The pilot should also facilitate a decrease in vehicular parking demand, vehicular traffic, and (GHG) emissions, while promoting active and healthy transportation options.
Qualified vendors are invited to submit proposals based on the information provided in this RFI.

This RFI is a mechanism for gathering information and does not constitute a binding procurement process, however, selection of goods and/or services may result from information obtained through this RFI process, where deemed appropriate. The Partners, jointly or individually, are not obligated to make an award or issue a Request for Proposal as part of this process. In addition, the Partners, in their sole discretion, may decide to engage in direct question and answer sessions with one or more vendors and may decide to enter into an agreement or issue permits based upon those discussions/interviews or a resulting proposal.

If a single demonstration pilot project or multiple demonstration pilot projects were successful, given the severity of our anthropogenic climate change crisis, it is anticipated that other employers will decide to install Dividend-Account car-parking systems. Since municipal governments are required under CEQA to adopt General Plan Updates (GPUs) that include, perhaps using a Climate Action Plan, a set of enforceable measures that will achieve climate-stabilizing targets, and since cars and light-duty trucks (LDVs) are the largest category of GHG emissions, it is further anticipated that municipal governments will, over time, update their off-street parking ordinances to include requirements for Dividend-Account Car Parking systems. Reference 2 shows that this system is adaptable to all types of parking. A selected vendor would have access to a market of more than 365,000 residents living in the north coastal region, more than 135,000 employees that work in the region, and others that visit the region for leisure.

Potential Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems program marketing opportunities may include, but are not limited to: being listed as a preferred vendor on the Partners websites, co-branded sustainability campaigns, signage, event sponsorship, press releases, and social media announcements.

D. Obtaining RFI Documents

The website for this RFI and related documents is: PlanetBids (http://www.encinitasca.gov/bids). All correspondence will be posted on the PlanetBids website. It is the responsibility of Proposers to check the website regularly for information updates and RFI clarifications, as well as any RFI addenda. To submit a proposal, a Proposer must be registered with the City of Encinitas as a vendor. To register as a vendor, go to the following link (http://www.encinitasca.gov/bids), and then proceed to the “New Vendor Registration” link. All addenda will be available on the PlanetBids website.

E. RFI Contact

The City of Encinitas will receive questions and information requests on this RFI up to 5:00 p.m. on some TBD Month “n”, 2018. All questions regarding the RFI documents shall be submitted through PlanetBids. All project correspondence will be posted on the PlanetBids website. It is the responsibility of the Proposers to check the website regularly for information updates, clarifications, and addenda.

II. REQUEST FOR INFORMATION or REQUEST FOR INDICATION OF INTEREST

This section describes the information being requested by the Partners to learn about prospective Dividend-Account Car-Parking System (“System”) vendors and optionally to select a vendor to operate in the Partners’ jurisdictions. Interested vendors must include all
information outlined below in a submitted proposal.

A. Dividend-Account Car-Parking System (“System”) Pilot Program Requirements

Vendors responding to this RFI must describe their proposed system that is capable of providing the following services and shall describe these services in their submission:

1. System pilot program(s), as described in Reference 1, to include the following installed and maintained capabilities:

2. A capability to establish and maintain a database of System Vehicles, System Members, System Parking and System Accounts. A System Account includes the mailing name and address of a person that has agreed to receive payments and pay bills that are the result of the implementation of the System and the actions taken by the person, or some other person driving the System Vehicle or System Vehicles, as described herein. Such a person is a “System Member.” A “System Vehicle” is one that can be identified when it is parked in the System and one that is associated with a System Account and System Member. A System Member may take responsibility to pay for the cost of parking for multiple System Vehicles.

3. A capability to provide an easy method for Employees and others to become System Members by establishing a System Account with their chosen System Vehicles.

4. A capability to provide signage to designate System Parking areas well enough to prevent nearly all accidental entries by unauthorized vehicles, meaning vehicles that are not System Vehicles.

5. A capability to provide written materials to explain to employees and others that may want to become System Members how the System will work and why it is an important improvement to economic fairness and environmental outcomes, assuming a reasonable level of cooperation with the City and other affected groups, such as City vendors and sub-contractors.

6. A capability to operate the system for an agreed-upon amount of time, with no money exchanges, to establish a pre-install database of commute behavior including using questionnaires to determine how non-drivers say they are getting to work.

7. A capability to identify a System Vehicle within a minute of its being parked in a System Parking space and to store the System Vehicle identifier and the time it was recognized as being parked.

8. A capability to recognize when a System Vehicle exits a System Parking space, within a minute and to store the vehicle identifier and the recognized exit time.

9. A capability to identify vehicles that are NOT System Vehicles when they are in the System Parking area and are therefore trespassing, while they are in the System Parking area.

10. A capability to record the start time and end time of the trespassing vehicle’s trespassing, to within an accuracy of 1 minute, as well as its license plate image, sufficient to support a conviction of trespassing.

11. A capability to send the license plate of the trespassing vehicle and its start time and end time of its trespassing to law enforcement officials with 5 minutes of the recorded start time of the trespass.

12. A capability to provide notice and evidence of this trespassing in real time and as stored
information for law enforcement so that they can then ticket and prosecute the owners of any and all vehicles that have been illegally parked in a System Parking space. It is anticipated that this would include the capture and storage of the license plate numbers of the vehicles that are parked in the System Parking lot whenever it is the case that the vehicle is not a System Vehicle.

13. A capability to compute an instantaneous charge rate (cost per minute) for the case of an application of “congestion pricing”, whereby an agreed-upon base price is increased by an agreed-upon congestion-pricing algorithm, designed to prevent the occupancy rate from exceeding an agreed-upon upper bound value, such as 90% occupied. An example of such an algorithm is in Reference 2.

14. A capability to compute and store the time that the charge rate changes, for the case of an application of a congestion-pricing algorithm. Note that this time is called the Rate Change Time. At these times, the rate could either increase, by the addition of a car being parked in a System Space or the rate could be decreased, by the subtraction of a car in a System Space.

15. A capability to accumulate a total charge for each System Member, where the total charge is the sum of the products of each parked duration time over which a fixed charge rate applies and the length of that time duration, for all the System Vehicles associated with the System Member, over a month. This total charge is called the System Member Monthly Charge (“SMMC”). Note that the Member may or may not be an employee.

16. A capability to compute the total charges, for all System Members over a month for the System. This amount is the Total System Monthly Charge (“TSMC”).

17. A capability to compute a Total System Monthly Earnings (“TSME”), which is the TSMC, reduced by an agree-to amount, such as 5%, where the 5% is taken out of the TSMC to cover the operator’s expenses.

18. A capability to record all the times an employee enters and leaves the work premises. One way to do this is to require employees to have an RFID. There may also be an GPS or a license plate reading solution. Note that a privacy requirement will prevent this information from being shared, with the employer, for example, with the exception of providing it to a law enforcement person, in the event a warrant is signed by a presiding judge.

19. A capability to use the times an employee enters and leaves the work premises to compute the time, over a month, an employee has spent at or within the work premises. This time is known as the Employee Monthly Time (“EMT”).

20. A capability to compute the total time all employees spent at the premises over a month, to be known as the Total Employee Monthly Time (“TEMT”).

21. A capability to compute an Employee’s Monthly System Earnings (“EMSE”) as the Total System Monthly Earnings (“TSME”), multiplied by the employee’s Employee Monthly Time, EMT divided by the TEMT. This is also described in Reference 1.

22. A capability to compute an Employee’s Add-In “EAI”, as follows. If the employee’s System Member Monthly Charge, SMMC, value is greater than the employee’s earnings, TSME; then, for that case, the EAI is equal to the employee’s SMMC minus the employee’s TSME. If the employee’s System Member Monthly Charge, SMMC value is not greater than the employee’s earnings, TSME; then the employee’s EAI is equal to zero. This is also described in Reference 1.

23. A capability to accept Employee’s Add-In, EAI money from the Employer, with the
expectation that the money would originate from a grant funded by, for example, the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF), or could come from the Employer’s budget, as a Climate Action Plan (CAP) or other expense. It could also be generated by converting some “free” parking to be a different Account Parking System Parking (System Parking), thereby generating new money to the City.

24. A capability to compute an employee’s monthly payment (“EMP”), as follows: It is equal to the Employee’s Monthly System Earnings, EMSE plus the employee’s Add-In, EAI minus the System Member Monthly Charge, SMMC. This is also described in Reference 1.

25. A capability to automatically send out monthly statements to all System Members. System Members who are not employees will receive a bill if they have parked in the System parking during the month. The bill will then be for the member’s SMMC. Each employee will receive a statement showing SMMC, EMSE, and EAI. If the employee’s EAI is zero, then the employee will receive a payment in the form of cashable check for the employee’s EMP. This is also explained in Reference 1.

26. A capability to protect employee privacy where privacy means that the employee’s data will never be shared, with the sole exception of sharing with law enforcement officials in accordance with a valid court order requesting the data. For example, at no time will the data be shared with other employees, including those working in the management of the employer that is providing the employee parking that is the System Parking.

27. A capability to protect System Member privacy where privacy means that the System Member’s data will never be shared, with the sole exception of sharing with law enforcement officials in accordance with a valid court order requesting the data.

28. A capability to allow visitors, vendors, and others, that are identified by the Company management, to be treated as employees. There could also be “visitor” parking that is not associated with the System.

29. A capability to identify System Vehicles that are parked in the visitor parking or other inappropriate parking places, since it is expected that it will required as a part of City Policy that System Vehicles that are associated with employees will be required to be parked in the System Parking. Since employees are earning money from the System Parking, it would be inappropriate for them to not use the System Parking. This information would be shared with City Management, as soon as it is collected.

30. A capability to perform regular inspection, maintenance, and repair of all System Parking facilities and associated capabilities often enough to eliminate nearly all system failures.

31. A capability to perform vendor-managed methods of enforcement.

32. A capability to have demonstrated secured financial backing with the ability to operate at full capacity for the life of the pilot program and beyond with a sustainable business model.

33. A capability to provide close coordination with all Partners, including real-time sharing of System Parking data collected, active promotion of the Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems program in coordination with each Partner, and timely response to any complaints received or requests made by the Partners and Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems users. Describe the type of data that is collected and can be provided to the Partners. Promotion and advertisement of the Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems program must comply with all Partners’ municipal codes and ordinances.

34. A capability to offer a Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems program that can be deployed, operated, managed, and maintained by the vendor at no cost, except for the
possibility of the EAI payments, to the Partners and with minimal oversight needed from the Partners.

35. A capability to establish and operated multiple Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems programs including for for cases other than employee parking, as described in Reference 2, that can be deployed, operated, managed, and maintained by the vendor at no cost, except for the EAI payment, for employee parking, to the Partners and with minimal oversight needed from the Partners.

36. A capability to conform to contract specifications, including general liability insurance, worker’s compensation, automobile liability insurance, indemnification, and termination clauses. Sample contract attached.

B. Proposal Elements

Vendors interested in responding to this RFI must prepare a proposal that includes the following information:

1. Describe how drivers can become System Members.

2. Provide a detailed System maintenance plan.

3. Describe the vendor’s capability to provide data and reports to the Partners, including raw and summarized data. Summarized data could include both user data (e.g., demographics, trip purpose, repeat usage, percent of trips starting and ending in close proximity to transit, mode shift, and transit usage) and trip data (e.g., average trip length, average trip time, trip start and end hotspots, trip path, estimated GHG emissions per trip). Ideally, this data should be provided via a publicly accessible API in your suggested General Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Feed Specification (GBFS) format. Describe vendor’s ability to collect quantitative and qualitative data and report out findings from users (e.g. in-app surveys).

4. Describe how the vendor will employ anti-theft and anti-vandalism measures to ensure Systems do not pose a nuisance to the community.

5. Since the establishment of Dividend-Account Parking systems will increase bike usage, describe how the vendor will address bicycle safety concerns, including helmet use, riding at night and other safety concerns that may or may not be regulated by state vehicle codes.

6. Describe how the Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems program may operate in conjunction with existing bike rental businesses operating in the Partners’ cities.

7. Describe the vendor’s plans for future growth and expansion, including possible anticipated increases in demand for good car parking systems as the public becomes more aware of the threat of anthropogenic climate change and how good systems improve economic fairness, etc.

8. Provide an estimated timeline for a twelve-to-twenty-four-month pilot Dividend-Account Car-Parking System program, including any needed permitting, set-up, promotion, advertising, maintenance and servicing, data delivery to Partners, summary and reporting on the outcome of the pilot program and possible continuation of the program.
9. Describe a recommended minimum Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems size for the North County Coastal operating area.

10. Describe strategies for effectively educating users on proper System Parking use and the reason that society needs to improve the way we pay for the use of car parking.

11. Describe any approach you would recommend to enhance access and fairness for disadvantaged communities.

12. Describe time required to deploy a Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems pilot program if selected based on System Parking size, etc.

13. Describe an approach to increasing the use of Dividend-Account Parking to include most city car parking, then across City boundaries, and then across County, State, and international boundaries, with the final system being one wherein nearly all System Vehicles have a single, world-wide, System Account.

References Providing Additional Description

1. *Eliminating the Harm of Bundled-Cost or Bundled-Benefit Parking*, Presentation to the 2018 Energy Utility Environment Conference (EUEC), Mike Bullock, March 2018


3. *Oceanside Civic Center Garage Space Allocation*, EXCEL Spread Sheet, Bullock, based on a file provided by Oceanside staff, July 2018

III. INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Due Date

Proposals must be submitted electronically no later than 5:00 p.m. on TBD Month 2018 or 2019. Proposals must be submitted electronically via the PlanetBids system used to download the RFI. The maximum file size for submittal is 50 megabytes, and the file type shall be Portable Document Format (PDF). The electronic system will close submissions exactly at the date and time set forth in the RFI or as changed by addenda.

B. Proposal Acceptance

Respondents are responsible for submitting and having their submittal accepted before the closing time set forth in this RFI or as changed by addenda. NOTE: Pushing the submit button on the electronic system may not be instantaneous; it may take time for the Respondent’s documents to upload and transmit before the submittal is accepted. It is the Respondent’s sole responsibility to ensure their document(s) are uploaded, transmitted, and arrive in time electronically. The City of Encinitas will have no responsibility for submittals that no not arrive in a timely manner, no matter what the reason.
C. Page Limit

No submissions exceeding twenty-five (25) pages will be accepted (excluding attachments). In addition, attachments may not exceed twenty-five (25) pages. The City of Encinitas discourages “padding” of proposals with brochures, extensive literature, and boilerplate material not applicable to a pilot Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems program.

D. Proposal Format

Proposals must be organized in the following format and include the following content:

1. Letter of transmittal signed by an individual authorized to bind the proposing entity stating the firm has read and will comply with all terms and conditions of the RFI.

2. General information about the firm, including the size of the organization, location of offices, number of years in business, organizational chart, name of owners and principal parties, number and position titles of staff.

3. Qualifications of principals, project managers and key personnel who would be assigned to this project. Include their position in the firm, and types and amount of relevant experience operating a Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems program or similar program. Identify the primary contact that will be the overall project manager. Resumes are not required, but may be included as attachments. The selected respondent may not substitute personnel without written authorization from the Partners.

4. A work plan that establishes the Respondent’s understanding of, and ability to satisfy Partners’ objectives. Respondent shall succinctly describe the proposed approach for implementing a Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems program, outlining the activities, including innovative ideas that would be undertaken in completing the various tasks and specifying who would perform them.

5. A preliminary estimated schedule for deployment of a pilot Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems program. Show all critical paths, major milestones, and decision points in pilot schedule.

6. A list of the municipal or other government agencies your firm has worked with during the past three years. Provide the following information for at least one operational system that has at least some of the similar components as would a Dividend-Account Car-Parking System program that is managed by the respondent:
   a) Name, address, and telephone number of the agency;
   b) Time period for the project;
   c) Brief description of the scope of the services provided;
   d) Identify the staff members on the project and their specific responsibilities; and
   e) Person and contact information for a reference.

IV. PROPOSAL EVALUATION

A. Proposal Evaluation
A review committee comprised of representatives from each of the potential Partner cities will judge the merit of proposals received in accordance with the general criteria defined herein. Failure of proposers to provide in their proposal any information requested in this RFI may result in disqualification of the proposal. The sole objective of the review committee will be to select the proposal that is most responsive to the Partners’ needs. The Partners reserve the right to elect to not proceed with a pilot Dividend-Account Car-Parking System program and reject all proposals received through this RFI process.

1. Experience of the vendor and proposed staff. Experience of project staff with similar scope of services. Level of education, training, licensing and certification of staff

2. Approach to the project. Demonstrated understanding of the Partners’ needs and solicitation requirements. Approach is well organized and presented in a clear, concise and logical manner.

3. Availability and proposed use of technology and methodologies. Quality control and thoroughness is well defined.

4. Capability to Perform. Ability to complete work within deadlines. Availability and continuity of staff during the course of the project, if selected. Unsatisfactory past performance with the City of Encinitas (or any of the Partner cities) may be considered as determined by the City of Encinitas (or any of the Partner cities) in their sole and absolute discretion.

5. Relevant Experience. Experience in performing similar services for organizations of similar size to the Partner cities. Experience with public agencies. Years of experience with these types of services.


B. Final Negotiation

As reflected above, vendor selection will be based on a combination of factors as determined to be in the best interest of the Partners. After evaluating the proposals and discussing them further with the finalists, or the tentatively selected vendor, the City of Encinitas reserves the right to further negotiate the proposed program.

V. CONDITIONS GOVERNING THIS PROCUREMENT

A. Scope Changes, Additions and Deletions

All changes in proposal documents shall be through written addendum and furnished to all proposers. Verbal information obtained otherwise will NOT be considered in the evaluation process.

B. Rejection of Proposals

The City of Encinitas reserves the right to reject any or all Proposals and to waive informalities and minor irregularities in Proposals received and to accept any portion of Proposal or all items of Proposal if deemed in the best interest of the City of Encinitas to do so.
C. Proprietary Information

Any restrictions on the use of data contained within a Proposal must be clearly stated in the Proposal itself. Proprietary information submitted in response to this RFI will be handled in accordance with applicable City of Encinitas Procurement Regulations and the California Public Records Act.

D. Response Materials Ownership

All materials submitted regarding this RFI become the property of the City of Encinitas. Responses may be reviewed by any person at Proposal opening time and after final selection has been made. The City of Encinitas has the right to use any or all ideas presented in reply to this request, subject to the limitations outlined in Proprietary Information above. Disqualification of a proposer does not eliminate this right.

E. Acceptance of Proposal Content

The contents of the Proposal of the successful proposer will become contractual obligations if contractual agreements action ensues. Failure of the successful proposer to accept these obligations in a permit to operate, purchase agreement, purchase order, contract, delivery order or similar acquisition instrument may result in cancellation of the award and such proposer may be removed from future solicitations.

F. Cost of Proposal Preparation

The City of Encinitas shall not be liable for any pre-contractual expenses incurred by any submitting vendor. Each submitting vendor shall protect, defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Encinitas from any and all liability, claims or expenses whosoever incurred by, or on behalf of, the entity participating in the preparation of its response to this RFI. Pre-contractual expenses are defined as expenses incurred by vendors in:

1. Preparing the proposal in response to this RFI;
2. Cost to acquire a permit; and
3. All other expenses incurred by a vendor related to preparation of proposal or establishment of a Dividend-Account Car-Parking System program.

G. Interview

Interviews with the top respondents may be requested. The selection of vendors invited to interview will be solely based on the Partners’ discretion. The vendors asked to interview will be notified in advance.
Sample License Agreement for Dividend-Account Parking Services

This License Agreement for Dividend-Account Car-Parking System Services ("Agreement") is made this this day of September 2017, by and between the City of Encinitas ("City") and ___ ("Dividend-Account Car-Parking System Vendor").

RECATS

1. A goal of City is to provide safe and affordable multi-modal transportation options to all residents, reduce traffic congestion, and maximize carbon free mobility.

2. Dividend-Account Car-Parking System services are a component to help the City achieve its transportation goals and the City desires to make this System available to residents and those who work or otherwise drive and park in the City.

3. Dividend-Account Car-Parking System Vendor proposes to operate a Dividend-Account Car Parking program within the City at an agreed-to location with an agree-to number of System parking spaces within the designated location or locations. As an example, based on Reference 3, there could be 239 spaces designated as System Parking, out of a total of 284 spaces in the Oceanside Civic Center Parking Garage. Note further, that if there are 259 employees that work for the City and are given parking spaces, there would be a need to establish 20 additional System Parking spaces outside of the Oceanside Civic Center Parking Garage.

4. Dividend-Account Car-Parking System Vendor will abide by all City ordinances and rules governing the use of public space.

5. Dividend-Account Car-Parking System Vendor possesses the technology necessary to install, operate, maintain, and expand such a system and multiple systems as demand expands.

AGREEMENT

1. Initial Term. This Agreement is effective for twelve to eighteen months from the date of execution ("Initial Term, Phase 1"), which will include a duration of installation during which no money is exchanged so as to establish a baseline of modal splits for employee commuting, and then a year of full operation to document the modal split changes and an estimated amount of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions saved by the program. At the conclusion of the Initial Term Phase 1, the Agreement may be extended by mutual written agreement of the parties for an additional two-year term (Initial Term, Phase 2), subject to any new terms agreed between the parties, unless either party notifies the other party of its intent not to continue with the Agreement no later than 30 days before the expiration of the Initial Term, Phase 1 and Phase 2.

2. Exclusive Operator. During the Initial Term’s Phase 1 and Phase 2, the City designates Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor as the exclusive provider of the System services within its city limits. This designation is personal to Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor and may not be assigned or transferred to any party. This exclusivity provision shall expire and not be renewed past the Initial Term’s Phase 1 and Phase 2 unless agreed in writing by the parties.
3. **Use of City Property.** City authorizes Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor to use (“License”) City property, including the public right-of-way and System Parking areas that are suitable, solely for the purposes set forth in Section 4 of this Agreement. This authorization is not a lease or an easement, and is not intended and shall not be construed to transfer any real property interest in City Property.

4. **Permitted Use.** Dividend-Account Car-Parking System’s System Members may use City Property solely for parking System Vehicles. The City Property is maintained by the City. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor may operate an agree-to-amount of System Parking places on City Property as set forth in Exhibit A. If at any time during the term of the Agreement Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor desires to place additional System Parking within the City limits, Dividend-Account Car-Parking Parking Systems Vendor must request and receive authorization from the city to do so in writing. The City may limit the number of System Parking places upon identifying a potential harm to public health or safety. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall not place or attach any personal property, fixtures, or structures to City Property without the prior written consent of City.

   a. Use of City Property and Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor’s operations within the City, shall, at a minimum: a) not adversely affect City Property or the City's streets, or sidewalks; b) not adversely affect the property of any third parties; c) not inhibit pedestrian or vehicular movement, as applicable, within City Property or along other property or rights-of-way owned or controlled by the City; d) not create conditions which are a threat to public safety and security. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall instruct its customers not to park or leave any System Vehicle where they would impede pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

   b. Upon termination of this Agreement by either party, Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall, at its sole cost and expense, immediately restore City Property to a condition which is visually and structurally indistinguishable from the immediately surrounding area.

5. **System Parking.** The City, at its own discretion, may support the System with the installation of signs and painting to further the orderly operation of the System Parking.

6. **Condition of City Property**

   a. City makes City Property available to Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor in an "as is" condition. City makes no representations or warranties concerning the condition of City Property or its suitability for use by Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor or its customers, and assumes no duty to warn either Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor or the System Members concerning conditions that exist now or may arise in the future.

   b. City assumes no liability for loss or damage to Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems System Members. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor agrees that City is not responsible for providing security at any location where Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor's System Vehicles are parked, and Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor hereby waives any claim against City in the event Dividend-Account Car-Parking System’s System Vehicles or other property are lost, stolen, or damaged.

7. **Maintenance and Care of Portion of City Property;** Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall be solely responsible for: (i) maintaining City Property to the City standards applicable for use by the Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor as
permitted under Section 3; and (ii) obtaining from the City any applicable permits or approvals required by the City. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall exercise due care in the use of City Property and shall be responsible for maintaining City Property in good condition and repair. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall not act, or fail to act, in any way that result in excessive wear or damage to City Property. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor expressly agrees to repair, replace or otherwise restore any part or item of real or personal property that is damaged, lost or destroyed as a result of the Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor's use of City Property. Should the Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor fail to repair, replace or otherwise restore such real or personal property, Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor expressly agrees to pay City's costs in making such repairs, replacements or restorations. The obligations under this Section apply to all City facilities, infrastructure, or appurtenances located on City Property.

8. Operations & Maintenance. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor will cover all maintenance costs for the System and maintenance to minimum level of service and reporting outlined in Exhibit A.

9. License Fee. The parties intend to agree to a license fee before the Agreement may be extended beyond the Initial Term.

10. Indemnification. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall defend, pay, indemnify and hold harmless City, its officers, officials, employees, agents, invitees, and volunteers (collectively "City Parties") from all claims, suits, actions, damages, demands, costs or expenses of any kind or nature by or in favor of anyone whomsoever and from and against any and all costs and expenses, including without limitation court costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees, resulting from or in connection with loss of life, bodily or personal injury or property damage arising directly or indirectly out of or from or on account of:

a. Any occurrence upon, at or from City Property or occasioned wholly or in part by the entry, use or presence upon City Property by Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor or by anyone making use of City Property at the invitation or sufferance of Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor, except such loss or damage which was caused by the sole negligence or willful misconduct of City.

b. Use of Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor's System Parking by any individual, regardless of whether such use was with or without the permission of Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor.

11. Insurance. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall procure and maintain for the duration of this agreement insurance against claims for which Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor has indemnified the City pursuant to Section 10 of this Agreement. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall maintain general liability and automobile liability insurance policies with limits of no less than one million dollars ($1,000,000.00) per occurrence for bodily injury or death, personal injury and property damage, and two million dollars ($2,000,000.00) aggregate. Each insurance policy shall name the City as an additional insured and it shall be endorsed to state that:

(i) coverage shall not be suspended, voided, or cancelled by either party, or reduced in coverage or in limits except after thirty (30) calendar days prior written notice by certified mail, return receipt requested, has been given to City; and (ii) for any covered claims, the Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor's insurance coverage shall be primary insurance as respects the City and any insurance or self-insurance maintained by the City shall be in excess of the Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor's...
insurance and shall not contribute with it. The insurance required to be provided herein, shall be procured by an insurance company approved by City, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld. Additionally, before Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall employ any person or persons in the performance of the Agreement, Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall procure a policy of workers’ compensation insurance as required by the Labor Code of the State of California, or shall obtain a certificate of self-insurance from the Department of Industrial Relations.

12. Compliance with Law. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor at its own cost and expense, shall comply with all statutes, ordinances, regulations, and requirements of all governmental entities applicable to its use of City Property and the operation of its System program, including but not limited to laws governing operation of vehicles. If any license, permit, or other governmental authorization is required for Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor's lawful use or occupancy of City Property or any portion thereof, Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall procure and maintain such license, permit and/or governmental authorization throughout the term of this Agreement. City shall reasonably cooperate with Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor, at no additional cost to City, such that Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor can properly comply with this Section and be allowed to use City Property as specified in Section 4, above.

13. Business License. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor is required to obtain and maintain a City Business License during the duration of this Agreement.

14. Required Reports. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall provide reports to the City concerning utilization of its System Parking not less than monthly, and shall cooperate with the City in the collection and analysis of any aggregated data concerning its operations.

15. No Joint Venture. Nothing herein contained shall be in any way construed as expressing or implying that the parties hereto have joined together in any joint venture or liability company or in any manner have agreed to or are contemplating the sharing of profits and losses among themselves in relation to any matter relating to this Agreement.

16. Termination. This Agreement may be terminated prior to the expiration date set forth in Section 1, above, upon the occurrence of any of the following conditions:

   a. Upon delivery of written notice from City to the Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor terminating this agreement for any reason, or for no reason, by giving at least sixty (60) days' notice to the Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor of such termination.

   b. An attempt to transfer or assign this Agreement.

Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor shall not terminate this Agreement without first by giving at least 180 days' written notice of plans for termination.

17. Amendment. This Agreement may be amended by mutual agreement of the parties. Such amendments shall only be effective if incorporated in written amendments to this agreement and executed by duly authorized representatives of the parties.

18. Applicable Law and Venue. The laws of the State of California shall govern the interpretation and enforcement of this Agreement. Any action to interpret or enforce the terms or conditions of this Agreement shall be brought in the Superior Court for the County of San Diego, or in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor hereby waives any right to remove any such action from San Diego County as is otherwise permitted under
California Code of Civil Procedure Section 394.

19. **Counterparts.** This Agreement may be executed simultaneously or in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same agreement.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF THE PARTIES HERETO have executed this Agreement on
date first above written.

CITY OF ENCINITAS

Karen Brust, City Manager

Date

ATTEST:

City Attorney
Exhibit A

Description of Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor’s Service Level Agreement

The following performance indicators shall be met and reported to help the City measure our success serving its citizens and improving the livability and mobility of Encinitas. Dividend-Account Car-Parking Systems Vendor will maintain it’s System in an excellent state of functionality and repair, with a minimum of error-free operation 95% of the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurement Tool</th>
<th>Minimum Performance Standard</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>App &amp; customer service support portal: phone and internet. The portal will support the establishment of an account and editing an account</td>
<td>A new account can be entered and audited. It can be edited and an audit can verify the edits. The time and method of the submissions can be retrieved</td>
<td>Tool to audit accounts either by name or unique account number</td>
<td>Accurate 99.5% uptime.</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to set the value price of the parking, a per minute value</td>
<td>The system can accept a “value price” and use the number as described in this report</td>
<td>Tool to audit the fact of and the proper use of the value price</td>
<td>Accurate 99.5% uptime.</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to set the base multiplier, which is used in the congestion pricing algorithm as shown in Table 2 of Reference 2. It is expected to be a number between 1.5 and 2.5. It can be adjusted upwards if the parking is getting too full too often</td>
<td>The system can accept a “base multiplier” and use the number as described in Table 2 of Reference 2.</td>
<td>Tool to audit the fact of and the proper use of the value base multiplier</td>
<td>99.5% of the time</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to report out monthly statements</td>
<td>A feature to display each statement that can be viewed and verified for accuracy with an accuracy of 99.5%</td>
<td>Interface to allow a specification of statements</td>
<td>Statements can be viewed and verified for accuracy with an accuracy of 99.5%</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to accept money into an account and to pay earnings and “add-ins”, out of the account, as described in this report</td>
<td>Most of the money accepted will be car-parking charge but there will also money that is sent in to cover the “Add-in” payments. Most of the money will be via an automated transfer as is done for dockless bike rentals. However, an ability to accept a mailed check will also be required.</td>
<td>Money transfers will occur and be observable with an accuracy of 99.5%</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to report out the percent of employees at their work location that are using their allocated parking over any duration, from specific days to longer specified durations</td>
<td>This tool supports a request for the percent of employees that are at work without using car parking in the employee parking spaces.</td>
<td>Software interface that will show the results on a screen and allows for the result file to be stored or printed</td>
<td>Functional 99.5% of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to report out the total amount charged to employees, paid to employees as earnings and, separately, as “add ins”, over any duration, from specific days to longer specified durations</td>
<td>This tool supports a request for the described data</td>
<td>Software interface that will show the results on a screen and allows for the result file to be stored or printed</td>
<td>Functional 99.5% of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spot usage rate</td>
<td>The monthly use rate is reported for any single parking place or for a set of parking places</td>
<td>The result can be viewed on screen or in a file that can be stored or printed</td>
<td>Data collection failure would be reported within two (2) hours during business hours between 8am to 8pm Monday through Friday except for State and Federal holidays. Direct 24/7 contact line for true emergencies, either by phone, text, and/or email. Failure outside of business hours reported within two hours (2) of start of business hours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System failure detected or reported by a member</td>
<td>Error either automatically reported to the person responsible and their back-ups, as a text on their phones and an email to their computer, to include the error report time</td>
<td>A program collects the time of the data error recognition and the time of the correction</td>
<td>Within two (2) hours during business hours between 8am to 8pm Monday through Friday except for State and Federal holidays. Direct 24/7 contact line for true emergencies, either by phone, text, and/or email. For complaint outside of business hours, within two hours (2) of start of business hours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Climate Change Rag

Based on Country-Joe McDonald’s Viet Nam Rag

Chorus
Well, it’s 1, 2, 3 temperatures rising high
Don’t ask me ‘cause I don’t give a damn
Climate it’s destabilizing
An’ its 5, 6, 7, rising up to the sky
Ain’t no time to wonder why
We all gonna die.

Verse 1
Artic ice is melting fast
Warmed up by the greenhouse gas
Pulls the rug on the polar bear
Pull the plug why should we care?
Kiss it good bye and tell is so long
Life on our Earth will be gone

Chorus

Verse 2
Park the car in the parking lot
Its free but the transit’s not
Get on the bus and pay some bucks
Even though the service sucks
Big or little it ain’t no bull
The freeways will be equally full

Chorus

Verse 3
Arctic ice will soon be gone
Permafrost it won’t be long
Methane gas will rise up high
Heat will cause our crops to die
Fifty bucks for a loaf of bread
Most of us will starve and be dead.

Chorus
Why not follow the example of the transit system in New Orleans? They have a daily 40 cents charge for Seniors over 65, where they can take their system all day for that charge. Wouldn't that be really helpful for Seniors? I don't think it would cut into your revenue to a great amount, but would encourage them to use your service.

Mike Nichols
University City,
San Diego
A few flyers on a bus or two is not really getting the word out that SANDAG is planning an $8.00 increase each month for SDM SENIOR & DISABLED riders, which is much higher than for other riders. One would justly question the reason and compassion of our stalwart, well paid executives at SANDAG for hitting the least fortunate citizens the hardest.

resident of San Diego, Mira Mesa
I am a 67 year old senior who buys a monthly $18 transit pass. Although a raise to $26 a month will not affect me unduly, I am concerned about the overall direction of raising fares to meet expenses, which seems a 20th century way of looking at things that doesn't take into account the larger, much more critical picture of our planetary future.

In a nutshell, San Diego County is part of this planet, and this planet has to find radical new solutions in the next few years - less than 12, per the UN report - or the cost of transit will be the least of our worries.

We need to get OFF fossil fuels. We need to completely restructure our transit system to include as many people as possible, getting them out of their cars and into buses, jitneys and whatever will move them around without individual vehicles - unless those vehicles are powered without fossil fuels. We need to restructure our neighborhoods so that people aren't forced to commute an hour or two to get to jobs - truly building things like grocery stores and necessities into developments, rather than building as we have, with clusters of large homes in cul de sacs leading to freeways.

But what we should NOT do is raise fares and cut routes so that even more people are forced OFF public transportation or forced to stay home from work or errands.

I believe public transportation should be free. Yes, that's a radical notion. But economically it makes sense, and there are models you can look to.

Look at the next 12 years and start thinking about long term goals, not short term finances.

Sincerely,

Peggy J. Stone
Please do not increase monthly rate for seniors by $8.00. $2.00 would be a more reasonable choice.
SANDAG/MTS
To whom it may concern: I have been to at least 2 public meetings of representatives from Sandag/MTS. In both cases we were told that there would be a question and answer time after their presentations. There was none. We were told on both occasions that they were out of time.
They spent most of their time tooting their own horns by saying what a great job they were doing and their super plans for the future.
I was not impressed and neither were any of the other people in the audience. I don’t believe that any of your people have ever ridden on MTS or have any idea how to make a schedule that would be convenient for a rider.
As a senior citizen of San Diego on a fixed income that is very small, an $8.00 increase on the monthly pass is going to affect my income. I could see a $2.00 raise being more reasonable and have expected it. Please consider a less drastic increase. Thank you.
Sincerely,
A concerned senior.
RE: Fare Changes and Revisions to Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance and TransNet Ordinance

I am a Senior, I buy Monthly Passes, and I ride MTS buses, the Trolley, and the NCTD Breeze. I take buses several times a week to classes at UCSD. On weekends, I ride to Farmers Markets and events around the county. It is a very convenient, enjoyable, responsible, and affordable means of transportation, always with a high level of service. I have introduced several friends and classmates to the ease of taking the bus. Affordable fare is very important for Seniors.

I am writing in opposition to the proposed change in the SDM Monthly Pass fare. I think you are asking Seniors to bear more than their share of the costs.

In meeting increased Operational Costs, Pass Types and the proposed increase in fares should be moderate and incremental. Let's compare the SDM and the Adult 30-Day/Monthly Pass: The proposed SDM pass is an $8.00 increase. That is a 44% increase from $18.00 to $26.00. There is no proposed increase for the Adult pass; It remains at $72.00.

I propose a SDM, 30-Day/Monthly Pass increase of $2.00, a 11% increase from $18.00 to $20.00.
I agree with the proposed increase in the minimum age for senior discounts, from 60 to 65 years.
Together, these changes allow Seniors to do their fair share. Fare revenue will increase and will offset necessary operational costs.

Your consideration will be very much appreciated.

Robyn Bianco
My name is Rochelle Glickman and I am a retired senior who uses the public transit system a lot. This rate hike will be very bad for me and I think many others as well. For those of us who live on limited incomes which don't go up very much a hike like this is very harmful. All you are doing is penalizing the list able in the city, seniors and the disabled. They will suffer more. Meanwhile the wealthy won't notice the difference, not that they take public transit anyway. In the long run this may be self defeating as well. You say you need to do this to keep up with costs. Well just maybe a lot of people will either take public transit less or stop all together. I really think you don't care about vulnerable people, only those with money. Shame on you!
I fell that the fare hikes for Senior Monthly passes are over 40% are more then any other age group how can you justify such a large fare increase for us seniors! Is anyone aware of such a huge increase per age group it's shameful.
I like to protest the over 40% Senior Fare increase for monthly pass this biggest percentage increase for any age group shameful!
From: Huston, Sandra (USACAS) [Contractor]
Sent: Thursday, November 1, 2018 11:28 AM
To: NCTD Rider Reports
Subject: Fare Increase

Hello:

While I recognize the cost of senior fares on the Coaster has not risen in ten years, I feel the proposed 50% increase is far too aggressive. The cost of student fares is being lowered considerably and the cost of most ridership is unchanged. Perhaps have an across the board increase of 5%.

Thank you for your consideration.
To MTS Board: I have reviewed your notice regarding the proposed fare changes and one of the changes that was requested is the age for seniors from 60 to 65. I would like to point out the San Diego County is building housing for seniors that are 55 and older. There are some seniors that live in these homes due to the fact that they have a disability or they have enough credits to retire early. I think you should consider lowering the age to 55 and above because of the 55 and up for low income housing. Thank you for your time Sarah J Umpleby
Hello - I am a 61 year old grandfather who relies on the Coaster to get to my job.

I was horrified to hear that you are planning to (a) raise the senior rate and (b) change the senior age to 65. You can't be serious!

Would you actually take my senior pass away from me, or would I be "grandfathered"?
To whom it may concern:

I am concerned about the proposed fare increase for the MTS Access.

I ride the bus at a minimum twice a day Monday through Thursday to get to my school which is called ABI (acquired brain injury). I had a stroke in 2010 and can no longer drive due to peripheral vision loss. I also take access to get to doctors appointments and other destinations.

The fare increase would create a hardship for me. I hope the fare will remain the same.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sharon A. Lynn
Hello,

I appreciate the fact that fares have remained at a reasonable rate for several years, but your proposed increase for a monthly pass is too high and a bit unfair. Unfair because $72 is really high to commute within North County, not everyone commutes to San Diego. I'm not opposed to an increase that is fair to everyone.

If I may suggest, an increase of $5 - $6 for those passengers who do not commute to San Diego seems to be more reasonable.

Thank you,
Sonya McArthur
I am reaching out to you as a very concerned Citizen, neighbor and public transit activist.

My underlying position is no fare increase unless there is a substantial service increase.

Our neighborhoods today—and particularly the neighborhoods we are planning—depend on high quality public transit.

Below are critical public transit issues, from my user perspective as a car-less daily public transit user needing to reach all areas of San Diego and border.

Goal
Public transit deserves to be a first class experience, like in New York where investment bankers who use it and in London, Paris where everyone uses it!

Car alternative
Frequency, consistent during the day, the evening and weekend.
Who would give up a car if they can’t get home after a party? Who would give up a car if they can’t do their shopping with multiple stops on the weekends because the frequency is dropped dramatically

$ This is not a farebox balanced budget analysis.
Every public transit user offsets the dramatic climate impact of car users.
Why would Mts think about penalizing the people who are contributing to the solution in so many ways including congestion, and climate impact: car users should subsidize public transit users. Mts has no right to ask public transit user to pay the entire price for use of public transit when car users are not paying the full price for car usage.

Mts must start
by increasing frequency seven day a week plus early and late night hours on existing transit line

Next
Mts must institute more direct transit lines so that a 10 minute car drive it’s not equivalent to a one hour MTS transit trip (each way) -because it required three connections. Plus the risk of missing any one connection could double ones arrival time.

Next
Mts must Expand more fingers into communities for people to be able to get get from where they live to where they want to work or play. Mts should not focused exclusively on home to work but home to play: after all this is San Diego and if you want transit users to use the services without a car you need to get them where they really want to go

Importantly
Mts is responsible for solving the last half-mile. This is critical. This issue has been highly successfully and cost-effectively accomplished in Mexico City. It’s called ecobicci.

What is ecobicci?
Here’s the link
https://www.ecobici.cdmx.gob.mx/en/service-information/what%20is%20ecobicci

Mexico City has integrated a docked biking system into their public transit system with a single app and a free 30 minute utilization so that people can get from where they live in the community to the closest transit stop. Mexico City implemented this with a corporate partnership which dramatically decrease the cost resulting in minimal upfront investment.

Docked bicycle stations were installed to serve concentric 30 minute intervals circles so that public adoption was immediate and cost effective well also encouraging people to use public transit.

Health/Sanitation
Every transit station must have and maintain clean restrooms open 24 hours available for all riders and visitors. These restrooms should be served/maintained by the city - not relegated to franchise stores - and should be maintained with high security. Yes homeless people may use them and actually it’s a health benefit that they do. Homeless people are also looking for jobs that are relevant for them. Homeless who want to use the bathroom might be ideal candidate for those can be paid a wage to maintain them and encourage proper standards for the use of them by other homeless people and all.

As a community we need to acknowledge that human beings need to go to the bathroom. It’s inhuman to rely on buying a Starbucks coffee or a McDonald’s hamburger to get access to a bathroom.

FYI for me living between OB and old town, the majority of my trips require three legs typically a bus a trolley and of us. Where do I get to go to the bathroom???

Accountability
Any public official responsible for/or making decisions about public transit must be required to use public transit a minimum of three days a week and at least one day during the weekend as a contingency for them maintaining their job. They must be reapproved on a monthly basis based on actual utilization of public transit.

Representation/feedback
Finally
Any public transit authority or decision making body must include representatives of the public who are exclusive public transit users.
It is not adequate to have just political presentation. These bodies must rely on input from real users— not just during a public comment period of a few weeks in the space of the year but an ongoing constant and respected feedback loop for any policy decisions, and construction that’s being undertaken on our taxpayer dollars.

Resource
We represent an active group of public transit users who offer ourselves as resources. We want to make San Diego public transit a first class experience.
One of many:
Stefania Aulicino

Sent from my iPhone San Diego
Stefania Aulicino

Cell/text

Founder/President

www.CapitalLinkUSA.com
Profitable Growth, Faster, Safer.

For International friends, Call, Text, or WhatsApp
To SANDAG,

I am disable rider of the San Diego Transit System. If you, feel the need to raise prices. Here are my suggestions: Any child 2 to 4 should be charge a quarter. 5 year to 10 should be half a adult fare. Teen a quarter more than what the pay now. Students of all kinds a ten cents raise. Adults a dollar more but works with both trolley and buses!!! NO raise on disable!!!!

Other suggestion, have more Transit police in Fashion Valley bus stop. Any citizen can predict when the trolley police will ride them. Around 1,15,30. Every month.
The proposed increase in the SDM from $18.00 to $26.00 is OUTRAGEOUS! That’s a 40% increase for those of us who are disabled and elderly who live on fixed incomes. The decrease for the youth doesn’t bode well for me either as most youth:

- Have jobs or have their parents pay for their bus fares/passes.
- Drive cars so they don’t have reason to take the bus?
- Have school buses that transport them to and from school.
- Millennials have more than us disabled and elderly folks.

Why decrease bus fare/passes for the youth and raise them for the disabled and elderly? That is not right! I can understand raising SDM from $18.00 to say, $20.00, but not $26.00. The CEO’s, presidents, and superintendents would use that money to give themselves raises, not improve transit service to customers. The SDM need the discount, not the millennials.

Sincerely,
Tina Wilson
The proposal to increase fares due to decrease of ridership is almost comical. This will serve no purpose until the root cause is addressed. The only proposed solution that I acknowledge is to increase the Fare box size, which is completely ineffective. One of the proposed solutions along that line is to provide a bike pass at a higher price, which is not only ineffective but also counterproductive. This makes it difficult for seniors to use the bike option and not ride the bus anymore.

The increase in age for defining seniors, 60 to 65 years old should not happen. Seniors are on limited income. The increase in price is a bit high. I believe it should be at 60% of the current fare as the fare increase is justified to the general public.

I am opposed to any fare increase. Particularly raising the SDM Senior fare would be a huge economic burden on many low-income seniors. And the minimum age for qualifying seniors should not be raised from 60 to 65 years old. Also, hike your “public meetings” should be held in the evening or weekends so that working people are not unfairly affected by the proposed fare increase. The MTS President should not be earning nearly $360,000 a year when many low-income workers are struggling to afford their family adequate public transit services.

Please keep senior at 60+. At 60, this is a useful way to reduce seniors dependency on the automobile. At 65+, not so much.

Hi. My name is Brian Korn. I use an SDM pass and ride the bus and Sprinter at least 4 days a week. I work 9am - 5pm. This seems ridiculous to me to be running a single car Sprinter during the rush hours. I have attached a picture of the Monkey Island to show how crowded the trains are.

I'm very disappointed that you would be increasing the senior rate at a higher percentage than any other rate. While I'm in favor of increased ridership due to the increase in age for defining seniors, 60 to 65 years old should not happen. I would urge that the increase in price is a bit high. I believe it would be more fair and equitable to lower price increase for seniors and keep the same age for seniors.

I implore the Board of Directors to consider a smaller increase in fares associated with the NCTD Breeze. While I see the need to increase fares to cover expenses, the Breeze is one of the more affordable public transportation options and appears to be in need of an increase in price. It is difficult to not be raised from 60 to 65 years old. Also your “public meetings” should all be held in the evening or weekends so that working people are not unfairly affected by the proposed fare increase.
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Hello, my name is Douglas Schwarterer. My comment is on the rate increase. I could understand maybe a $5 a month rate increase on the Compass Pass, but anything higher than that is a bit steep, I think. My number is [REDACTED]. My phone number is [REDACTED]. I need to get in touch with you. Thank you.

Hi, I'm a senior, and it's very difficult for me to get a bus pass for whatever they are going to charge this time. $18 is enough for us. I would appreciate if you wouldn't raise the fare because I'm on a fixed income and it's hard. That's it. Bye.

Hi, this is Richard Hill. I've been a rider with San Diego Transit for over 40 years and I would hate to have to stop because of it. I would hate to have to be broke because of it. Now, a raise, sure, why not? Your [REDACTED], maybe a little increase of $3 or $4. I could see that being fair. Taking down the children $10 and raising the senior citizen - that's $20 each way - I think that's unfair. The idea of being able to save and our independence in being able to save is so important. If you have to pay for something that changes your life for the worse, it's not fair. Also, my phone number is [REDACTED]. Thank you very much. I'll be in touch.

Yes, I am a disabled bus rider on North County Transit and I'm opposed to the fare increase and also the increase of the Access Plus covered bus benches. And we also need - whoever, I know they didn't do it - but the City of Escondido did a bus lane in San Marcos, and the other one attends Lincoln and uses public transportation occasionally. I pay for school transportation with the time change. They do chemotherapy on Grand and 5th and they need a bus bench there. Thank you very much.

Hi, I'm a senior, and it's very difficult for me to get a bus pass for whatever they are going to charge this time. $18 is enough for us. I would appreciate if you wouldn't raise the fare because I'm on a fixed income and it's hard. That's it. Bye.

Yes, my name is Pat Andrews and I'm a senior citizen. This pay raise is ridiculous - the pay raise to raise the rates. We are being taxed twice. A fixed income, so I wanted I'm going to the that public meeting on October 30 in Escondido from 12 to 2 p.m. I was hoping to speak in front of the main bus stop in front of theater, and they need to get that taken care of for people with disabilities. Thank you very much.

Hi, I would like to leave a comment for the SANDAGs. Well, I'm not really happy about this NCTD going up to $5 and the MTS going up to $18, especially for people who are on Social Security. I drive for my job, and that's two jobs. I think that they need to look at the whole picture and ask themselves, ‘What are other cities doing?’ I'm afraid of having my independence taken away from me. By the way, my cell number is [REDACTED]. Thank you very much. Goodbye.

Yes, my name is Guillermina. My phone # is [REDACTED]. I just picked up a notice about fare changes for MTS and LFYT and would like to make a comment. First, it's not enough time, as today is November 6th and if I need to write a letter to send to you I must do it by the 10th of this month. So I would really appreciate it if you could extend the time so I could send it. And then, they are going to increase the fare on LFYT. I'm afraid of not being able to go to the places I need to go or to the places I like to go. And when we mean fixed, we mean fixed - nothing changes or nothing going downhill. Okay, thank you very much. Goodbye.

Hi, my name is William Bowina and I wanted to make a comment about raising the fares. Why can't we just leave it at $3.50 each way. We could afford that, but to raise it to $5 seems to be unfair to us, especially for people on Social Security. I drive for my job, and that's two jobs. I think that they need to look at the whole picture and ask themselves, ‘What are other cities doing?’ I'm afraid of having my independence taken away from me. By the way, my cell number is [REDACTED]. Thank you very much. Goodbye.

Hi, my name is Georgina Blake. My phone number is [REDACTED]. Before I talk about the fare increase, maybe you could have a little map of the whole thing so people can see what they are doing. I'm not saying it's going to be enough, but if you could have it that way I think that would be good for us, especially for people on Social Security, because it makes it much easier to see how much you do in that way. That's the way it's going to be unfair to people like myself who are blind and people who have disabilities. Thank you very much.

Hi, I'm a senior, and it's very difficult for me to get a bus pass for whatever they are going to charge this time. $18 is enough for us. I would appreciate if you wouldn't raise the fare because I'm on a fixed income and it's hard. That's it. Bye.

Hi, I would like to leave a comment for the SANDAGs. Well, I'm not really happy about this NCTD going up to $5 and the MTS going up to $18, especially for people who are on Social Security. I drive for my job, and that's two jobs. I think that they need to look at the whole picture and ask themselves, ‘What are other cities doing?’ I'm afraid of having my independence taken away from me. By the way, my cell number is [REDACTED]. Thank you very much. Goodbye.

Hi, this is Douglas Schwarterer. My comment is on the rate increase. I could understand maybe a $5 a month rate increase on the Compass Pass, but anything higher than that is a bit steep, I think. My number is [REDACTED]. My phone number is [REDACTED]. I need to get in touch with you. Thank you.
26 Voicemail

This is my comment on your proposed fare changes. I hope this is the correct number. First of all, if you have public meetings, you should be there. In my own experience, public meetings are where people who work can attend because it’s more like your meetings than when you’re at work. From there, they do the same thing for 25 years. I have been living in North County for 25 years. Since 1997, I have used a bus pass every month without interruption until they became the BREEZE 10-15 years ago. I’m kind of noticed that there was the regional pass and the North County Pass. Now, you have to raise your rate to take the bus on either of these passes. The $30 BREEZE Pass. If you think about that, this would be harmful for a lot of people. I mean this is a more than 20%. Usually, even when raising fees by 20%, you need six months notice. Usually, raising fees this way is not. It’s a bit, big. Of course, it is not. You can add, rental, medical, living expenses, living expenses. It adds up. So, if you want to make an increase, do it in increments and still know the existence of the BREEZE. I think it should be phased out. I think you shouldn’t do it. This is a North County resident. I’ve been living here since 1987. I would appreciate it if people watch their thinking this before making these drastic changes. Right now, thank you very much. Hoppy, might reconsider raising the BREEZE 30 Pass. It is not a very big idea. Thank you and have a wonderful day. I am very grateful to have a mass transit. Keep up the good job and if we can’t see you somewhere.

27 Voicemail

This is Mr. Louis Vernot at [REDACTED]. I want to know why the senior fare cards are targeted with a 46% increase, when adult fare rates remain constant and why are junior fare decreases by 26%. Senior income does not increase, while working people receive raises and promotions. Senior citizens have supported California’s transportation services for more than 50 years, only to be treated like second class citizens. Maybe somebody thinks California is not the place for seniors. Thank you.

28 Voicemail

Hello, my name is Jean Collins. I am 75 years old and live in Escondido. I understand that you need to raise revenue and increase the good services you have on the Number 33; but not so dramatically and the amount of difference – the rise for the Compass Card is – is too much to do all at once. I would greatly appreciate it. I don’t raise my rate so much to about the bus, I won’t be able to use the Compass Card anymore. I will have to cut back how many times a month I use the bus. They would make life too me very difficult. Please do not hit the low-income seniors by raising the senior Compass Card that much. I hope you can find a way not to do that. I have been a steady rider for over 40 years and I appreciate the bus system. I’ve never been able to get a pass here and I depend greatly on the bus. So, that’s just going to be a hardship with everything else that you can continue to operate efficiently and conveniently. I’m surprised the rises is not increased as you had hoped. Yes.

29 Voicemail

Hello. Good afternoon. I am a senior citizen that counts in your proposal for the increased fare of the senior citizen, disabled, and Medicare. The $26 is too much, is too high. We cannot afford to increase almost 50% from $18 to $26. That is almost 50%. We cannot afford to increase that since the senior citizens will be a hardship, almost 50% to seniors, because, of course, seniors are on a fixed income. So, if you are raising it by 50%, we can’t afford your increase for the senior citizen, disabled, and Medicare. I think the maximum increase is $18, because that’s the income level of the seniors you are providing for. I am a senior citizen who lives in San Diego. My name is [REDACTED]. I am a senior citizen. My telephone number is [REDACTED]. Please consider it. Do not increase our senior citizen fare to $26. Please maintain it at $18. It is too high. We cannot afford to have higher fees because we know that senior citizens only seldom take the bus 1 or 2 times per week. If they, why is raising the fare to $26 too much? Please consider it. Thank you very much. Bye.

30 Voicemail

Yes, I would like to leave this message. I am a senior citizen of 75 years old and in many ways, I have no transportation other than the bus. I raised there are many truths that are not addressed, namely different. Here come schedule schedule cuts - just enough to give drivers a break, but a loss of one, in a way. We preferred rush hour service, for which the drivers hated. They’re gutless, especially the route that climbs up to Alpine. During the three week hot spell this summer, the temperature affected the fuel and they had to pull the buses down. Propulsion is the November 5 ballot, but if the gas tax is repealed, it will affect public transportation. I also sarcastic about raising the Compass Card, I think. We’re going to increase the amount of money to increase the Compass Card, because (a) I’m your $1500 at the end of the year in the bank. With this increased amount, I would like to know that would be a lot of help for social security or whatever standard check you get. So, if you are raising the fare of the region, you should let the seniors be the ones to benefit from it.

31 Voicemail

The price increase from $18 to $26 is too great. I am going to pay more for less service. One option would be to add more odd routes or reduce fares for seniors. The bus stop is key necessary for Route 30 provides no protection from the elements.

Public Testimony Transcriptions

1 Public MTS Board

Deborah Room Room

Fierro

Why decrease bus fees passes for the youth and raise them for the disabled and elderly? That is not right! I understand raising $6M from $18 to $25,000, but not $26. The CEO’s, presidents, and superintendents would use that money to generate revenues, not improve transit service to gain. Can you explain how much is needed? That is not to say you can continue to operate efficiently and conveniently. This is not the rise that I would expect to see. $26 is too much.

2 Public MTS Board

Room Room

My name is [REDACTED]. I am a senior citizen. I live in San Diego. My telephone number is [REDACTED]. Please consider it. Do not increase our senior citizen fare to $26. Please maintain it at $18. It is too high. We cannot afford to have higher fees because we know that senior citizens only seldom take the bus 1 or 2 times per week. If they, why is raising the fare to $26 too much? Please consider it. Thank you very much. Bye.

3 Public City Lines 1

City Hill S. L. Henderson

My name is S.L. Henderson. I am a female. I have to give you this. I live in North San Diego County. I live in San Diego County. I would like very much to address this issue. I have a little time: the senior rates and routes. First, population projections of as of January 17, San Diego County seniors ages 65 or more is between 400,000 to 450,000. We are only $18 to 15 or 20, or $26. The $26 is far too much for many seniors. It is a large economic burden to increase senior rates at all. The rate they have now is fair, but increasing that would be a large burden and I am also opposed to raising the age for seniors to 65.

4 Public Excelsior

Clyde Kowall

My name is Clyde Kowall and I am a North County resident. I’ve been living in North County for more than 50 years, only to be treated like second class citizens. Maybe somebody thinks California is not the place for seniors. Thank you.

5 Public Excelsior

Mike Laper

My name is Mike Laper. I think the increases is unfair for the elderly, especially we are on fixed incomes. It’s just totally unfair. We cannot afford that - to go to the doctors, to pick up our medications. People don’t realize that families, our friends have abandoned us. Nobody is a nice person who wants to give us rides up there. The bus, the LIFT, is the only transportation that they have. I want to stop that - I am not going to stop that because I can only afford our transportation. What more can I say. It’s just unfair. I am glad.
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I really don’t think the $8 increase for SDM is fair. I think that what MTS needs to do is make a slow increase over the years. People aged 65 over, you don’t see a lot of finances only go up once a year and we didn’t get any increase this year. I’m a senior and disabled but you cannot do that to us. I don’t think it’s fair that people like me who are disabled have to pay up. We don’t even get food stamps with SSI. What I’m proposing is $72 to $75, SDM to $20 and youth stay at $17. 3000 seniors and I, and there is a lot of milk for a lot of us, we don’t get food stamps with SSI. What I’m proposing is $72 to $75, SDM to $20 and youth stay at $17. 3000 seniors and I, and there is a lot of milk for a lot of us. What I’m proposing is $72 to $75, SDM to $20 and youth stay at $17. 3000 seniors and I, and there is a lot of milk for a lot of us. And for us, the fare increase means that our money won’t be enough — won’t keep up with the changes. And I’m a senior and disabled. I don’t know how many students have $8 – right away from that is in middle school, and we cut them off. And further, I’m thinking possibly a moderate range adjustment for the first 30% in a family and discount for the second, third or fourth which might actually induce people but don’t want to spend $36 for each kid to ride a bus but if you could spend $30 for the first one and $17 for the second, third and fourth. We have a lot of families that would at least be able to see some benefit to that or can’t justify spending $26, or whatever it is, for each and every one of their kids. People have stuff for free or for a discount, so why pay if you have one child, you pay for all this. I know that some of you have points to the fact that I already have components, isn’t it simple pointing out the fact that I probably am already living, like I tell you from the family thing, you should at least have something more than a few bad spots. I cannot understand how to get rid of the $22. And you only pay twice a year. Often you pay at the end of the year. Often you pay at the end of the year. Even though we’re only in the spot, you probably won’t call them. You would have to do that to get something like a 15-minute walk or a 10-minute walk. It doesn’t make sense.”
I have a comment in response to MTS’ spokesperson based on a UT article. “But the reality is the current (senior) ... to make up for that in the past.” Reading that makes me feel like before we had ADA laws. No one wanted to recognize us as human and part of your ridership. I believe you would like to get rid of all of that. That’s why I am here. I am just a rider. I am currently an MTS rider with 4 adults. I have to pay for 4 adults. I have to pay for a $72.00 adult pass for a month. It is I think a fair increase since rates have not increased in 10 years. For the clients that travel on 4 fixed bus routes traveling long distances, $5.00 is adequate based on the distance. To 4-1 routes should remain at $5.00. For myself to travel to the gym under the new proposed rate increase it would be $50. For me to go to a shorter distance. Because it would be 3 fixed bus routes, it would be $40. This is why I say 2-3 fixed routes should remain at $5.00. Anyone traveling 3+ routes, because of the distance, should be covered at $50. So maybe we should just adjust the rate on distance instead of fixed routes. Zero to 15 miles = $5.00. 16-25 miles = $10.00. So, with MTS's proposal, I would have to pay $40.00 for a month plus $5.00 for the comp pass. Discontinued partial week/month comp passes and for additional cost of transfer to bus after increased comp pass is not acceptable.

I use the train and I have a monthly pass. It looks like all of the rates are going up but not to the extent that the senior and disabled rate is. And why you are actually getting a credit. But the seniors are usually on fixed incomes and disabled otherwise are at almost poverty levels. We cannot afford those kinds of increases. That is a one that is increased more than the others. The rate in for seniors in $25.00, 44% increased more than the others. I don’t ride anywhere but my kids do. My rice doesn’t have a train system, but now. Additionally, train passes should be checked more often on the train or at the station. They’re checked once a week or less. Last time they’ve been at the station more than I’ve been riding for months. I always diligently carry my card. I don’t know the answer to your question. 60. MTS are thieves trying to raise fees and NOT providing excellent bus/trolley services on weeknights, plus it is soooo unimportant.

I use public transit. It is so ridiculous that MTS wants to raise its fares when the company sucks. The drivers are RUDE. There are no security guards at MTS Trolley and bus stop Service has been reduced to an hour wait on Sunday. What is the matter with MTS? Do you think the world stops on a Sunday? People attend church services, work, shop, go to ball games and entertainment. But because MTS is so lazy and NOT providing services to the public, they are NOT providing services to the public and bus stops are being cut off. MTS will loose customers and may have to go bankrupt. STOP picking on the elderly and RESPECT your elders. DO NOT increase the fares to $22.00 for seniors and seniors. MTS are thieves trying to raise fees and NOT providing excellent bus/trolley services on weeknights, weekends and holidays.

MTS Survey Comments

1 MTS Survey: The rate increase is too high. It needs to be more reasonable and effectivly and evenly be raised.

2 MTS Survey: I disagree with the raise, I have been a rider for 15 years. I think the rates are too high. With the high rates I see people giving in. I see people lowered the number of days they ride.

3 MTS Survey: I am not a user.

4 MTS Survey: More security is needed in the Trolley. There are a lot of people that get on to sell cheese, etc.

5 MTS Survey: What doesn’t public transit go to the airport?

6 MTS Survey: No. I ride 3 days a week. I travel to the airport and downtown.

7 MTS Survey: I don’t need a comp pass.

8 MTS Survey: MTS has increased the rate for the wheel chair rider.

9 MTS Survey: It is so ridiculous of this company to charge so much for a Monthly Pass. $72.00 is OUTRAGES! People can hardly afford living here and MTS cannot raise prices when most of the time we get 80% customer service from their drivers. Keep on raising prices, cutting services and having long one wait on Sunday and I will bet you that MTS will lose customers and may have to go bankrupt. STOP picking on the elderly and RESPECT your elders. DO NOT increase the fares to $22.00 for seniors and seniors. MTS are thieves trying to raise fees and NOT providing excellent bus/trolley services on weeknights, weekends and holidays.

10 MTS Survey: Thank you for your service.

11 MTS Survey: I use the train and I have a monthly pass. It looks like all of the rates are going up but not to the extent that the senior and disabled rate is. And why you are actually getting a credit. But the seniors are usually on fixed incomes and disabled otherwise are at almost poverty levels. We cannot afford those kinds of increases. That is a one that is increased more than the others. The rate in for seniors in $25.00, 44% increased more than the others. I don’t ride anywhere but my kids do. My rice doesn’t have a train system, but now. Additionally, train passes should be checked more often on the train or at the station. They’re checked once a week or less. Last time they’ve been at the station more than I’ve been riding for months. I always diligently carry my card. I don’t know the answer to your question. 60. MTS are thieves trying to raise fees and NOT providing excellent bus/trolley services on weeknights, plus it is soooo unimportant.

I use public transit. It is so ridiculous that MTS wants to raise its fares when the company sucks. The drivers are RUDE. There are no security guards at MTS Trolley and bus stop Service has been reduced to an hour wait on Sunday. What is the matter with MTS? Do you think the world stops on a Sunday? People attend church services, work, shop, go to ball games and entertainment. But because MTS is so lazy and NOT providing services to the public, they are NOT providing services to the public and bus stops are being cut off. MTS will loose customers and may have to go bankrupt. STOP picking on the elderly and RESPECT your elders. DO NOT increase the fares to $22.00 for seniors and seniors. MTS are thieves trying to raise fees and NOT providing excellent bus/trolley services on weeknights, weekends and holidays.
I want free transfers for bus and trolley riders.

I want more Sunday bus service. Sunday more 944 and 945. Please for my work. Lyft costs me $18.50 every Sunday.

An app to see where buses are in route such as Uber/Lyft maps.

Keep up the good work (for rides) and also housing for the homeless!!

I want senior's monthly pass to not increase more than 22.5%. I would agree to maybe a $21 monthly senior pass.

Look at the top admin and scrap the revenue from there before even making people pay more for public transportation.

You are not addressing the needs of the homeless who cant afford anything!!

I'm a SDSU student, I get the discounted semester pass.

I am a MTS employee and I'm concerned about raising the senior age to 65 because people get excited that they are almost 65 and now they have to wait another 5 years. 2, 3, and 14 day passes should stay because a lot of people buy those passes, especially tourists.

I am OK with the service.

No quiero pagar más porque mi salario no me gustan para los gastos basicos.

Need night service

I would STRONGLY DISAGREE with the proposed $26 fare hike for seniors. This is a 44% increase for customers who typically have an annual cost of living increases of 3-5% range. Significant factor for car users is not cost but convenience. Significant factor for non-regular users is cost, especially when youth rates are substantially reduced. Youth fares on monthly passes are currently quite competitive compared to other area transit agencies. A 28% decrease is uncalled for especially when SDM rates are increased 45% making it the highest in Southern California.

I strongly object to raising the rate of the monthly SDM pass from $18 to $26. This is a 44% increase for customers who already struggle on social security and SSI or disability which usually are given annual cost of living increases in the 3-5% range.

MTS should not raise the price of the SDM pass. MTS is already highly overpriced compared to Southern Californian Transit Districts and the system is already losing riders.

I would like to think that the MTS board cares about people who are on a fixed income, like the homeless and elderly. The system is already losing riders due to low gas prices and the system is not maintaining the service. I am poor and I work hard to keep my job. The price of everything is going up and I can't afford your change.

I strongly object to raising the rate of the monthly SDM pass from $18 to $26. This is a 44% increase for customers who already struggle on social security and SSI or disability which usually are given annual cost of living increases in the 3-5% range.

Maintenance costs low, improve quality and quantity, and campaign for more funding from local and state government.

In 2014, the MTS board approved the MTS fare increase of 14% and 51% for seniors and disabled. This is a significant increase. The MTS Board should take into consideration the annual cost of living increases for seniors and disabled. Yes that was spelled that way to make you think! someone needs to. Leave it alone, it's got to be better now than how you would change it to. Yes, Yea’ leave it alone.

Another option for fare increase would be to increase fares during those times when the board believes the service is inadequate. This would help the MTS and you can also get more riders which helps the service.

I think raising the senior age is ultimately ridiculous. Less people will be able to take advantage of that increase.

I strongly object to raising the rate of the monthly SDM pass from $18 to $26. This is a 44% increase for customers who already struggle on social security and SSI or disability which usually are given annual cost of living increases in the 3-5% range.

I strongly object to raising the rate of the monthly SDM pass from $18 to $26. This is a 44% increase for customers who already struggle on social security and SSI or disability which usually are given annual cost of living increases in the 3-5% range.
I think the one-way fare as it currently exists should stay the same.

Seniors are paying more of the burden.

The proposed single ride fare will standardize buses' and trolley's fares, lets bring back transfers between the two systems without a day pass. More reminders and enforcement of quality of life issues like loud music, eating, smoking on platforms, etc. Having cleaning teams at terminuses so the trolleys are not filled with spilled drinks, litter, etc.

Leaves the passengers of the 3rd edad, they don't let them change buses or trolleys for free only if they re one trip or max. (English Translation: I don't think rules should increase for seniors because it looks like they are very limited.

Cleaner trolley, better weekend services, etc.

I don't want the Price Hike on disabled monthly pass since I used it everyday for school at Mesa College. With my limited SSI, my fund can only last so long before I have to make hard cut that make it harder.

SDSU/Del Program Requires Public Transportation To Access Class @ SkyPoint Court along Rosecrans SM (Ruffin Rd) and stop @ 9:50 pm. There is no service within 1/2 mile when classes end. Classes available Saturdays 8 am - 12 pm but NO SERVICE at all.

Find a better way

LCD Extremely Confusing @ Trolley Station. Often Inaccurate and Not In Real-Time. Curious to see unmarked Pick Up Truck. No ID on Employee Servicing the Trolley Fare Machines @ Euclid Ave Trolley on Oct 3rd 8:45 - 9:30 pm.

Will MTS' two children ride free with a fare-paying adult on weekends promotion be discontinued with the introduction of the $3 youth day pass?

I disagree we lower the cost for the youth. If it already that set price it should remain the same.

I'm very committed to riding public transit. I don't yet drive, but even if I did, riding MTS to College is far better than commuting. These fare hikes won't be too high but will, at the same time, allow MTS and NCTD to improve their services even more.

Thank you

MTS Survey

I know who rode public transit as youths now avoid it at all costs - not riders 4 life. Students in El Cajon lost services.

I disagee we lower the cost for the youth. If it already that set price it should remain the same.

I'm very committed to riding public transit. I don't yet drive, but even if I did, riding MTS to College is far better than commuting. These fare hikes won't be too high but will, at the same time, allow MTS and NCTD to improve their services even more.
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The buses are more reliable than the Coaster

I think that it is disgusting to pass on the maintenance, sustainment and improvement of the system to riders when the majority of the financial support comes from... favors freeway expansion (in their constituencies btw) at the expense of improving SD MTS and making commuting by bus more comfortable and safe.

Keep the same prices

The fare prop. ideas fail to meet the quality of service

Security at night, especially downtown, San Diego

Don’t raise for seniors - thanks

Would be a good idea to give a free ride day once a month or every three months. I call this a perk - something good and earned.

Especially to Lake Poway and area.

Any rate increase must be accompanied with more value specifically increased frequency is this light it later service and... of $22/mo ($4 increase) could be acceptable with a $6 discount on the Youth 30-day pass instead of the proposed $10 cut.

The fare is used by many seniors who are on fixed income and cannot afford it

Seria para algunos de gran beneficio. Pero algunas personas que lo usan diariamente. Creo que no estarian de acuerdo.

Split the proposed change to SDM/youth passes. Raise SDM to $32. lower youth to $30.

We should consider offsetting the increase by lowering the Youth $4.00 and increasing the SDM by $4.00 other out and accomplish the same thing.

The proposed increase to the disabled monthly passes should be cut to only $4.00 and adding the $4.00 increase to youth monthly passes.

Please submit your feedback on the survey form.

754 MTS Survey

MTS Survey

The buses are more reliable than the Coaster.

Thanks for the Rapid 215 and 235 after 40 years I’m still riding good and bad.

I would have to find a way where the extra $8 a month would come from in my $1137 S.S. monthly check. I believe I haven’t received a COLA raise in years.

If you want raise fares, need restroom everywhere. 7 days a week with security. I am SDM fare and can’t afford more. North County has restroom. We shouldn’t have to pay to use. Want what Escondido has. Youth can pay more.

I don’t raise for seniors - thanks

I am disabled, have a heart condition I... and cannot work. The Youth can generate an income stream I CANNOT. Youth should pay for themselves. I should NOT have to

I go to school. I am 64 years old and like low rates on pass. More service on bus 967 and more, less expense on passes. ... I got punched in the face. There was a fight on the Trolley. I’ve been beat up 25 times. I’ve seen other people

MTS Survey

It is unfair that SDM fare is being raised $8 for the most vulnerable passengers to lower fare for youth. Raise SDM fare by $4 rather than $8.

Split the proposed change to SDM/youth passes. Raise SDM to $32, lower youth to $30.

We can’t buy $2.50 one-way pass on phone, and need to do so often. the monthly pass isn’t enough of a discount for me to buy, at present. Maybe have an intermediate bulk pass we can buy with our phones?

Most plan 6 or 7 day passes, but I... to weekday frequency plus more direct express route so that trips do not take one hour for a 10 minute drive. On the

I am on fixed income and cannot afford it

I don’t want business With such a mid-priced cost cutting approach like that. The MTS clearly does not have a mass public user of the service. We users know what is needed and how much we value the Mts public service for the San Diego city we love.

In regards to the fare changes, I dislike the current proposal with the increase of the SDM 30 day pass. I think if an increase is necessary, a role of $22/mo ($4 increase) could be acceptable with a $6 discount on the Youth 30-day pass instead of the proposed $10 cut.

All in all – utilizing 3 separate companieshame the public transit service as a whole. I see the issues of road bus/trike operations, which coincide with poor engineering when scheduling seems to be an issue as well. For example, why not have rapid bus go to DMV offices? or why aren’t more express buses, Trolley stations? Plus, there is an area where no buses travel going downtown

In regards to the fare changes, I dislike the current proposal with the increase of the SDM 30 day pass. I think if an increase is necessary, a role of $22/mo ($4 increase) could be acceptable with a $6 discount on the Youth 30-day pass instead of the proposed $10 cut.
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We should consider offsetting the increase by lowering the Youth $4.00 and increasing the SDM by $4.00 other out and accomplish the same thing.

The fare prop. ideas fail to meet the quality of service

We could have a detailed cost analysis of the current and proposed operations. We could ask the public for their input on this.
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As a senior on limited income I strongly disagree with raising our monthly fares. Thank You.

I understand that people who use MTS more frequently should also get discounts.

I will pay more for MTS to be as punctual and consistent as Japan transit system.

I would pay more if more the route 60 northbound route operated between 5am -10am and if the southbound trips operated between 2pm - 7pm.

To increase use of the trolley by the elderly, try this as a test: chose one day each month that an older person can ride for free.

As a college student, I love that I can buy a semester pass. I would also love to see a weekend pass, since I do not plan to have a car in San Diego while in school. Also, it's difficult sometimes to get around when the times on the platforms are so erratic. I'd like to see improved accuracy. I'd love to get more involved in MTS and would also like to see more interaction with SDSU and college students to reduce cars on the road.

I am a senior, on a fixed income, and if I have to pay more for my monthly pass, I will tell you that I would be able to do more things as I can only pay for one. I will only do that if I can't afford to ride.

I would love to see more security on site. Especially at night.

I am a senior disabled rider. The $18 I pay I consider to be under priced. I would prefer to have the fare remain at the current price, but if price increased to $25 - $30 per month, I would continue to utilize MTS.

Keep it affordable for those who don't have cars and those who are trying to help the planet.

Public transit is not meant to run at a profit or even break even. It's meant to be heavily subsidized cheap transportation.

Since there is going to be discussion of reduced fares for seniors/disabled and youth, the regular adult pass should be considered. It should be increased to a big financial help because then I would have to choose between paying my phone bill which I need which is $80 or have a bus pass. Please do something about the CONSTANT music use on cell phones on the bus and trolley.

Why are we proposing a rate increase? Why are we not looking at increasing route efficiency and servicing the areas that are of most need in the budget? They've done this in Houston TX and were able to increase service routes including weekend service by optimizing routes. Let's look at that before making the transit options for our lower income resident unaffordable. Alternatively why not charge by the time using the system like in san francisco? Let's think outside of the box here.

The MTS system on campus makes our campus very unsafe. I believe raising the prices would help our problem here on campus because less homeless people would be riding it. I think the prices should increase so the MTS busses and trolleys are cleaner and with better service.

As a regular ($72) monthly rider, it's almost insulting how little SDM riders pay. Yes, I understand SDM riders are on a low or fixed income, but half-price passes for $36/month are appropriate, not a quarter of what I pay ($18).

I am a senior, on a fixed Social Security income & the increase would hit my monthly budget but I would have to pay the increase especially if it means better service as far as the most used buses running more often and being on time. At least of working people will not ride the bus because they only not do it always show up on time or don't show at all and now we have missed my ride to get to work.

I am a senior, on a fixed Social Security income & the increase would hit my monthly budget but I would have to pay the increase especially if it means better service as far as the most used buses running more often and being on time. At least of working people will not ride the bus because they only not do it always show up on time or don't show at all and now we have missed my ride to get to work.
We are older person live in Carmel Valley more than 10 years but no bus come, so sad. We need bus to UTC, so sad. We need bus to UTC, reason shown below:

1. Nearby all older Americans say they want to live independently in their homes and communities for as long as possible. People believes older Americans should have that opportunity, and we government have been working to ensure they do. But unless people have safe, convenient and affordable transportation options, they will be stuck at home or will be at greater risk on the roads then they need to be. Having access to transportation is critical to staying connected to friends and family and to pursuing day-to-day activities, both that are essential and those that enhance the quality of life.

2. Safe, affordable, and accessible transportation choices are critical for older adults who wish to remain independent.

3. Today, too many older Americans are “aging in place” in communities where travel by car is their only transportation option.

4. Public transportation is very limited in northeast in America's suburbs and rural areas, where most older people live, and there is no indication that the situation will improve soon.

5. Over half of individuals who do not drive stay home on any given day.

6. People who don't travel outside their homes risk social isolation.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

none, but please do not increase the fare price. thank you.

Please provide senior discounts on all of the changes.

I enjoy the benefits of taking the trolley to and from work. I look forward to any proposed changes – you're doing a great job!

I strongly agree that Youth should pay less than Adults.

The Fashion Valley Transit center needs to be remodeled. The elevator smells of urine every day. The stairs up to the Trolley are too narrow and dirty.

With rising gas prices I Gave up my car to ride buses and trolley more. I have some good routes from Chula Vista to ... downtown are very limited and make it hard when I come into town late on the Amtrak. There should be late night services.

That's a pretty steep increase for SDM fares.

A few suggestions to make MTS more useful:

- Con, McDonalds, etc. There are many places, that have no benches to sit on, and people have to stand for a half hour and more at times. (in the rain, wind, and not sun.) Fun, & hard on disability & older folk! Many people are holding shopping bags and groceries, and we don’t always want to set them down especially in the rain. Simple, but “good things” to do for others, so we hope others would do the same too! We hope that you will consider making these changes for the people who ride MTS, and these are the same folks that help to make your company profitable, and a SUCCESS. It is the Riders on the Buses! Thanks for listening!

Don’t combine Youth & SDM passes and make them the same price.

Please do not increase the senior age from 65 to 68.

Don’t increase the age for senior to 65.

Thank you. Please consider to implement a route north from the Coronado Bridge Express with train.

I'm a single disabled mom of a 12 or 13 who must have a bus pass for school and doctor appointments, etc. because of safety. I can't afford her pass even at a decreased rate. Increased rates are needed, but when about a scholarship for the kids that can't afford the cost? Thanks!

I stopped riding MTS when they started stopping going for ride sharing. Less people are using public transit because of ride share. If MTS doesn't bring back backseats and keeps4 the rates the same more and more riders are going to rush for ride sharing.

MTS does a very Nice job on their Bus Services, and the Bus Drivers are really "Great, Patient with people, and are skilled in their driving, Helpful, Friendly, and Considerate" A few ideas that are really important are: to put Covers over the Bus Stops, (to help the customers of MTS on the Hot, Windy, & Rainy Days.) Several of the Protective Covers, were put in a year or two ago, and then were taken out completely, (never replaced again!) These should be replaced immediately. & the money could come from some of the "Advertising" that is often on the Busses, such as Coca-Cola, McDonalds, etc. There are many places, that have no benches to sit on, and people have to stand for a half hour and more at times. (in the rain, wind, and not sun.) Fun, & hard on disability & older folk! Many people are holding shopping bags and groceries, and we don’t always want to set them down especially in the rain. Simple, but “good things” to do for others, so we hope others would do the same, too! We hope that you will consider making these changes for the people who ride MTS, and these are the same folks that help to make your company profitable, and a SUCCESS. It is the Riders on the Buses! Thanks for listening!

There needs to be a discount for adults. Let’s be real I can’t even afford to buy a $75 a month pass. At least $35 a month and I will think about it.

Trolley and bus services need to go longer at night. People work night shift or have to get home late and not having trolley or buses that run past 8 or 9 pm hure those commuters. Most big cities have 24 hour transit. That’s the biggest drawback to the transit system here.

The Fashion Valley Transit Center needs to be remodeled. The elevator smells of urine every day. The stairs up to the Trolley are too narrow and dirty.

I hope my own fan for riding both bus and trolley don’t increase at all but stay the same for me and others who are $ 5.00 & $2.00 in age.

For months no one checked fees on the.coaster and trolley did not pay. Now I want to raise rates. Reduce delinquencies.

I am a senior on a fixed income and need to save money whenever and whenever I can. I can’t say I would ever volunteer to pay more for anything.

I appreciate the reduced fare on a youth pass. My son doesn’t take public transportation as much as I do. What I don’t like about the proposed changes is getting rid of the 2-, 4-day passes. I have bought those a few times when working to transition to a new pass paid structure.

Useless those passes are well.

The senior discount fare should continue to be 60 years of age. Many older adults need to ride and are on tight budgets as it is.

The $5 increase in the Senior/Disabled pass of $2.50 TO $300 a percentage of increase — if it’s unreasonable to increase that price point over 45% when the other are not being such a direct hit. Living on fixed income, you’re forcing people to take money out of their limited food budgets to compensate for your 45%, unreasonable increase.

Increase routes in 91220 please.

More frequent service in areas other than just Downtown and Hillcrest/North Park, please. And service near senior living complexes. It’s astounding how many have NO service!

Thanks for taking input. I ride every day, and it’s really a pretty great system, with just a few tweaks needed!

I believe you have great service!

Trolley and bus services need to be go longer at night. People work night shift or have to get home late and not having trolley or buses that run past 8 or 9 pm hure those commuters. Most big cities have 24 hour transit. That’s the biggest drawback to the transit system here.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

6. People who don't travel outside their homes risk social isolation.

We are older person live in Carmel Valley more than 10 years but no bus come, so sad. We need bus to UTC, so sad. We need bus to UTC, reason shown below:

1. Nearby all older Americans say they want to live independently in their homes and communities for as long as possible. People believes older Americans should have that opportunity, and we government have been working to ensure they do. But unless people have safe, convenient and affordable transportation options, they will be stuck at home or will be at greater risk on the roads then they need to be. Having access to transportation is critical to staying connected to friends and family and to pursuing day-to-day activities, both that are essential and those that enhance the quality of life.

2. Safe, affordable, and accessible transportation choices are critical for older adults who wish to remain independent.

3. Today, too many older Americans are “aging in place” in communities where travel by car is their only transportation option.

4. Public transportation is very limited in northeast in America's suburbs and rural areas, where most older people live, and there is no indication that the situation will improve soon.

5. Over half of individuals who do not drive stay home on any given day.

6. People who don't travel outside their homes risk social isolation.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.
I also wish that MTS will give at least once in a while promo for those who avail monthly pass, like once in a while we can buy monthly pass at a discounted price during a promo period.

$5 is a good solid round amount to have on hand to get a day pass. Increase to $6 would make it slightly more difficult ... the Compass Cloud app, I think it is more reasonable to increase the fare then. Additionally, a $10 and $20 fare option

Earlier services - I cannot get to Old Town from La Mesa earlier than about 5:50, but would certainly ride an earlier run.

I think these are excellent proposed changes. Keeps things simple. Thanks!

Mts should have a program for low income families like myself , that paying 72 dollars is already alot .

I'm deaf

Im ok with the increase because it seems like it won't be as much as I thought. However I do hope that it will help increase security on the trolleys and better trolley appearance

More and more frequent service would result in additional riders and you would t have to increase fares. Instead of ... service and make buses unbearably slow. I used to take the coaster every day. It was a joke. It broke down all the time.

I understand the fee increase, but $8 is quite a steep jump when you're on a fixed income (ie: social security benefits)

I would like to see Sunday service brought back to Poway

Please don't get rid of multi-day passes! When I go to comic-con, I want to pay for a four-day pass, not deal with buying a new pass every day. Getting a minor discount for a multi-day pass seems quite reasonable. I'm thinking of cancelling my monthly pass because I don't use it enough. It does pass away in Jan. 2023.

Senior have so much money and most of it goes for medicine and doctors before transtit

This is unfair to the elderly.  You are raising the rate and the age.  Most are on fixed income and can't afford a 44% increase.

In comparison to other large US metro areas, the SD trolley is a steal. It is very cheap as is, so a minimal increase in fares is fine.

In comparison to other large US metro areas, the SD trolley is a steal. It is very cheap as is, so a minimal increase in fares is fine.

I think it is unfair to hit the SDM with an $8 hike as they are the ones on a fixed income.

Senior Disabled people who are already struggling for their survival will be even more struggling if the proposed lumping together of the price of the Senior/Disabled pass with the Youth Pass is adopted. Kids have their parents to help them pay for the cost of riding the bus and trolley. Senior/Disabled people who are on a fixed income for survival have nowhere to turn. Quality of life is a concern for the Senior/Disabled, and the proposed lumping together of the price of the Senior/Disabled pass and the Youth Pass is a huge burden.

 vets are more important than kid passes.  I started using UBER or LYFT because of convenience.

Veteran passes are more important than kid passes.  I started using UBER or LYFT because of convenience.

I think that fares are cost prohibitive to some, however I would most definitely utilize the bus system more if it were more affordable. That being said, I also strongly advocate for discounted fares for young people and environmentally friendly vehicles.

Agree with your proposals listed.

Senior Disabled people who are a fixed income keep getting squeezed and squeezed tighter and tighter because the amount of the Social Security and other types of benefits we rely on for survival are not keeping up with the rise in the cost of living in San Diego. It is already extremely hard for Senior Disabled people who are already struggling to make their survival as it is. If the proposed lumping together of the price of the Senior/Disabled pass with the Youth Pass is adopted, it will be even more difficult for them to survive.

Under the new changes, the Compass Cloud app will be more useful for those who are proficient in using the app. I think the proposed changes are reasonable and should be adopted.

NCTD and MTS are a godsend to working adults who can't drive, whether due to disability, not being able to afford a car, or environmental concerns. Taxis, Lyft, and Uber are too costly to be a daily use option. It's rare to have viable public transit options in the U.S., and we should be making these services cheaper, more convenient, and more widely available for regular users, particularly for discounted rides to day-tripping tourists and residents and children and raising prices for those who need to get around. If MTS and/or NCTD need more money to provide service, they should consider other options.

NCTD survey to be combined and on the same page. NCTD service is abysmal. Many people have to commute from MTS to work in NCTD areas.

A $65 is a bad number - you need two bills to make the payment. $5 is so much more convenient for the riders.

I think the MTS survey could be streamlined to speed up the response by respondents.

I think to keep the 2-3 14 day passes, and 5 day pass as well.

I use the trolley to commute to work. I noticed that it is crowded when the members that live in Chula Vista, Mike Mesa and even San Marcus area has the option to use the direct bus instead of a trolley. Why can they provide the non-stop bus as an alternate commute for people that live in Spring Valley/Mesa area we need other alternative route to commute to work other than the trolley.

need a route on Coop Dr. in to Keenan.

Need start planning to build new trolley line from UTC to Miramar College station soon.

If the trolley breaks down, riders should get a voucher.

I think a lot of SDM riders might have trouble with higher fares. A lot of them look like they are barely scraping by. I could pay a little more, but that for I’d like to see at least some of the trolley when there are events downtown and always 3 cars. There are 3 cars on trolleys headed downtown and only 2 for the return trip, it can be a problem to those of us who can’t walk all the way. Waiting a half hour for a trolley at night is not great.

Earlier services - I cannot get to Old Town from La Mesa earlier than about 5:50, but would certainly ride an earlier run.

it’s a fair price. i used to take the trolley to work and it would cost me $3.50 more. it’s a small price to pay to avoid the stress of driving.

I think it is unfair that the fares will be going up next year due to the fact that buses/trolleys are frequently late. I also think that the fare should be charged to the SDMT.

I'd like to see the fares be cheap for seniors to get on the bus.

In comparison to other large US metro areas, the SD trolley is a steal. It is very cheap as is, so a minimal increase in fares is fine.

I think that these are excellent proposed changes. Keeps things simple. Thanks!

Research on demand: A new model of the trolley service

Senior/Disabled people who are on fixed income need to do much more service here.

I have been riding MTS for almost 20 years. I love your service, keep it up.

In comparison to other large US metro areas, the SD trolley is a steal. It is very cheap as is, so a minimal increase in fares is fine.

In comparison to other large US metro areas, the SD trolley is a steal. It is very cheap as is, so a minimal increase in fares is fine.

In comparison to other large US metro areas, the SD trolley is a steal. It is very cheap as is, so a minimal increase in fares is fine.

In comparison to other large US metro areas, the SD trolley is a steal. It is very cheap as is, so a minimal increase in fares is fine.

In comparison to other large US metro areas, the SD trolley is a steal. It is very cheap as is, so a minimal increase in fares is fine.

In comparison to other large US metro areas, the SD trolley is a steal. It is very cheap as is, so a minimal increase in fares is fine.

I'm afraid to ride anymore due to issues not addressed yet by MTS.

Vets are more important than kid passes. I started using UBER or LYFT because of convenience.

Veteran passes are more important than kid passes. I started using UBER or LYFT because of convenience.

More and more frequent service would result in additional riders and you would t have to increase fares. Instead of making buses unbearably slow. I used to take the coaster every day. It was a joke. It broke down all the time.

I'm afraid to ride anymore due to issues not addressed yet by MTS.

Vets are more important than kid passes. I started using UBER or LYFT because of convenience.

Veteran passes are more important than kid passes. I started using UBER or LYFT because of convenience.
The mentally disabled and people with ailments find it easier to find the bus stop when it is near their home. We have to have the #815 bus stop that stopped at 3rd & Peach back. Please, so that they can find it easier. Thank you.

Single mother barely making ends meet, 3 little ones on MediCal. People do not make the disabled pass, I can’t buy 3 of them.

I use to take my little brother and sisters to home school. Bus came pick them up at 3 p.m. each, to then take #815 to go to school. All my family got to church on Sunday on #815.

Vet on bus, was disabled, Fixed low income, please don’t raise the disabled pass.

Man Homeless please don’t raise the 30 day SDM. I will not be able to afford it.

Monthly SDM No $52.00 for 2 people too much.

We need our #815 bus back at Broadway & Main St. It’s hard to get to the bus stop; we need it back. City of El Cajon.

I am on Fixed income cannot pay $20.00 SDM Monthly.

I am taking medications that I cannot be in sun or cold for long durations of time. Please bring back bus #815 that it turned left on Broadway to Main, and to Broadway west, to turn LEFT on 3rd Street and Peach where lots of seniors live and need the #815 bus.

I am taking medications that I cannot be in sun or cold for long durations of time. Please bring back bus #815 that it turned left on Broadway to Main, and to Broadway west, to turn LEFT on 3rd Street and Peach where lots of seniors live and need the #815 bus.

Monthly SDM can’t afford $26.00 fixed income.

I have a walker, the bus stops are too far for me to get food and come back. We need the #815 bus back. It turned left on Broadway to Main Street and Peach where lots of seniors live and need the #815 bus.

I walk with the crutches under my arms, they hurt so the part that I need my bus closer is key at 3rd and Peach, bus #815 please. Permanent condition.

I am a senior with permanent knee damage can’t walk long distance. Fixed income, cane and walker: $52.00 for SDM Monthly.

Single mother barely making ends meet, 3 little ones on MediCal. People do not make the disabled pass, I can’t buy 3 of them.

I use to take my little brother and sisters to home school. Bus came pick them up at 3 p.m. each, to then take #815 to go to school. All my family got to church on Sunday on #815.

Vet on bus, was disabled, Fixed low income, please don’t raise the disabled pass.

Man Homeless please don’t raise the 30 day SDM. I will not be able to afford it.

Monthly SDM - $52 for two people too much.

I quit my jobs to take care of her, IHSS don’t pay much. Please do not raise the bus pass 30 day SDM, I need to get all the meds from the store to her.

Monthly SDM can’t afford $26.00 fixed income.

I have a walker, the bus stops are too far for me to get food and come back. We need the #815 bus back. It turned left on Broadway to Main Street and Peach where lots of seniors live and need the #815 bus.

I walk with the crutches under my arms, they hurt so the part that I need my bus closer is key at 3rd and Peach, bus #815 please. Permanent condition.

I am a senior with permanent knee damage can’t walk long distance. Fixed income, cane and walker: $52.00 for SDM Monthly.

Single mother barely making ends meet, 3 little ones on MediCal. People do not make the disabled pass, I can’t buy 3 of them.

I use to take my little brother and sisters to home school. Bus came pick them up at 3 p.m. each, to then take #815 to go to school. All my family got to church on Sunday on #815.

Vet on bus, was disabled, Fixed low income, please don’t raise the disabled pass.

Man Homeless please don’t raise the 30 day SDM. I will not be able to afford it.

Monthly SDM can’t afford $26.00 fixed income.

Monthly SDM No $52.00 for 2 people too much.

We need our #815 bus back at Broadway & Main St. It’s hard to get to the bus stop; we need it back. City of El Cajon.

I am on Fixed income cannot pay $20.00 SDM Monthly.

I am taking medications that I cannot be in sun or cold for long durations of time. Please bring back bus #815 that it turned left on Broadway to Main, and to Broadway west, to turn LEFT on 3rd Street and Peach where lots of seniors live and need the #815 bus.

I have a walker, the bus stops are too far for me to get food and come back. We need the #815 bus back. It turned left on Broadway to Main Street and Peach where lots of seniors live and need the #815 bus.

I walk with the crutches under my arms, they hurt so the part that I need my bus closer is key at 3rd and Peach, bus #815 please. Permanent condition.

I can’t go vote the 875 and 874 use to go to Kennedy Park Recreation Center - Meeting Room 1675 East Madison Ave. at 118.00 it’s too far. You should have buses to get to our voting poll. All Seniors, disabled, and disabled veterans use bus 875 & 874 to vote.

I am taking medications that I cannot be in sun or cold for long durations of time. Please bring back bus #815 that it turned left on Broadway to Main, and to Broadway west, to turn LEFT on 3rd Street and Peach where lots of seniors live and need the #815 bus.

I have a walker, the bus stops are too far for me to get food and come back. We need the #815 bus back. It turned left on Broadway to Main Street and Peach where lots of seniors live and need the #815 bus.

I walk with the crutches under my arms, they hurt so the part that I need my bus closer is key at 3rd and Peach, bus #815 please. Permanent condition.
They're 12 in our family in one house. I buy bus passes until they come out of my ears. They are seniors, parents, taking care of them. 3 kids, a wife, 3 brothers, and 2 sisters. Please, I beg of you, do not raise the 30-day Senior, Disabled, Medicare Bus Pass. I have a heart.

Father of 5. I buy bus passes, please do not raise the price, we are destitute. We walk when we can't afford it, we need to save for food.

Disabled mother on Medicare, 2 children. I have to buy 3 bus passes. Please do not raise the price.

Senior/Disabled/Medicare need $18.00 bus pass for everything in my life all month. It is for only form of transportation. Please do not raise the $18.00 bus pass.

Profession Hoif Professional. Do you actually read these comments??

It's my only flexibility for low income recipients, raise would be devastating on a sliding scale based on income.

The 358/359 service should be 6 days service instead of just Mon-Fri. Thank you.

PLEASE don't tax my already challenged income as a senior citizen! I get SSA each month and a 2.5% COLA (once a year only). Please do not raise the $18.00 bus pass.

Don't like 40% increase in fares for disabled, senior fares (don't charge too much).

Why raise rates for seniors and disabled who have difficulty getting $75? young adults won't ride because they can't get to their rap music as loud as they want and blast the base, so raise cost on people who can afford is easier.

I'm a long-time user of the Coaster. I believe a fare increase is important for maintaining service and meeting the needs of regular riders.

I am a full-time student. I have very little income and can barely afford my bus pass as is.

I propose that the 358/359 service should in six day service instead of just Mon-Fri. Thank you.

Disabled mother on Medicare, 2 children. I have to buy 3 bus passes. Please do not raise the price.

An almost $25 increase for SDM zone pass on seniors who can least afford it only unit feel unfair.

Don't take my bus service. I usually base my choice to use NCTD based on the compared cost to driving/commuting.

Why raise rates for seniors and disabled who have difficulty getting $75? young adults won't ride because they can't get to their rap music as loud as they want and blast the base, so raise cost on people who can afford is easier.

I ride the bus almost every day - would like more bus routes. I noticed in 2009, in the San Diego area to Carlsbad the ... of a commuter bus that ran  Monday through Friday, but they cut the hours and only did rush hour - and two years or three

I am a 61 year old grandfather who relies on the Coaster to get to work.  If you increase the fare AND move the goalposts (by taking away my senior pass for the next four years), I'm screwed.

I ride the bus almost every day - would like more bus routes. I noticed in 2009, in the San Diego area to Carlsbad the ... of a commuter bus that ran  Monday through Friday, but they cut the hours and only did rush hour - and two years or three

Concerned with paying.

Ridiculous.  Your service is so unreliable cannot be used with any confidence.

Bus pass costs should be raised on a sliding scale only. Many people especially (disabled & seniors) can barely afford a monthly pass as is.
NCTD Survey

I can understand a fare increase but I do not like the change in age limit for SDM! I also expect that if the fares do increase that the time and bus drivers learn their routes before they start a new route. Also, increasing fares do not encourage an increased ridership.

I should not have to change from the Sprinter-Breeze monthly pass to the pass for all of SD. I do not use the other vehicles offered and shouldn't have an extra $158 yearly cost because of it. Your increase from $59 to $72 is too much!

Increased fares makes me nervous...but I also understand operational costs are increasing...I really wish you didn't have to!!

Proposed fares remain very good value for money vs. other transportation methods (or driving a car), and are still considerably cheaper than other major cities transit systems (e.g. BART, London's underground).

You have decreased services throughout North County. Most of us walk a mile to a mile and a half to bus stops. Your buses and trains break down too often. Who wants to pay $6 for a day pass? Why would you increase the cost to ride the Coaster and Sprinter when for the last year or so, there have been multiple delays? Your services are not 24 hour services. You don’t service everywhere in order for an increase. It seems to me that the inconvenience of your customers does not matter to you.

Improved and more frequent services are essential to the success of San Diego as a city in the global marketplace, and the proposed increased fares are measured and reasonable.

I am not happy about that. I ride the Coaster almost every day and it is not really that reliable, last week I had to take a bus home from Old Town and I was lucky that I got on because you do a poor job of announcing delays and cancellations and I do check the Twitter feed. Today my train was 15 minutes late. Now you have reduced the numbers of cars from 5 to 4 the cars are crammed like cattle cars. Please keep the senior rate at 60 years old I don’t want to have to start driving again at my age.

Don't want to jinx it, but for a while the Coaster was delayed quite a bit due to "mechanical difficulties". Not confident to take when catching a flight any more because of delays. Need equipment that is reliable and serviced properly.

I understand the need to increase fares but some of increases are quite large. Most importantly is all the "mechanical" and PTC issues causing cancellations or delays on our daily commute. If reliability were better it would probably not be such an issue. We already pay a lot for the 3 zone monthly pass. Thank you.

The proposed increase in the SDM from $18.00 to $20.00 is OUTRAGEOUS! That's a 40% increase for those of us who are disabled and elderly who live on fixed incomes. The decrease for the youth doesn't bode well for either as most youth have jobs or have their parents pay for their bus fares/passes. Why decrease bus fares/passes for the youth and raise them for the disabled and elderly? That is not right! I can understand raising SDM from $18.00 to say, $20.00, but not $26.00. Most of that money would be going into the CEO's, presidents, and superintendents pockets, not improving service which we need. If rates go up, they should go up for everyone. If anything the SDM need the discount, not the millennials.

I ride the Coaster to and from work, I am pleased that the conductors have started checking tickets/passes. I realize the importance of making sure riders are paying the fares before increasing fares to cover expenses. I think there are still people who ride the Coaster without paying, because they can get away with it most of the time. Thank you. I LOVE THE COASTER!

My concern is the 58% SDM Coaster fare rise increase. Seniors typically use public transportation because they either cannot afford to operate a vehicle or they are no longer allowed to drive thus necessitating the use of public transportation. These increased $5 could be a senior's IIX or food on the table as most seniors are on a fixed income. Perhaps a staggered increase over 6 months or a year as I recognize the need for fare increases. All that said, Coaster not THAT reliable...breaks down frequently and is often late due to PTC issues.

The survey is... odd. Saying "Don't Know" when the option doesn't apply makes it seem as if I don't care... The removal of the Regional Adult pass for $59 is a bad idea. I cannot afford a car, and it's either dip into what little I have for grocery for a bus pass. I wait full time and I barely afford to live in SD county. For #5? You guys ALREADY reduce services? #7 you know perfectly well most taking these services cannot afford to stop taking the breeze, sprinter or coaster. The only times I EVER use the trolley is when I manage to snag a volunteer shift at comic con, and even then there is a special fare. I feel as if the NCTD has never once actually listened to the people...

Should bring back the free transfer from Coaster to MTS Bus 652 to the airport. It's really annoying to have to have $2.25 exact change on the bus, when we pay everything else by credit/debit card. Increase the Sprinter adult one-way ticket to $2, not $2.55. People that want to ride the Sprinter will pay the extra money....

I am 61 year old now and what I am seeing is you want to raise the age of senior to 65 is that correct?

The Coaster has been a wonderful way for my Senior daughters to get to Comic Con, and even then there is a special fare. I feel as if the NCTD has never once actually listened to the people...

I cannot afford a car, and it's either dip into what little I have for grocery for a bus pass. I wait full time and I barely afford to live in SD county. For #6? You guys ALREADY reduce services, #7 you know perfectly well most taking these services cannot afford to stop taking the breeze, sprinter or coaster. The only times I EVER use the trolley is when I manage to snag a volunteer shift at comic con, and even then there is a special fare. I feel as if the NCTD has never once actually listened to the people...

I understand the need to increase fares but some of increases are quite large. Most importantly is all the "mechanical" and PTC issues causing cancellations or delays on our daily commute. If reliability were better it would probably not be such an issue. We already pay a lot for the 3 zone monthly pass. Thank you.

The proposed increase in the SDM from $18.00 to $20.00 is OUTRAGEOUS! That's a 40% increase for those of us who are disabled and elderly who live on fixed incomes. The decrease for the youth doesn't bode well for either as most youth have jobs or have their parents pay for their bus fares/passes. Why decrease bus fares/passes for the youth and raise them for the disabled and elderly? That is not right! I can understand raising SDM from $18.00 to say, $20.00, but not $26.00. Most of that money would be going into the CEO's, presidents, and superintendents pockets, not improving service which we need. If rates go up, they should go up for everyone. If anything the SDM need the discount, not the millennials.

I am not happy about that. I ride the Coaster almost every day and it is not really that reliable, last week I had to take a bus home from Old Town and I was lucky that I got on because you do a poor job of announcing delays and cancellations and I do check the Twitter feed. Today my train was 15 minutes late. Now you have reduced the numbers of cars from 5 to 4 the cars are crammed like cattle cars. Please keep the senior rate at 60 years old I don’t want to have to start driving again at my age.

Don't want to jinx it, but for a while the Coaster was delayed quite a bit due to "mechanical difficulties". Not confident to take when catching a flight any more because of delays. Need equipment that is reliable and serviced properly.

I ride the Coaster to and from work, I am pleased that the conductors have started checking tickets/passes. I realize the importance of making sure riders are paying the fares before increasing fares to cover expenses. I think there are still people who ride the Coaster without paying, because they can get away with it most of the time. Thank you. I LOVE THE COASTER!

My concern is the 58% SDM Coaster fare rise increase. Seniors typically use public transportation because they either cannot afford to operate a vehicle or they are no longer allowed to drive thus necessitating the use of public transportation. These increased $5 could be a senior's IIX or food on the table as most seniors are on a fixed income. Perhaps a staggered increase over 6 months or a year as I recognize the need for fare increases. All that said, Coaster not THAT reliable...breaks down frequently and is often late due to PTC issues.

The survey is... odd. Saying "Don't Know" when the option doesn't apply makes it seem as if I don't care... The removal of the Regional Adult pass for $59 is a bad idea. I cannot afford a car, and it's either dip into what little I have for grocery for a bus pass. I wait full time and I barely afford to live in SD county. For #5? You guys ALREADY reduce services? #7 you know perfectly well most taking these services cannot afford to stop taking the breeze, sprinter or coaster. The only times I EVER use the trolley is when I manage to snag a volunteer shift at comic con, and even then there is a special fare. I feel as if the NCTD has never once actually listened to the people...

Should bring back the free transfer from Coaster to MTS Bus 652 to the airport. It's really annoying to have to have $2.25 exact change on the bus, when we pay everything else by credit/debit card. Increase the Sprinter adult one-way ticket to $2, not $2.55. People that want to ride the Sprinter will pay the extra money....
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Purpose of Analysis

Pursuant to the San Diego Association of Government’s (SANDAG) Board Policy No. 018, and in accordance with federal Title VI civil rights requirements (FTA Circular 4702.1B, October 1, 2012), SANDAG is responsible for evaluating whether any proposed change to the Fare Ordinance will have a disparate impact on minorities (based on race, color, or national origin) or result in a disproportionate burden on low-income persons. Pursuant to the FTA Circular and the FTA Title VI FAQ dated December 2012, the Fare Equity Analysis is conducted for fixed route transit, including both bus and rail services.

SANDAG Title VI Requirements

Pursuant to SANDAG’s Board Policy No. 018, section 1.2, the process to be followed in determining whether a fare change has a disparate impact on minorities or a disproportionate burden on low-income individuals is as follows:

1.2.1.1 SANDAG will determine the existence of disparate impacts to minority populations for all Fare Ordinance changes. Pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, disparate impacts are found when there is a difference in adverse effects between minority and non-minority areas of ten percent (10%) or more. Minority populations will be deemed adversely affected when the proportion of minority persons adversely affected by the change exceeds the average proportion of minority persons in the analysis service area. If SANDAG, in consultation with the transit operators, chooses to implement a proposed fare change in the Fare Ordinance despite a finding of disparate impact on minority populations, or if SANDAG finds, in consultation with the transit operators, even after the revisions, that minority populations will continue to bear a disproportionate share of the adverse effects of a proposed fare change, SANDAG may implement the fare change only if:

1.2.1.1.1 There is a substantial legitimate justification for the proposed fare change, and
1.2.1.1.2 A finding is made that there are no alternatives that would have a less disparate impact on minority populations and still accomplish the legitimate goals of the fare change.

1.2.1.2 SANDAG will determine the existence of disproportionate burdens on low-income populations for all Fare Ordinance changes. Pursuant to Executive Order 12898 (Clinton 1994), disproportionate burdens are found when there is a difference in adverse effects between low-income and non-low income populations of ten percent (10%) or more. Low-income populations will be deemed adversely affected when the proportion of low-income persons (using a threshold of at or below 200 percent of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines) adversely affected exceeds the average proportion of low-income persons in the analysis service area. If SANDAG chooses, in consultation with the transit operators, to implement a proposed fare change in the Fare Ordinance...
despite a finding of disproportionate burden on low-income ridership, or if SANDAG finds, in consultation with the transit operators, even after the revisions, that low-income riders will continue to bear a disproportionate burden due to the proposed fare change, SANDAG may implement the fare change only if the transit agency(ies) show that they will:

1.2.1.2.1 Take steps to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts where practicable, and
1.2.1.2.2 Provide a description of alternatives available to low-income populations affected by the fare changes.

This process is not intended by SANDAG, MTS, NCTD or the FTA to be an absolute determination of discrimination. Rather, the finding of a potential disparate impact or disproportionate burden according to this test is intended to trigger additional steps that otherwise can be skipped.

This analysis also does not contemplate an assessment of the relative equity of the fare structure as it exists today, only of whether the proposed changes are themselves equitable. This is in accordance with FTA guidance.

Description of Proposed Fare Change

SANDAG, the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the North County Transit District (NCTD) are currently considering changes to fares in the region. The current fixed route fare structure and proposed changes are set forth in Table 1 below. These changes are proposed to be implemented February 24, 2019.

In addition, SANDAG, MTS and NCTD are implementing a new definition of “senior” so that it will only apply to riders over the age of 65 compared with the current age of 60. However, all individuals who are certified as a senior prior to February 24, 2019 will continue to be considered a “senior” and will not be subject to the changed definition. Therefore, no individual will experience an increase or decrease in fares as a result of this changed definition. All individuals who are not certified as a senior by February 24, 2019 can expect to experience a delay in when they qualify for the reduced “senior” fares.

The agencies also considered other changes to current and future fares, however no other changes to fixed route are proposed for adoption at this time. A separate Fare Equity Analysis will be conducted prior to proposing any additional changes to the fixed route fare structure in the future.

Dataset and Methodology

As required by this policy and FTA Circular 4702.1B, SANDAG has calculated the number of minority and low-income boardings taken with each fare product that is currently offered by MTS or NCTD. This data was obtained from the 2015 SANDAG On-Board Transit Survey and annual calculations of ridership by fare product.
Table 1: Current Fare Structure and Proposed Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Fare</th>
<th>Fare Change</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional 30 Day/Monthly Pass</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional 30 Day/Monthly Youth Pass</td>
<td>Combined into single, lower cost, SDM/Youth Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional 30 Day/Monthly SDM Pass (age 65)</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>Eliminate, Riders use Day Passes (2)</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>Eliminate, Riders use Day Passes (3)</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>Eliminate, Riders use Day Passes (4)</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>Eliminate, Riders use Day Passes (10) or Monthly</td>
<td>$43.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Day Pass</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Reduced Fare (SDM/Youth) Day Pass</td>
<td>New Fare Product, Riders previously used Regional Day Pass (or cash fare)</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Plus Day Pass (new Premium Regional Day Pass)</td>
<td>No longer includes COASTER service (80%)</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Plus Day Pass</td>
<td>Including COASTER service (15% of riders)</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express 30 Day/Monthly Pass</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express 30 Day/Monthly Youth Pass</td>
<td>Combined into single, lower cost, SDM/Youth Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Bus One-Way</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Express One-Way (Routes 20, 50, 60, 110, 150, 235, 237, 870, 950)</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 1 Zone</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 1 Zone SDM</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 2 Zone</td>
<td>Decrease (2 Rural Zones are combined) (76%)</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 1 Zone SDM</td>
<td>Increase (2 Rural Zones are combined) (1%)</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 2 Zone SDM</td>
<td>Decrease (2 Rural Zones are combined) (19%)</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley One-Way (Rider does not transfer)</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley One-Way (Rider does transfer)</td>
<td>Eliminate free transfer, Rider pays twice (18%)</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM MTS Bus One-Way</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM Express One-Way</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM Rapid Express One-Way</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREEZE One-Way</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREEZE SDM One-Way</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTER One-Way</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTER SDM On-Way</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTER/BREEZE 30 Day/Monthly</td>
<td>Eliminate, Riders use higher cost Regional Pass</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (1 Zone)</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (2 Zone)</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (3 Zone)</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (1 Zone) SDM</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (2 Zone) SDM</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (3 Zone) SDM</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (1 Zone) Y</td>
<td>Combined into single, lower cost, SDM/Youth fare</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>(1.50)</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (2 Zone) Y</td>
<td>Combined into single, lower cost, SDM/Youth fare</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>(2.25)</td>
<td>-45%</td>
<td>-45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (3 Zone) Y</td>
<td>Combined into single, lower cost, SDM/Youth fare</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>(2.25)</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass (1 Zone)</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass (2 Zone)</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$161.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass (3 Zone)</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
<td>$182.00</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass Youth</td>
<td>Combined into single, lower cost, SDM/Youth Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$82.50</td>
<td>$58.00</td>
<td>(24.50)</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass SDM</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>$41.25</td>
<td>$58.00</td>
<td>$16.75</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER SDM/Youth Day Pass</td>
<td>New Fare Product, Riders previously used full fare Region Plus Day Pass</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>(4.50)</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTER/BREEZE SDM Day Pass</td>
<td>Eliminate, Riders use new, higher cost, Regional Reduced Fare Day Pass</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This On-Board Survey effort involved two types of surveys with bus and rail riders in the San Diego Service area: on-to-off counts and an origin-destination survey. Surveys were conducted on the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Bus, MTS Rail (Trolley), NCTD BREEZE, NCTD COASTER, and NCTD SPRINTER. Overall, over 88,000 On-to-Off Counts Surveys and nearly 33,900 Origin-Destination Surveys were completed. Both surveys were carried out by ETC Institute on behalf of SANDAG between February 2015 and December 2015. The demographic and fare payment information in the survey provided SANDAG with the percentage of riders for each fare product who are considered to be a minority or a low-income rider.

The information from the On-Board Survey is combined with calculations on the boardings by fare product based on farebox data, APC data, and annual surveys of fare use. This provides information on the boardings by fare product and allows calculation of the number of boardings by fare product for minority and low-income individuals.

MTS and NCTD have numerous fare types. Figure 1 below shows the principal fare types used by riders across both MTS and NCTD systems.

![Figure 1: Principal Fare Types](image)

Effect on Minority Populations

The FTA defines a minority person as anyone who is American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. Table 2 below presents the estimates of minority and total riders for each fare product being changed, and for all other riders, that resulted from SANDAG’s analysis of survey and other data. Table 2 also presents the percent change in the fare for each group of riders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>% Fare Change</th>
<th># of Riders</th>
<th># of Riders Adversely Impacted (Any Fare Increase)</th>
<th>Impact (% Fare Change * # of Riders)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional 30 Day/Monthly Pass</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57,463</td>
<td>78,356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional 30 Day/Monthly Youth Pass</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>9,305</td>
<td>10,775</td>
<td>(3,360)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional 30 Day/Monthly SDM Pass (age 65)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11,354</td>
<td>22,961</td>
<td>3,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Day Pass</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>39,711</td>
<td>52,730</td>
<td>7,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Reduced Fare (SDM/Youth) Day Pass</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>(450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Plus Day Pass (new Premium Regional Day Pass)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express 30 Day/Monthly Pass</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express 30 Day/Monthly Youth Pass</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express 30 Day/Monthly SDM Pass</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Bus One-Way</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7,263</td>
<td>11,106</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Express One-Way (Routes 20, 50, 60, 110, 150, 235, 237, 870, 950)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rapid Express One-Way</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 1 Zone</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 2 Zone</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 1 Zone SDM</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 2 Zone SDM</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley One-Way (Rider does not transfer)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39,917</td>
<td>52,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley One-Way (Rider does transfer)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8,762</td>
<td>11,525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM MTS Bus One-Way</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM Express One-Way</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM Rapid Express One-Way</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREEZE One-Way</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3,171</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>1,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREEZE SDM One-Way</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTER One-Way</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTER SDM On-Way</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTER/BREEZE 30 Day/Monthly</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (1 Zone)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (2 Zone)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (3 Zone)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (1 Zone) SDM</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (2 Zone) SDM</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (3 Zone) SDM</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (1 Zone) Y</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (2 Zone) Y</td>
<td>-45%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (3 Zone) Y</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass (1 Zone)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass (2 Zone)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass (3 Zone)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass Youth</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>(54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass SDM</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER SDM/Youth Day Pass</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTER/BREEZE SDM Day Pass</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ALL FARES</td>
<td>71.59%</td>
<td>260,437</td>
<td>57,288</td>
<td>111,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.36%</td>
<td>28,649</td>
<td>19,340</td>
<td>28,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As defined by SANDAG’s policy the existence, or non-existence, of disparate impacts to the minority populations is determined by whether the proportion of minority persons adversely affected by the change exceeds the average proportion of minority persons in the analysis service area by more than 10%. To determine this, individuals facing a fare increase were considered to be adversely affected by the fare change. The proportion of minority persons adversely affected by the change was calculated based on the number minority persons who faced a fare increase and the total number of riders who faced a fare increase. The average proportion of minority persons in the analysis service area was calculated as the proportion that minority persons made up of all riders. The key results are as follows:

- The proportion of minority persons adversely affected by the change is: 67.36%
- The average proportion of minority persons in the analysis service area is: 71.59%
- As the proportion of minority persons adversely affected by the change does not exceed the average proportion of minority persons in the analysis service area by more than 10%, there is no disparate impact.

A second calculation was conducted to estimate the proportion of the fare increase burden born by minority persons compared with the proportion that minority persons make up of all riders. This calculation takes into account that the fare change reduces the fares for some riders, reducing the burden on those riders, and also that a larger fare change places a greater burden on a rider than a smaller fare change. The two rightmost columns in Table 2 therefore show the result of multiplying the percentage change in price of each fare product times the number of riders using that fare product. A fare product which has a price reduction (such as the Regional 30 Day / Monthly Youth Pass) shows a negative number in these columns as it reduces the burden on riders, while a fare product which has a price increase (such as the Regional 30 Day / Monthly Senior Disabled Medicare Pass) shows a positive number as it increases the burden on riders. This calculation was performed separately for all riders and for minority persons, and these totals were then used to estimate the proportion of the fare increase burden born by minority persons. This was compared with the average proportion of minority persons in the analysis service area, calculated as discussed above.

- The proportion of the fare increase burden born by minority persons is: 67.50%
- The average proportion of minority persons in the analysis service area is: 71.75%
- As the proportion of the fare increase burden born by minority persons does not exceed the average proportion of minority persons in the analysis service area by more than 10%, this confirms that there is no disparate impact.

Effect on Low-Income Populations

The FTA defines a low-income person as a person whose household income is at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines, unless the agency has adopted a different, broader, definition. SANDAG defines a low-income person as a person whose household income is at or below 200% of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines. Table 3 below presents the estimates of low-income and total riders for each fare product.
being changed, and for all other riders, that resulted from SANDAG’s analysis of survey and other data. Table 3 also presents the percent change in the fare for each group of riders.

As defined by SANDAG’s policy the existence, or non-existence, of a disproportionate burden on low-income riders is determined by whether the proportion of low-income persons adversely affected by the change exceeds the average proportion of low-income persons in the analysis service area by more than 10%. To determine this, individuals facing a fare increase were considered to be adversely affected by the fare change. The proportion of low-income persons adversely affected by the change was calculated based on the number low-income persons who faced a fare increase and the total number of riders who faced a fare increase. The average proportion of low-income persons in the analysis service area was calculated as the proportion that low-income persons made up of all riders. The key results are as follows:

- The proportion of low-income persons adversely affected by the change is: 65.95%
- The average proportion of low-income persons in the analysis service area is: 66.17%
- As the proportion of low-income persons adversely affected by the change does not exceed the average proportion of low-income persons in the analysis service area by more than 10%, there is no disproportionate burden.

A second calculation was conducted to estimate the proportion of the fare increase burden born by low-income persons compared with the proportion that low-income persons make up of all riders. This calculation takes into account that the fare change reduces the fares for some riders, reducing the burden on those riders, and also that a larger fare change places a greater burden on a rider than a smaller fare change. The two rightmost columns in Table 3 therefore show the result of multiplying the percentage change in price of each fare product times the number of riders using that fare product. A fare product which has a price reduction (such as the Regional 30 Day / Monthly Youth Pass) shows a negative number in these columns as it reduces the burden on riders, while a fare product which has a price increase (such as the Regional 30 Day / Monthly Senior Disabled Medicare Pass) shows a positive number as it increases the burden on riders. The calculations were performed separately for all riders and for low-income persons, and these totals were then used to estimate the proportion of the fare increase burden born by low-income persons. This was compared with the average proportion of low-income persons in the analysis service area, calculated as discussed above.

- The proportion of the fare increase burden born by low-income persons is: 66.38%
- The average proportion of low-income persons in the analysis service area is: 66.17%
- As the proportion of the fare increase burden born by low-income persons does not exceed the average proportion of low-income persons in the analysis service area by more than 10%, this confirms that there is no disproportionate burden.
## Table 3: Low-Income and Total Ridership by Current Fare Structure with Proposed Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>% Fare Change</th>
<th># of Riders</th>
<th># of Riders Adversely Impacted (Any Fare Increase)</th>
<th>Impact (% Fare Change * # of Riders)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Low-Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional 30 Day/Monthly Pass</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42,850</td>
<td>66,231</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional 30 Day/Monthly Youth Pass</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>5,698</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional 30 Day/Monthly SDM Pass (age 65)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13,952</td>
<td>19,302</td>
<td>13,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Day Regional Pass</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Day Pass</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28,957</td>
<td>43,698</td>
<td>29,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Reduced Fare (SDM/Youth) Day Pass</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Plus Day Pass (new Premium Regional Day Pass)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Plus Day Pass</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express 30 Day/Monthly Pass</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express 30 Day/Monthly Youth Pass</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Express 30 Day/Monthly SDM Pass</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Bus One-Way</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5,262</td>
<td>9,302</td>
<td>5,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Express One-Way (Routes 20, 50, 60, 110, 150, 235, 237, 870, 950)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rapid Express One-Way</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 1 Zone</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 2 Zone</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 1 Zone SDM</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural 2 Zone SDM</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley One-Way (Rider does not transfer)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30,185</td>
<td>44,720</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley One-Way (Rider does transfer)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6,262</td>
<td>9,817</td>
<td>6,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM MTS Bus One-Way</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM Express One-Way</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM Rapid Express One-Way</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREEZE One-Way</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>3,272</td>
<td>2,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREEZE SDM One-Way</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTON One-Way</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTON SDM On-Way</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTON/BREEZE 30 Day/Monthly</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (1 Zone)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (2 Zone)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (3 Zone)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (1 Zone) SDM</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (2 Zone) SDM</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (3 Zone) SDM</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (1 Zone) Y</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (2 Zone) Y</td>
<td>-45%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER One-Way (3 Zone) Y</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass (1 Zone)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass (2 Zone)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass (3 Zone)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass Youth</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER 30 Day/Monthly Pass SDM</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER SDM/Youth Day Pass</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTON/BREEZE SDM Day Pass</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ALL FARES</td>
<td>144,049</td>
<td>217,705</td>
<td>61,546</td>
<td>93,321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                                           | 66.17%        | 65.95%      | 66.38%     |                       |
WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) have not increased fares in ten (10) years, even as operating expenses have continued to increase;

WHEREAS, MTS has a projected budget shortfall for fiscal year 2019 and NCTD has farebox recovery ratios that fall below levels mandated by State statute;

WHEREAS, a Comprehensive Fare Ordinance amendment incorporating modifications is necessary to provide MTS and NCTD the ability to revise fares for purposes of simplification of the regional fare structure, to clarify the fare rules for the region, and to increase revenue to bridge funding shortfalls and/or improve farebox recovery ratio levels mandated by State statute; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors wishes to render written findings in support of the determination that the amended Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance does not require an Environmental Impact Report before it approves such amendment; and

WHEREAS, if a project falls within a category exempt by administrative regulation under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), no further agency evaluation of environmental impact is required; and

WHEREAS, establishment of fares and fare modifications are exempt from CEQA pursuant to an exemption for fees charged by a public agency for the purpose of meeting operating expenses pursuant to Public Resources Code, § 21080, subd. (b)(8); and California Code of Regulations Title 14, § 15273, subd. (a); and

WHEREAS, it has been made clear that any increased revenues obtained from the fare modification will be used for operations purposes rather than for capital improvements.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that SANDAG makes the following findings:

Both MTS and NCTD need to revise fares to both simplify the fare structure and to increase revenue for purposes of meeting operating expenses.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 8th of February 2019.

ATTEST: ___________________________  ___________________________
CHAIR  SECRETARY

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association, and Mexico.
Annual Review and Proposed Amendments to Board Policies and Bylaws

Overview
The Office of General Counsel annually reviews Board Policies and Bylaws with staff and leadership to determine if updates should be recommended to the Board of Directors. In addition, Board Policy calls for the Board to annually renew its delegation of authority to the Executive Director for conducting investments on behalf of SANDAG (Attachment 4); and approval of Board Policy No. 032: San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission Interest Rate Swap Policy (Attachment 13). Proposed amendments to the SANDAG Bylaws and Board Policies were discussed by the Executive Committee at its December 7, 2018, meeting and at its January 11, 2019, meeting.

Key Considerations
The proposed amendments are summarized below and shown in tracked changes in Attachments 1 through 14.

SANDAG Bylaws (Attachment 1)

Article III, Section 5: Clarify stipend allowance for attendance at Board and Policy Advisory Committee meetings, Working Group meetings, and other events, and update compensation amounts for Board Chair and Vice Chair. Based on a request by the Executive Committee at its January 11, 2019, meeting, language has been added to better define compensable outside meetings and events, and stipends for outside meetings and events inside and outside of the SANDAG jurisdiction are separately addressed.

Article V, Section 1: Allow the Board Chair to appoint a voting member of the Board or a Policy Advisory Committee to chair a meeting of that body when all other leadership will be absent.

Board Policy No. 001: Allocation of Responsibilities (Attachment 2)

Section 6: Add reference to tribal nations and activities to the Borders Committee’s responsibilities.

Board Policy No. 002: Policies and Procedures for Policy Advisory Committees (Attachment 3)

Section 6: Delete duplicative language (from Bylaws) dealing with contingent leadership at the Board or Policy Advisory Committees when normal leadership is absent.

Board Policy No. 007: Equal Employment Opportunity Program (Attachment 5)

Section 1.2: Update protected classifications language to make consistent with state and federal law.

Action Requested: Approve
The Executive Committee recommends that the Board of Directors:

1. approve the proposed amendments to the SANDAG Bylaws and Board Policies (Attachments 1 through 14); and

2. renew its annual delegation of authority to the Executive Director pursuant to Board Policy No. 003: Investment Policy (Attachment 4), and approval of Board Policy No. 032: San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission Interest Rate Swap Policy (Attachment 13).

---

1 These policies were reviewed by management and the SANDAG Financial Advisor, PFM. Based on this review, no changes are proposed.
Board Policy No. 015: Records Management (Attachment 6)

Section 2.3: Allow records to be maintained in an electronic rather than hard copy format so long as the electronic storage system meets specified standards consistent with state law, and hard copies are not otherwise required to be kept by law.

Board Policy No. 017: Delegation of Authority (Attachment 7)

Section 4.1: Increase the delegated authority of the Executive Director to enter into agreements not currently in the budget (and make other modifications to the budget) from $100,000 to $300,000 per transaction so long as the overall budget remains in balance.

Section 4.16: Authorize the Executive Director to write off or make settlement on uncollectable debts in an amount not exceeding $5,000 upon concurrence by the Director of Finance that after using all appropriate collection tools, it is likely that the full debt is uncollectible and that it would not be cost effective to pursue collection of the entire debt.

Section 4.17: Authorize the Executive Director to approve an addendum to a previously-approved Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration when such an addendum is otherwise allowed under California Environmental Quality Act Section 15164 where only minor technical changes or additions are being made. This authority previously was approved for the Mid-Coast Corridor program of projects; this amendment would extend that authority to other qualifying project addenda.

Section 6: Require the Executive Director to prepare an administrative policy for employee evaluations consistent with the requirements of Assembly Bill 805 (Gonzalez, 2018) (AB 805).

Board Policy No. 019: Project Plans, Specifications & Estimates (Attachment 8)

Procedure 3: Clarify that project designs must conform to SANDAG design criteria in addition to the other stated criteria.

Board Policy No. 024: Procurement and Contracting – Construction (Attachment 9)

Section 8: Update statutory reference to make consistent with state law.

Board Policy No. 028: Asset Ownership and Disposition (Attachment 10)

Section 2.4.2; Section 2.8: Allow competitive public auctions as an asset disposition method and update the proportional reimbursement requirement for Federal Transit Administration-funded assets to be consistent with federal regulations.

Board Policy No. 030: Contingency Reserve Policy (Attachment 11)

Section 2.B: Establish the source, use, timing, and funding level of the new TransNet Major Corridors Program Contingency Reserve.

Board Policy No. 031: TransNet Ordinance & Expenditure Plan Rules (Attachment 12)

Section 3 of Rule 23: Define a “Guest Dwelling” as not more than one attached or detached residential dwelling unit on the same parcel as an existing single-family dwelling which provides independent living facilities for one or more persons.

“Guest Dwellings” currently qualify as an exception to TransNet Extension Ordinance Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) requirements but that term is not defined in the Ordinance or Board Policy No. 031. This has created uncertainty among local jurisdictions when considering application of the RTCIP fee to “granny flats,” “companion units,” or other reasonably synonymous types of development. The proposed amendment generally is based on the definition of an “accessory dwelling unit” in Government Code Section 65852.2 and has been developed with input from the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee as well as member agency legal counsel. This amendment is intended to clarify rather than
modify the existing exception for “Guest Dwellings,” and new residential units fitting the definition will continue to be exempt from payment of the RTCIP fee.

**Board Policy No. 039: Audit Policy Advisory Committee and Audit Procedures (Attachment 13)**

*Section 3.1.1:* Clarify that the Audit Committee oversees the annual SANDAG financial statement audit.

*Section 5.1:* Clarify that the Board of Directors has the responsibility for selection of the Independent Performance Auditor.

*Section 6.1:* Clarify that the Independent Performance Auditor reports to the Audit Committee; and makes the scope of the annual audit plans consistent with AB 805.

The Audit Committee discussed the proposed amendments to Board Policy No. 039 at its January 11, 2019, meeting (subsequent to the Executive Committee meeting) and recommended approval of the proposed amendments with the following additional modifications:

*Section 2.3:* State that in the selection by the SANDAG Chair of the Audit Committee Chair and Vice-Chair, ideally one of the two leadership positions would be held by a public member and the other held by a Board member. Current language contains no limitation on leadership selections.

*Section 6.1:* Add language clarifying that performance audits shall be conducted of as many of SANDAG departments, offices, boards, activities, agencies, and programs as resources permit. This was based on a stated concern that the current amended language mandates audits of all aspects of SANDAG without regard to available resources.

**Next Steps**

Pending approval by the Board of Directors, the amended Bylaws and Board Polices would become effective immediately and posted to the SANDAG website.

**Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director**

Key Staff Contact: John Kirk, (619) 699-1997, john.kirk@sandag.org

Attachments:  
1. SANDAG Bylaws  
2. Board Policy No. 001  
3. Board Policy No. 002  
4. Board Policy No. 003  
5. Board Policy No. 007  
6. Board Policy No. 015  
7. Board Policy No. 017  
8. Board Policy No. 019  
9. Board Policy No. 024  
10. Board Policy No. 028  
11. Board Policy No. 030  
12. Board Policy No. 031  
13. Board Policy No. 032  
14. Board Policy No. 039
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
BYLAWS

ARTICLE I  
NAME AND PURPOSE

Section 1

The name of this organization shall be the San Diego Association of Governments (hereinafter referred to as SANDAG).

Section 2

The purposes of this organization are as set forth in the San Diego Regional Transportation Consolidation Act (the “Act”), as established by state and federal law, and as approved by the Board of Directors. The primary purpose for which this organization is created is to engage in regional cooperative comprehensive planning, programming and where authorized, implementation thereof, and to assist the Member Agencies.

ARTICLE II  
DEFINITIONS

The following terms shall have the meanings ascribed to them within this section unless the content of their use dictates otherwise:

a. “Board Member” shall mean a voting member of the Board of Directors.

b. “Region” shall mean that territory physically lying within the boundaries of San Diego County.

c. “Population” of any Member Agency shall mean that population as defined in SB 1703.

d. “Fiscal Year” shall mean that year beginning July 1, and ending June 30.

d. “Member Agencies” shall mean the cities within San Diego County and the County of San Diego collectively.

e. “Subregion” shall mean one of the following six geographic areas: San Diego County; the City of San Diego; “North County Coastal,” which includes the cities of Del Mar, Solana Beach, Encinitas, Carlsbad, and Oceanside; “North County Inland,” which includes the cities of Vista, San Marcos, Escondido, and Poway; “South County,” which includes the cities of Chula Vista, National City, Imperial Beach, and Coronado; and “East County,” which includes the cities of El Cajon, Santee, La Mesa, and Lemon Grove.

1 Public Utilities Code §132350 et seq.
ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION

Section 1

Membership in this organization shall be as provided in state law, Board Policies, and these Bylaws.

Section 2

a. All powers of SANDAG shall be exercised by the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors may choose to delegate several of its responsibilities from time to time in accordance with Board policy.

b. Only the duly selected official representative(s), or in his or her absence, his or her duly selected alternate or alternates, shall be entitled to represent his or her Member Agency in the deliberations of the Board of Directors.

c. When changes occur, names of the official representatives and alternates shall be communicated in writing to the SANDAG Clerk of the Board by each participating Member Agency.

Section 3

There shall be at least six standing committees which shall be known as Policy Advisory Committees with the membership set forth in the Act or Board Policy.

a. The procedure for subregional appointments to the Policy Advisory Committees shall be established by Board policy. In the case of the subregional appointments, the policy shall ensure a noticed, formal process wherein all Board Members (including alternates) from each subregion are provided an opportunity to participate in the selection process. Each subregion shall ensure that SANDAG staff is notified of the date, time, and location for that subregion’s meeting. After the meeting for each subregion is set by the primary Board Members, SANDAG staff shall provide Board alternates from each subregion advance notice of the meeting. A majority of the primary members present at the subregion meeting shall make a selection by January 31. An alternate member may vote in the absence of the primary member. In appointing persons to the Transportation Committee, to the extent possible, the subregions and other agencies should avoid duplication of representation from any city other than the City of San Diego.

b. Procedures for Policy Advisory Committee attendance and voting shall be established by Board policy. The policy shall ensure the formal delineation of the voting membership at each meeting.

c. The Board Chair and Vice Chair may serve as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Policy Advisory Committees.

d. The Board Chair shall select the Chair and Vice Chair of all Policy Advisory Committees except the Executive Committee and Audit Committee, annually in or around February.

e. The Board Chair shall serve as the chair of the Executive Committee. The Board Vice Chair shall serve as the Vice Chair of the Executive Committee.

f. The Chair and Vice Chair of the Audit Committee shall be selected as set forth in Board Policy No. 039.
Section 4

The Board of Directors or a Policy Advisory Committee with delegated authority shall have the authority to appoint all additional committees or working groups and may provide for the appointment of alternates to these committees if permitted by a Board Policy.

a. Additional Policy Advisory Committees may be appointed by the Board of Directors as may be required to carry out general and continuing functions and may be abolished only upon specific action by the Board of Directors.

b. Ad hoc specialized subcommittees or working groups may be appointed by the Board of Directors as the need arises to accomplish specific tasks. The Policy Advisory Committees may appoint working groups to advise them. Upon completion of its assignment, each ad hoc subcommittee or working group shall disband.

Section 5

In addition to any compensation mandated by state law for Board meetings, the rates below shall apply. Persons must be present for at least 1/2 of the time set for the meeting or the duration of the meeting, whichever is less, in order to be eligible for compensation.

a. For attendance by Board Members, or alternates in their absence, at Board meetings or Board subcommittee meetings, $150 per meeting.

b. For attendance by Board Members and alternates when serving as a member or alternate of a Policy Advisory Committee, $100 per meeting.

c. For attendance by Board Members and alternates, or advisory Board members when serving as a chair of a Working Group, $100 per meeting.

d. For attendance by Board Members at meetings or events other than those described above when serving as an official representative of SANDAG or from which from which SANDAG will derive a specific benefit through the attendance of a representative, $100 per each day of the meeting or event in which business is conducted if within the County of San Diego, or $150 per each day of the meeting or event in which business is conducted if outside of the County of San Diego. Ethics training and similar classes of an educational nature shall not constitute an event for which compensation will be paid unless the Board Member is attending the training as an official representative of SANDAG.

c. For Board Members and alternates of Policy Advisory Committees, $100 per meeting.

d. The limit on the total number of paid meetings for Board, Policy Advisory Committee, and Working Group meetings members or alternates per individual is six meetings per individual per month.

e. The Chair of the Board shall receive additional monthly compensation of $500-700 per month.

f. The Vice Chair of the Board shall receive additional monthly compensation of $250-350 per month.
ARTICLE IV

MEETINGS

Section 1

a. A quorum for a meeting of the Board of Directors shall be as provided for in Section 5 of this Article.

b. A quorum shall be required for the conduct of any business of a committee. No business shall be conducted by a committee without a quorum. A simple majority of the appointed members of a committee shall constitute a quorum. All decisions by a committee shall be by simple majority of the quorum.

Section 2

Parliamentary procedure at all meetings shall be governed by Roberts Rules of Order except as otherwise modified by state law, Board Policy, or these Bylaws. SANDAG shall forward notice of the meetings of the Board of Directors and each Policy Advisory Committee, stating the time, location, and the agenda of business to each Board Member's agency and to the respective members and alternates of the Board of Directors or the Policy Advisory Committees, at the earliest time possible, but in no event less than 72 hours prior to meetings, except that such written notice of regular Board of Directors' meetings may be forwarded by first class mail or other appropriate means not less than seven days prior to such meeting.

Section 3

All meetings of a SANDAG legislative body, including without limitation regular, adjourned regular, and special meetings of the Board of Directors, shall be called, noticed, held and conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act (commencing with Section 54950 of the California Government Code). Closed session items should be heard by the Board of Directors unless timeliness requires consideration by the Executive Committee or, for transportation matters the Transportation Committee. The Audit Committee may hold closed sessions on matters within its purview. In any event, the Transportation Committee is authorized to convene closed sessions and make final decisions with regard to real property transactions related to transportation projects, however, this delegation does not include the authority to make a Resolution of Necessity or to commence litigation. The Transportation Committee will report real property transaction purchase amounts at the next regular meeting of the Board occurring after final execution of the purchase documents.

Section 4

The Board and committees shall meet according to the following schedule:

a. The Board of Directors and Policy Advisory Committees shall hold their regular meetings on Fridays unless otherwise determined from time to time by the Board of Directors or Policy Advisory Committee. Regular meetings of the Board of Directors shall be held on the second and fourth Friday mornings of the month at the SANDAG offices or at other locations within San Diego County, unless otherwise provided by the Board. Special meetings of the Board of Directors or Policy Advisory Committees may be called from time to time by their respective Chair.
b. Other committees shall meet whenever called by their respective Chair.

Section 5 (Sections 132351.2 and 132352.1 of the Public Utilities Code)

a. There are 19 Member Agencies on the Board and a majority of the Member Agencies constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business. In order to take final action on any item, except the final vote(s) electing the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board, which shall require use of the weighted vote procedure as described below in subsection b, a majority vote of the Board Members present on the basis of one vote per agency (tally vote) is required. After the tally vote of the Board Members is taken, a weighted vote may be called by the Board Members of any two Member Agencies unless otherwise required by law. Approval under the weighted vote procedure requires the vote of not less than four Board Members representing separate Member Agencies and not less than 51 percent of the total weighted vote to supersede the original action of the Board.

b. The election of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board shall require use of the weighted vote procedure set forth in Public Utilities Code Section 132351.2(e) without a prior tally vote requirement. In the event approval using the procedure in Public Utilities Code Section 132351.2(e) cannot be obtained to allow final action on the election, one or more preliminary votes may be taken using the tally vote method in order to narrow the options sufficiently to obtain approval on the final action as required by Public Utilities Code Section 132351.2(e).

c. The City and County of San Diego shall each determine how to allocate their tally vote between their two members by resolution and shall provide their resolutions to the SANDAG Clerk of the Board. The City and County of San Diego shall allocate their weighted votes equally.

d. For the weighted vote, there shall be a total of 100 votes, except additional votes shall be allowed pursuant to subdivision (h). Each Member Agency shall have that number of votes determined by the following apportionment formula, provided that each agency shall have at least one vote, no agency shall have more than 50 votes, and there shall be no fractional votes in the allocation of votes to each Member Agency:

1. If any agency has 50 percent or more of the total population of the San Diego County region, allocate 50 votes to that agency and follow paragraph (2), if not, follow paragraph (3).

2. Total the population of the remaining agencies determined in paragraph (1) and compute the percentage of this total that each agency has.

   (A) Multiply each percentage derived above by 50 to determine fractional shares.

   (B) Boost fractions that are less than one, to one and add the whole numbers.

   (C) If the answer to subparagraph (B) is 50, drop all fractions and the whole numbers are the votes for each Member Agency.

   (D) If the answer to subparagraph (B) is less than 50, the remaining vote(s) is allocated one each to the Member Agency having the highest fraction excepting those whose vote was increased to one pursuant to subparagraph (B) above.

   (E) If the answer to subparagraph (B) is more than 50, the excess vote is taken one each from the Member Agency with the lowest fraction. In no case shall a Member Agency’s vote be reduced to less than one.
(3) Total the population determined in paragraph (1) and compute the percentage of this total that each Member Agency has.

(A) Boost fractions that are less than one to one and add the whole numbers.

(B) If the answer to subparagraph (A) is 100, drop all fractions and the whole numbers are the votes for each Member Agency.

(C) If the answer to subparagraph (A) is less than 100, the remaining vote(s) is allocated one each to the Member Agency having the highest fraction excepting those whose vote was increased to one pursuant to subparagraph (A) above.

(D) If the answer to subparagraph (A) is more than 100, the excess vote(s) is taken one each from the agency with the lowest fraction. In no case shall a Member Agency’s vote be reduced to less than one.

e. When a weighted vote is taken on any item that requires more than a majority vote of the Board, it shall also require the supermajority percentage of the weighted vote.

f. The weighted vote formula shall be recomputed in the above manner every July 1.

g. For purposes of subsection d, the population of the County of San Diego is the population in the unincorporated area of the county. In those years when the primary representative of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors to the SANDAG Board of Directors is from a district that is substantially an incorporated area, a supervisor who represents a district that is substantially an unincorporated area shall be appointed to the Board as the secondary representative. Alternatively, in those years when the primary representative of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors is from a district that is substantially an unincorporated area, a supervisor who represents a district that is substantially an incorporated area shall be appointed to the Board as the secondary representative.

h. Any newly incorporated city shall receive one vote under the weighted vote procedure specified above until the next recomputation of the weighted vote formula, at which time the new agency shall receive votes in accordance with the recomputed formula. Until this recomputation, the total weighted vote may exceed 100.

**ARTICLE V**

**OFFICERS AND THEIR DUTIES**

**Section 1**

The Board of Directors shall have as officers a Chair and Vice Chair who are primary members of the Board. Policy Advisory Committees shall have as officers a Chair and Vice Chair, who are primary or alternate members of the Board and primary members of their respective committees. The Executive Director shall be the Secretary of the Board and each Policy Advisory Committee.

a. The Chair shall preside over Board and committee meetings, and have general supervision of Board and committee affairs. The Chair shall sign all official documents when directed to do so by the Board and committees respectively.
b. The Vice Chair shall perform the duties of the Chair in his or her absence and perform any duties that the Chair may require.

c. In the event of the absence of both officers of the Board of Directors or Executive Committee at a meeting or otherwise, a Chair of a Policy Advisory Committee shall serve as Chair Pro Tempore and perform the duties of the Chair according to the following schedule: first quarter of calendar year – Chair of Borders Committee; second quarter of calendar year – Chair of Public Safety Committee; third quarter of calendar year – Chair of Regional Planning Committee; fourth quarter of calendar year: Chair of Transportation Committee.

d. In the event of the absence of both officers of a Policy Advisory Committee, or in the case of a Board of Directors or Executive Committee meeting, the absence of all officers including the then-current Chair Pro Tempore as designated above, the Immediate Past Chair may preside or the quorum of members present shall elect a Chair Pro Tempore to preside for that meeting. The Secretary, with a quorum present, shall call the meeting to order and preside during such election of a Chair Pro Tempore; he or she shall immediately relinquish the chair upon completion of the election. Board Chair may appoint a voting member of the Board or committee in advance to act as acting chair of the body for that meeting.

Section 2

The Board may delegate authority to the Board Chair for action consistent with Board approved criteria on categories of items.

Section 3

Election of officers of the Board of Directors shall be held every two years during a regular meeting in or around December. A majority of the Board Members may approve variations to the schedule in this Section in the event of a vacancy or other exigency. The Chair and Vice Chair shall not be from the same subregion. Officers for the Board of Directors shall be elected in the following manner:

a. In or around July of an election year, application forms will be made available on the Board of Directors page of the SANDAG website for persons interested in applying for the Chair or Vice Chair position on the Board of Directors. Applications shall be structured to screen for the best regional leaders from among the primary members and shall include questions concerning the candidate’s vision statement for SANDAG and his/her qualifications. Applications shall be due within 30 days after the application forms are posted. Only candidates who submit an application by the deadline or who are primary members nominated from the floor on the day of election will be considered for office.

b. The Chair shall appoint up to a six-person nominating committee, who shall be members of the Board from each of the subregions. The nominating committee appointments shall be announced at a regular meeting in or around September of each year. The nominating committee shall not, however, include Board Members from Member Agencies that have applicants for the Chair or Vice Chair position on the Board of Directors.

c. If more than one candidate has applied for a particular office, the nominating committee shall interview the candidates. The nominating committee shall submit a slate of nominees for the two Board offices in writing for mailing to Board Members in or around November. Additional nominations for any office may be made by Board Members at the election meeting.
d. In the event that the nominating committee is unable to recommend any of the applicants for any or all chair positions, either because an applicant is or is reasonably expected to be unavailable to serve, or for any other reason, the nominating committee may recommend a supplemental process, subject to Board approval. The constraints set forth in the normal nomination process, apart from the prohibition of a jurisdiction of a candidate for office serving on the nominating committee, shall not be mandated to apply to the supplemental process.

e. In choosing the nominees from the Board Members, the nominating committee shall take into account the nominee’s availability, experience, skills, geographic diversity, and the benefits associated with having the Vice Chair succeed the outgoing Chair. The nominating committee also shall take into account the prohibition against both officers being from the same subregion in determining which nominees to present to the Board.

f. The officers shall be elected pursuant to the weighted vote process set forth in Article IV, Section 5(b) of these Bylaws.

g. All officers shall be elected for a term(s) of two years or until their successors are elected. They shall begin their term of office on January 1.

h. In the event that the Board Member who has been elected Chair or Vice Chair is no longer a primary member of the Board of Directors, the office shall be considered vacant.

i. Any vacated office of Chair or Vice Chair may be filled at the next regular Board meeting by nominations from the floor, and the election shall be carried out pursuant to the weighted vote process set forth in Article IV, Section 5(b) of these Bylaws. A member must be a primary member to be nominated from the floor.

Section 4

a. The Board of Directors shall appoint an Executive Director who shall hold office until he or she resigns or is removed by the Board of Directors. The Executive Director shall be the chief executive officer of SANDAG. The Executive Director shall have charge of all projects and property of SANDAG. The Executive Director and if she or he is an employee, the independent performance auditor, shall file with the Director of Finance of SANDAG an official bond in the minimum amount of $100,000 or such larger amount as the Board of Directors specifies, guaranteeing faithful performance of his or her duties.

b. The Executive Director will be responsible to the SANDAG Board of Directors as set out in Board Policies and administrative policies and manuals for the administration of SANDAG’s business, including: (1) development of program objectives, definition, directions and priorities; (2) management of SANDAG programs and coordination of staff and support services; (3) the development of financial support programs for SANDAG activities; (4) the recommendation and submission of an annual SANDAG program budget to the Board of Directors; (5) execution of the adopted personnel, purchasing, and budgetary systems; and (6) development of a recommended administrative policy that includes a process to conduct staff performance evaluations on a regular basis to determine if the knowledge, skills, and abilities of staff members are sufficient to perform their respective functions, and which is brought to the Board for review on an annual basis. The Executive Director shall perform such other and additional duties as is necessary to carry out the objectives and function of SANDAG and as directed by the Board of Directors.
c. Any additional staff support services provided by Member Agencies or others shall be coordinated by the Executive Director.

d. The Executive Director is hereby enabled to promulgate an employee manual, as well as all other administrative policies governing the administrative procedures of SANDAG.

ARTICLE VI

FINANCIAL

Section 1

The Board of Directors shall approve a preliminary budget no later than April 1 of each year. The Board of Directors shall adopt a final budget no later than June 30 of each year. A copy of the preliminary budget when approved and a copy of the final budget when adopted shall be filed with each Member Agency.

Section 2

Responsibility for supplying funds for that portion of the budget for SANDAG, which is to be supplied by the Member Agencies, as adopted by the Board of Directors, shall be divided among the Member Agencies based on their population with each Member Agency including within its budget as funds to be supplied to SANDAG that sum of money determined by taking the ratio its population bears to the total population of the region and multiplying it by that portion of the approved budget to be supplied by the Member Agencies. Payment of this determined sum of money shall be made by each Member Agency by July 15 of each year. If payment by a Member Agency has not been made by September 1 of each year, that Member Agency shall no longer vote as a member of the Board of Directors. A delinquent Member Agency will be allowed to vote when full payment has been made, including interest computed from July 15 at the established legal rate.

Section 3

The Director of Finance of SANDAG shall establish and maintain such funds and accounts as may be required by good accounting practice, state and federal law, and these Bylaws. The books and records of SANDAG in the hands of the Director of Finance shall be open to inspection at all reasonable times by representatives of the Member Agencies. The Director of Finance of SANDAG shall issue a Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) by December 31 after the close of each fiscal year and a copy shall be provided to each of the Member Agencies.

Section 4

The Director of Finance of SANDAG shall receive, have the custody of, and disburse SANDAG funds upon the warrant or check-warrant of the Finance Manager pursuant to the accounting procedures developed under Section 3 above, and shall make the disbursements required to carry out any of the provisions or purposes of SANDAG. The Director of Finance of SANDAG may invest SANDAG funds in accordance with state and federal law. All interest collected on SANDAG funds shall be accounted for and posted to the account of such funds.
Section 5

Delegation of authority from the Board of Directors for final financial/contracting approvals, including selection of vendors, acceptance of funding, stipulations of any nature, and any resulting budget amendment to serve as a limitation applicable to a particular job or program (not to be exceeded on a serial basis), shall be as follows:

a. Up to $100,000 to the Executive Director, subject to increase by Board action, or as may be modified in Board Policy No. 017 concerning delegation of authority to the Executive Director.

b. Up to $500,000 to the Executive Committee for any item, subject to increase by Board action.

c. Up to $500,000 to the Transportation Committee for transportation items, subject to increase by Board action.

d. Up to $500,000 to the Public Safety Committee for ARJIS and Criminal Justice Division items, subject to increase by Board action.

e. The Executive Director, Executive Committee, Public Safety Committee, and Transportation Committee shall report approvals under this section to the Board of Directors at least quarterly.

Section 6

The amount budgeted for Member Assessments related to Criminal Justice database access shall be as adopted by the Board of Directors, and divided among the Member Agencies using a formula based on population. Payment of this determined sum of money shall be made by each Member Agency by July 15 of each year. If payment by a Member Agency has not been made by September 1 of each year, that Member Agency shall no longer vote as a member of the Board of Directors. A delinquent Member Agency will be allowed to vote when full payment has been made, including interest computed from July 15 at the established legal rate.

ARTICLE VII

RELATIONSHIPS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

Section 1

The functions of the Board of Directors and Policy Advisory Committees shall be established by Board policy. The Board of Directors may delegate functions to the Policy Advisory Committees as it deems appropriate.

Section 2

The Board of Directors shall provide guidance to committees and working groups. The Board may advise Member Agencies on the coordination of general plans, or on the resolution of conflicts between the general plans of agencies in the San Diego region.

Section 3

Conflicts between governmental agencies should be resolved among the affected agencies. In matters affecting more than one local government, and where requested by the affected agencies, SANDAG
shall have the authority to hear and make recommendations if the conflicts are not resolved to the satisfaction of each affected agency. Regional plans should serve as the guideline for the resolution of conflicts.

Section 4

Each action taken by SANDAG that requires implementation should include designation of the agency or agencies directly responsible for such implementation.

Section 5

The general and specific references to the construction authority of SANDAG in SB 1703 shall be interpreted as applicable solely to its responsibilities for project development and construction of transit projects which were previously within the purview of the transit development boards and are consolidated under the authority of SANDAG.

ARTICLE VIII

INFORMATION AND EVALUATION

Section 1

a. SANDAG shall disseminate information concerning its work program and activities. The required information system should be organized and categorized so that it will continue to allow full and efficient use of information by the public and private sectors.

b. Adequate provision for public participation shall be provided as required by law and as directed by the Board of Directors.

c. The Board shall perform an annual evaluation of SANDAG’s goals, purpose, structure, and performance, directed toward continually improving the planning, coordination, and implementation process.

ARTICLE IX

AMENDMENTS

Section 1

The Board of Directors shall be responsible for making all amendments to these Bylaws.

a. Proposed amendments may be originated by the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee, or any member of the Board of Directors.

b. Prior to being taken to the Board of Directors for approval, proposed amendments should be taken to the Executive Committee preliminarily for review and discussion and then brought to the Executive Committee at a subsequent meeting for a recommendation for approval to the Board.

c. A copy of any proposed amendments shall be forwarded by the Clerk of the Board to the official representative of each Member Agency, his or her alternate and the Member Agency itself, at the same time as the proposed amendments are mailed as a report attachment to the agenda for the preliminary Executive Committee meeting referred to in subsection b of this section.
d. Amendments to these Bylaws (except those provisions mandated by state law) shall require the
vote of a majority of the Member Agencies using the voting process described in Article IV,
Section 5(a) of these Bylaws.

Adopted July 2003 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Revised November 2003 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended November 2004 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended January 2006 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended July 2007 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended December 2008 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended January 2010 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended March 2014 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended November 2014 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended December 2015 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended January 2017 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended February 2018 by the SANDAG Board of Directors
Amended _____________ by the SANDAG Board of Directors
ALLOCATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Board and Policy Advisory Committees Responsibilities

Shown below are responsibilities for the Board of Directors and each of the six Policy Advisory Committees (Executive, Transportation, Regional Planning, Borders, Public Safety, and Audit). Selected responsibilities are delegated by the Board to the Policy Advisory Committees to allow SANDAG to effectively address key public policy and funding responsibilities. All items delegated to the Policy Advisory Committees are subject to Board ratification.

All functions not specifically delegated by the Board to a Policy Advisory Committee may be delegated to a Policy Advisory Committee on a one-time basis upon request by the Executive Director and approval by the Chair. Such actions shall be reported to the Board at its next regular meeting.

2. Board Responsibilities

2.1 Approve the Regional Plan, which merges the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), the Regional Transportation Plan, and the Sustainable Communities Strategy as well as plan components and other regional plans (e.g., Regional Energy Plan, MHCP, etc.)

2.2 Approve Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and corridor studies

2.3 Fulfill responsibilities of the consolidated agency as set forth in the San Diego Regional Transportation Consolidation Act (Public Utilities Code §132350 et seq.)

2.4 Fulfill the responsibilities of the San Diego Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

2.5 Approve programming of funds (TDA, CMAQ, STIP, etc.)

2.6 Certify/adopt project environmental documents pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act or the California Environmental Quality Act

2.7 Approve Overall Work Program and Program Budget

2.8 Approve amendments to the Program Budget and Overall Work Program and authorize contracts with consultants for amounts equal to or greater than the amounts to be determined for administrative and policy committee authorization.

2.9 Approve the annual legislative agenda

2.10 Provide policy direction through Policy Development Board meetings

2.11 Appoint Committees and Board officers
2.12 Delegate responsibilities to Policy Advisory Committees and ratify Committee actions. All items delegated to the five Policy Advisory Committees are subject to direct Board action upon request of any members.

2.13 Delegate responsibilities to Board Chair consistent with Board criteria. Conference sponsorships and proclamations are hereby delegated subject to current or subsequently approved criteria.

2.14 Develop and adopt an administration policy that includes a process to conduct staff performance evaluations on a regular basis to determine if the knowledge, skills, and abilities of staff members are sufficient to perform their respective functions, and monitor the evaluation process on a regular basis.

2.15 Provide a report, developed by the Transportation Committee, to the Legislature consistent with Government Code section 9795 on or before July 1 of each year that outlines the public transit needs, transit funding criteria, recommended transit funding levels, and additional work on public transit, as delegated to the Transportation Committee by the Board, and specifying the funds spent explicitly on public transportation.

2.16 Develop and adopt internal control guidelines based on recommendations from the Audit Committee to prevent and detect financial errors and fraud based on the internal control guidelines developed by the state Controller pursuant to Government Code section 12422.5 and the standards adopted by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

2.17 Vote on whether to remove the independent performance auditor for cause, such removal being subject to an approving vote by two-thirds of the Audit Committee and the Board.

2.18 Approve which firm to contract with to conduct the annual financial statement audits.

2.19 Approve the individual or firm to hire to carry out independent performance auditor responsibilities.

2.20 Approve the budget needed to carry out the annual audit plan of the independent performance auditor.

3. Executive Committee Membership and Responsibilities

3.1 The Executive Committee shall consist of six voting members with board members representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South County, and the representative, or the representative’s alternate in their absence, from the City of San Diego and the County. The Chair and Vice Chair of the Board shall serve as voting members of the Executive Committee. Additionally, any Chair of any other Policy Advisory Committee who is not otherwise a member of the Executive Committee shall serve as an advisory, non-voting member of the Executive Committee.
3.1.1 Set agenda for Board. Any Board member requesting that an item be considered for inclusion on the agenda must present such request in writing to the Chairperson prior to the Executive Committee’s consideration of such agenda.

3.1.2 Review and recommend Overall Work Program and Program Budget

3.1.3 Approve amendments to the Program Budget and Overall Work Program and authorize contracts up to amount approved by the Board

3.1.4 Review and act on state and federal legislation

3.1.5 Comment on behalf of SANDAG or provide recommendations to the Board regarding comments on third party environmental documents

3.1.6 Act upon and evaluate dispute resolution

3.1.7 Advise on personnel actions

3.1.8 Act on behalf of Board when timing requires

3.1.9 Make policy recommendations to the Board

3.1.10 Perform other duties as assigned by the Board

3.1.11 Approve financial/contracting transactions, including selection of vendors, acceptance of funding, stipulations of any nature, and any resulting budget amendment up to $500,000, subject to increase by Board action.

3.1.12 Annually review a list of all the SANDAG lower-level committees and working groups to determine the need to maintain the committee or working group and approve any revisions in functions or membership.

3.1.13 Review all proposed amendments to the Bylaws or Board Policies and make recommendations to the Board regarding those amendments.

3.1.14 Conduct expedited reviews and approvals of Energy Working Group actions on an as-needed basis.

4. Transportation Committee Membership and Responsibilities

4.1 The Transportation Committee shall consist of ten voting members with board members or alternates representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South County and the mayor or a council member from the City of San Diego, a supervisor from the County of San Diego, a member of the board of the MTS appointed by the board of the MTS, a member of the board of the NCTD appointed by the board of the NCTD, a member of the board of the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority appointed by the board of the Airport Authority, and a member of the board of the San Diego Unified Port District appointed by the board of the Port District.
4.1.1 Provide oversight for consolidated transit responsibilities

4.1.2 Provide policy oversight for transportation plans and corridor and systems studies

4.1.3 Establish/approve transportation prioritization criteria for SANDAG programs.

4.1.4 Approve of SANDAG submitting grant applications for SANDAG transportation projects.

4.1.5 Approve TDA and STA claim amendments and RTIP and STIP amendments

4.1.6 Recommend funding allocations to the Board

4.1.7 Approve transit operator budgets for funding

4.1.8 Approve Regional Short Range Transit Plan and Coordinated Human Service and Public Transportation Plan

4.1.9 Make recommendations regarding changes to Board Policy No. 018: Transit Service Policy and Board Policy No. 029: Regional Fare Policy and Comprehensive Fare Ordinance

4.1.10 Conduct public hearings as delegated by Board

4.1.11 Approve contracts for transit up to amount approved by the Board

4.1.12 Advise Board on other transportation policy-level issues

4.1.13 Recommend legislative program for transportation and transit

4.1.14 Approve financial/contracting transactions, including selection of vendors, acceptance of funding, stipulations of any nature, and any resulting budget amendment up to $500,000 for transportation items, subject to increase by Board action

4.1.15 Convene closed sessions and make final decisions with regard to real property transactions related to transportation projects; however, this delegation does not include the authority to make a Resolution of Necessity or to commence litigation

4.1.16 Conduct hearings and authorize additional public meetings when appropriate pursuant to Board Policy No. 025 to hear official testimony from the public regarding Comprehensive Fare Ordinance amendments

4.1.17 Approve amendments to the Comprehensive Fare Ordinance

4.1.18 Accept for distribution, hold public hearings regarding, and adopt/certify environmental documents where items can be approved through actions of
4.1.19 Approve loans of TransNet funds when such loans are incorporated into an RTIP amendment requiring an exchange of TransNet funds for funds from another source.

4.1.20 Provide oversight and approvals for Coordinated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) matters and appoint Transportation Committee representative to the CTSA Board.

4.1.21 Approve revisions to funding allocations for Federal Transit Administration Section 5311 funding.

4.1.22 Approve the TransNet compliance audits consistent with Board Policy No. 031: TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules.

4.1.23 Provide input on project selection criteria for, and recommend projects for funding under, the statewide and TransNet active transportation programs, and other TransNet grant programs such as the Smart Growth Incentive Program and Environmental Mitigation Program.

4.1.24 Provide oversight for Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies responsibilities and related motorist aid programs.

4.1.25 Provide coordinated oversight with the Regional Planning Committee for recommendations on the preparation and implementation of components of the Regional Plan.

4.1.26 Develop a report by July 1 of each year that specifies the funds spent explicitly on public transportation, outlines the public transit needs, transit funding criteria, recommended transit funding levels, and additional work on public transit, and recommend acceptance of such report to the Board.

5. Regional Planning Committee Membership and Responsibilities

5.1 The Regional Planning Committee shall consist of six voting members with board members or alternates representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South County, and the mayor or a council member from the City of San Diego, and a supervisor from the County of San Diego.

5.1.1 Provide coordinated oversight with the Transportation Committee for recommendations on the preparation and implementation of components of the Regional Plan.

5.1.2 Recommend regional infrastructure financing strategies to the Board.

5.1.3 Represent the Board for outreach and public information on the Regional Plan and its components.
5.1.4 Advise Board on regional planning policy issues

5.1.5 Approve distribution of funds from the California Coastal Commission Beach Sand Mitigation Fund and California Coastal Commission Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund.

5.1.6 Recommend project selection criteria for, and recommend projects for funding under, the *TransNet* Smart Growth Incentive Program and Environmental Mitigation Program

6. **Borders Committee Membership and Responsibilities**

6.1 The Borders Committee shall consist of seven voting members with board members or alternates representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South County and the mayor or a council member from the City of San Diego, a supervisor from the County of San Diego, and a mayor, council member, or supervisor from the County of Imperial.

6.1.1 Provide oversight for planning activities that impact the borders

6.1.2 Provide oversight for the preparation of binational, interregional, and tribal planning programs

6.1.3 Recommend border infrastructure financing strategies to the Board

6.1.4 Establish closer SANDAG working relations with surrounding counties, Mexico, and the region’s tribal nations

6.1.5 Advise Board on binational, interregional, and tribal policy-level issues

6.1.6 Review and comment on regionally significant projects in adjoining counties

7. **Audit Committee Membership and Responsibilities**

The membership, authority and responsibilities for this committee are set forth in Board Policy No. 039.

8. **Public Safety Committee Membership and Responsibilities**

The membership, authority and responsibilities for this committee are set forth in Board Policy No. 026.
9. **Distribution of Meeting Materials**

9.1 All agendas for meetings of the Board of Directors, Policy Advisory Committees, and all other SANDAG legislative bodies covered by the Brown Act (Government Code § 54950 et seq.) shall be posted on the SANDAG Web site and copies of such agendas will be available for viewing by the public in the SANDAG business office reception area.

9.2 All closed session items shall be provided to appropriate Board and/or Policy Advisory Committee members prior to the closed session. Closed session meeting materials will be sent by a secure method and clearly labeled as confidential. If a representative will not be able to attend a meeting he/she should ensure the closed session materials are forwarded to the appropriate alternate to review prior to the meeting. All closed session meeting materials must be deleted or returned to the Office of General Counsel at the end of the closed session.

10. **Work Assigned to Staff**

Requests for staff to perform work on a project that is not specified in the Overall Work Program or Program Budget shall only be conducted following approval by the Board if the work is estimated to exceed four hours of staff time.
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Policies Advisory Committee Membership

1. Membership

1.1 Executive Committee: Six members to include a Board member from each subregion (South County, East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, City of San Diego, County of San Diego).

1.1.1 Alternates may be the second City of San Diego Board member or alternate, the second County of San Diego Board member or alternate, and alternates elected from each subregion who shall be primary members of the Board.

1.1.2 Any Chair of any other Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) who is not otherwise a member of the Executive Committee shall serve as an advisory, non-voting member of the Executive Committee.

1.2 Transportation Committee: Ten members to include a Board member or alternate from each subregion, and a member of NCTD, MTS, the Airport Authority and San Diego Unified Port District appointed by the governing body of those agencies. There may be ten alternates chosen in the same manner.

1.3 Regional Planning Committee: Six members to include a Board member or alternate from each subregion. There may be six alternates chosen in the same manner.

1.4 Borders Committee: Seven members to include, a Board member or alternate from each subregion, and a mayor, councilmember, or supervisor from the County of Imperial. There may be seven alternates chosen in the same manner.

1.5 Audit Committee: Five voting members appointed by the Board of Directors. Two of the members shall be board members or alternates and three shall be members of the public. There may be alternates chosen as described in Board Policy No. 039: Audit Policy Advisory Committee and Audit Activities.

1.6 Public Safety Committee: Six members to include a Board member or alternate from each subregion. The six Associate Member organizations taking part in this committee shall have the following representation: two members from the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee, a member selected by the County Sheriff, a member representing the San Diego County District Attorney’s Office, a member from regional Fire/Emergency Medical Services, and a member representing the City of San Diego Police Chief. In addition, there will be eight nonvoting Advisory Members selected as follows: two persons selected by the Federal Justice Agency Association, one person selected from San Diego County Criminal Justice Association, a member of the Regional Homeland Security Committee, a member selected by the State Public Safety Agency Association, one person selected by the Department of
Defense, and one representative of the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association. There may be alternates chosen in the same manner.

2. Limitation on Committee Memberships

No Board member or alternate may serve as the primary member of more than two PACs at any one time, except those Board members serving on the Audit Committee. Committee membership may be expanded by the Board.

3. Ex Officio Members

A PAC may include ex officio members if appropriate to roles and responsibilities of the committee. The Board Chair and Vice Chair may serve as ex officio members on any of the PACs. Unless otherwise stated in a Board Policy or Board action applicable to a particular committee, all ex officio members on SANDAG’s Board or committees shall be nonvoting members.

4. Appointments for PACs Other Than the Audit Committee

4.1 Public Agencies

4.1.1 The mayor and council of the City of San Diego and the governing body of each of the other member agencies will make their appointments to the Board annually by January 10, and when vacancies occur. Each member agency shall confirm the appointment of its primary and alternate Board members by sending a written letter to the SANDAG Clerk of the Board. All such appointments shall go into effect immediately following approval by the member agency’s governing body.

4.1.2 The SANDAG Chair will provide notice requesting that Board members from each of the subregions appoint a Board member or alternate as authorized to serve as a primary member on each PAC and one to serve as an alternate to each PAC. At the time this notice is given, all primary and alternate Board members will be provided with an attendance record for all primary and alternate members currently serving on the Board or a PAC. Each subregion shall ensure that SANDAG staff is notified of the date, time and location for that subregion’s meeting. After the meeting is set by the primary members of each subregion, SANDAG staff shall provide Board alternates from each subregion advance notice of the meeting. A majority of the primary members present at the subregion meeting shall make a selection. An alternate member may vote in the absence of the primary member. The Chair shall be sent a letter from the subregion’s representatives informing him/her of the names of the persons who have been selected for appointment to each PAC. Appointments will be made by January 31 or as vacancies occur. Appointments shall go into effect immediately upon approval by the subregion.
4.2  Associate Members

In addition to the members appointed pursuant to Section 4.1, the Public Safety Committee shall have voting members appointed from the organizations listed below by their respective appointing authorities by January 31 of each year:

4.2.1 Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee – 2 voting members

4.2.2 County Sheriff – 1 voting member

4.2.3 San Diego County District Attorney’s Office – 1 voting member

4.2.4 Regional Fire/Emergency Medical Services – 1 voting member

4.2.5 City of San Diego Police Chief – 1 voting member

4.3  Advisory Members

In addition to the voting members appointed pursuant to Sections 4.1 and 4.2, the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee shall have the following nonvoting members appointed from the following organizations by their respective appointing authorities by January 31 of each year:

4.3.1 County Criminal Justice Association – 1 advisory member

4.3.2 Federal Justice Agency Association – 2 advisory members

4.3.3 Regional Homeland Security Committee – 1 advisory member

4.3.4 State Public Safety Agency Association – 1 advisory member

4.3.5 Regional Transit Services – 1 advisory member

4.3.6 Department of Defense – 1 advisory member

4.3.7 Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association – 1 advisory member.

4.4  Failure to Appoint

If any subregion fails to make an annual appointment to a PAC by January 31 or within three weeks of mailing of the notice to proceed to appoint to fill a vacancy, the Chair of SANDAG shall make the appointment. If any organization referred to in Sections 4.1, 4.2 or 4.3 fails to make an appointment to the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee, the current representative shall continue to serve until a replacement appointment is made by his/her organization.

5.  Vacancies

Vacancies on PACs shall be filled as they occur in the same manner as appointments.
6. Chair/Vice Chair

The Chair and Vice Chair of the PACs, other than the Executive Committee and Audit Committee, shall be appointed by the Board Chair in February or as vacancies occur. The officers of the PACs (except for the Executive Committee, whose officers are dictated by the Bylaws, and the Audit Committee, whose officers are dictated in Board Policy No. 039) can be primary or alternate members of the Board, but must be primary members of the PAC they will chair. The appointments shall go into effect immediately unless otherwise directed by the Board Chair. The Board Chair and Vice Chair shall serve as the Chair and Vice Chair of the Executive Committee. The Vice Chair conducts the meetings in the absence of the Chair. In the event of the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair for the Executive Committee, a Chair of a PAC shall serve as Chair Pro Tempore and perform the duties of the Chair according to the following schedule: first quarter of calendar year – Chair of Borders Committee; second quarter of calendar year – Chair of Public Safety Committee; third quarter of calendar year – Chair of Regional Planning Committee; fourth quarter of calendar year – Chair of Transportation Committee. In the event of the absence of both the Chair and Vice Chair for any other PAC or other standing committee, the Immediate Past Chair may preside or the quorum of members present shall elect a chairperson pro tempore to preside for that meeting. The Executive Director or a Chief Deputy Executive Director, with a quorum present, shall call the meeting to order and preside during such election of chairperson pro tempore; he/she shall immediately relinquish the chair upon completion of the election.

7. Attendance

7.1 Primary and alternate members are strongly encouraged to attend all Committee meetings. Roll call shall be taken by the Chair at the beginning of the meeting to determine the voting members present at that time. The voting members shall be seated collectively in order for the public to recognize them as such. Other nonvoting alternates in attendance may participate in Committee discussion but shall not be authorized to act on any item.

7.2 Board alternates selected to chair a Policy Advisory Committee are strongly encouraged to attend all Board meetings to represent their committee and provide information to the Board concerning actions taken at the committee meetings.

7.3 If an organization with voting rights or a subregion is unrepresented at three Committee meetings during the term described in Section 4 of this Policy, a letter will be sent to the applicable appointing body or group, as well as to the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee concerning the absences.

7.4 In order to ensure a quorum, full participation, fairness, and comprehensive knowledge of the items discussed at SANDAG meetings, members who are eligible for compensation for attendance at a SANDAG meeting must be present for at least 1/2 of the time set for the meeting or the duration of the meeting, whichever is less, in order to be eligible for compensation in accordance with Article III, Section 5 of the Bylaws.

8. Compensation

Primary and alternate members of the PACs will be compensated $100 per meeting attended subject to the limitations on number of meetings per month set forth in the SANDAG Bylaws.
9. Meetings

PAC meetings should normally be held on Fridays or when called by the committee Chair. Parliamentary procedure at all meetings shall be governed by Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised.
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INVESTMENT POLICY

1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to identify various policies and procedures that enhance opportunities for a prudent and systematic investment policy, and to organize and formalize investment-related activities.

The investment policies and practices of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are based upon state law and prudent money management. All funds will be invested in accordance with the SANDAG Investment Policy and the California Government Code. The investment of bond proceeds will be further governed by the provisions of relevant bond documents.

2. Scope

It is intended that this policy cover all funds and investment activities, with the exception of bond proceeds, under the direction or care of SANDAG, including funds of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, SourcePoint, the SANDAG chartered nonprofit corporation, and the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS). Investment of bond proceeds shall be subject to the conditions and restrictions of bond documents and Treasury regulations related to arbitrage restrictions on tax-exempt bonds.

3. Prudence

All persons authorized to make investment decisions on behalf of SANDAG are trustees and therefore fiduciaries subject to the prudent investor standard: “When investing, reinvesting, purchasing, acquiring, exchanging, selling, or managing public funds, a trustee shall act with care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing, including, but not limited to, the general economic conditions and the anticipated needs of the agency, that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiarity with those matters would use in the conduct of funds of a like character and with like aims, to safeguard the principal and maintain the liquidity needs of the agency.”

Investment officers acting in accordance with written procedures and the investment policy and exercising due diligence shall be relieved of personal responsibility for an individual security’s credit risk or market price changes, provided deviations from expectations are reported in a timely fashion and appropriate action is taken to control adverse developments.
4. **Objectives**

4.1 *Safety.* Safety of principal is the foremost objective of the investment program. Investments of SANDAG shall be undertaken in a manner that seeks to ensure preservation of capital in the portfolio.

4.2 *Liquidity.* The investment portfolio of SANDAG will remain sufficiently liquid to enable SANDAG to meet its cash flow requirements.

4.3 *Return on Investment.* The investment portfolio of SANDAG shall be designed with the objective of attaining a market rate of return on its investments consistent with the constraints imposed by its safety objective and cash flow considerations.

5. **Delegation of Authority**

5.1 The Board of Directors delegates the authority to invest or to reinvest funds, or to sell or exchange securities so purchased, to the Executive Director for a one-year period. The Executive Director is charged with the responsibility for carrying out the policies of the Board of Directors and shall assume full responsibility for investment transactions until the delegation of authority is revoked or expires. In accordance with the SANDAG established system for internal control, all financial transactions of SANDAG require the signature of at least two individuals authorized by the Executive Director.

5.2 For the purposes of carrying out this investment policy, any two of the following individuals, unless delegated per Section 5.5, are hereby authorized to make investment decisions, in strict accordance with this investment policy, on behalf of SANDAG:

- Executive Director
- Chief Deputy Executive Director
- Director of Finance
- Finance Manager
- TransNet Department Director
- Such other individuals authorized, in writing, by the Executive Director

5.3 All accounts established for the purpose of investing SANDAG funds shall require the written authorization of the Executive Director.

5.4 No single individual, acting alone, may engage in an investment activity, except for an authorized investment advisor/manager with discretionary authority delegated per Section 5.5.

5.5 The Executive Director may delegate investment management and decision authority, via written agreement, to one or more professional investment advisors/managers who are duly qualified and registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the
Investment Advisers Act of 1940. All agents engaged in this capacity shall make all investment decisions and transactions in strict accordance with state law and this investment policy.

5.6. The daily management responsibility for the investment program is assigned to the Director of Finance, who shall monitor and review all investments for consistency with this investment policy.

6. Ethics (Conflict of Interest)

Officers, employees and agents thereof involved in the investment process shall comply with state law and refrain from personal business activities that could conflict with proper execution of the investment program, or which could impair their ability to make impartial decisions.

7. Selection of Financial Institutions and Broker/Dealers

7.1. SANDAG shall transact business only with banks, savings and loan associations, and registered investment securities dealers. The purchase by SANDAG of any investment other than those purchased directly from the issuer shall be either from an institution licensed by the State as a broker/dealer, as defined in Section 25004 of the Corporation Code, who is a member of the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, or a member of a federally regulated securities exchange, a National or State-Chartered Bank, a Federal or State Association (as defined by Section 5102 of the Financial Code), or a brokerage firm designated as a Primary Government Dealer by the Federal Reserve Bank. The Director of Finance shall investigate all institutions that wish to do business with SANDAG, in order to determine if they are adequately capitalized, make markets in securities appropriate to the needs of SANDAG, and agree to abide by the conditions set forth in the SANDAG Investment Policy.

7.2. The Director of Finance shall maintain a list of authorized broker/dealers and financial institutions which are approved for investment purposes, and it shall be the policy of SANDAG to purchase securities only from those authorized institutions and firms. If SANDAG has contracted investment advisors/managers, the Director of Finance may approve and use a list of authorized broker/dealers provided by the investment advisor/manager.

8. Permitted Investment Instruments

8.1. The portfolio shall be diversified by security type and institution to avoid incurring unreasonable and avoidable risks regarding specific security types or individual financial institutions. Government Code §53601 states that when there is a percentage limitation for a particular category of investment, that percentage is applicable only at the date of purchase. Credit requirements listed in the investment policy apply at the time of purchase. In the event a security held by SANDAG is subject to a credit rating change that brings it below the minimum credit ratings specified for purchase, the Director of Finance shall review the security. The course of action to be followed will then be decided by the Director of Finance and either the Executive Director or the Chief Deputy Executive Director on a case-by-case basis, considering such factors as the reason for the change,
prognosis for recovery or further rate drops, and the market price of the security. Any credit rating changes below the minimum credit ratings specified for purchase will be reported to the Board of Directors with the next Quarterly Investment Report, along with the findings and any actions taken.

8.2. **Treasury Obligations:** notes, bonds, bills, or certificates of indebtedness, or those for which the full faith and credit of the United States are pledged for the payment of principal and interest.

8.3. **Federal Agencies and U.S. Government Sponsored Enterprises:** Federal agency or United States government-sponsored enterprise obligations, participations, or other instruments, including those issued by or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by federal agencies or United States government-sponsored enterprises.

8.4. **State Municipal Obligations:** Registered treasury notes or bonds of any of the 50 United States, including bonds payable solely out of revenues from a revenue-producing property owned, controlled, or operated by a state or by a department, board, agency or authority of any of the states. Such obligations must be rated A-1 or its equivalent or better short-term; or in a rating category of AA or its equivalent or better long-term by at least one of the nationally recognized statistical-rating organizations.

8.5. **Local Agency Obligations:** Bonds, notes, warrants, or other evidences of indebtedness issued by any local agency within the State, including bonds payable solely out of the revenues from a revenue-producing property owned, controlled, or operated by the local agency, or by a department, board, agency, or authority of the local agency. Such obligations must be rated A-1 or its equivalent or better short-term; or in a rating category of AA or its equivalent or better long-term by one of the nationally recognized statistical-rating organizations.

8.6. **Repurchase Agreements:** Repurchase Agreements used solely as short-term investments not to exceed 90 days.

8.6.1 The following collateral restrictions will be observed: Only U.S. Treasury securities or Federal Agency securities will be acceptable collateral. All securities underlying Repurchase Agreements must be delivered to SANDAG’s custodian bank or handled under a properly executed tri-party repurchase agreement. The total of all collateral for each Repurchase Agreement must equal or exceed, on the basis of market value plus accrued interest, 102 percent of the total dollar value of the money invested by SANDAG for the term of the investment. Since the market value of the underlying securities is subject to daily fluctuation, the investments in repurchase agreements shall be in compliance if the value of the underlying securities is brought back up to 102 percent no later than the next business day.

8.6.2 Market value must be calculated each time there is a substitution of collateral.

8.6.3 SANDAG or its trustee shall have a perfected first security interest under the Uniform Commercial Code in all securities subject to Repurchase Agreement.
8.6.4 SANDAG may enter into Repurchase Agreements with (1) primary dealers in U.S. Government securities who are eligible to transact business with, and who report to, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and (2) California and non-California banking institutions having assets in excess of $1 billion and in the highest short-term rating category, as provided by one of the nationally recognized statistical-rating organizations.

8.6.5 SANDAG will have properly executed a Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (SIFMA) agreement with each firm with which it enters into Repurchase Agreements.

8.7. **Bankers’ Acceptances:** Bankers’ Acceptances issued by domestic banks or domestic branches of foreign banks, which are eligible for purchase by the Federal Reserve System, the short-term paper of which is rated in the highest rating category by one of the nationally recognized statistical-rating organizations. Purchases of Bankers’ Acceptances may not exceed 180 days maturity or 40 percent of SANDAG surplus money. No more than 10 percent of SANDAG surplus funds may be invested in the Bankers’ Acceptances of any one commercial bank.

8.8. **Commercial Paper:** Commercial paper of “prime” quality of the highest ranking or of the highest letter and number rating as provided for by a nationally recognized statistical-rating organization. The entity that issues the commercial paper shall meet all of the following conditions in either paragraph (a) or paragraph (b):

a) The entity meets the following criteria: (i) Is organized and operating in the United States as a general corporation. (ii) Has total assets in excess of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000). (iii) Has debt other than commercial paper, if any, that is rated in a rating category of “A” or its equivalent or higher by a nationally recognized statistical-rating organization.

b) The entity meets the following criteria: (i) is organized within the United States as a special purpose corporation, trust, or limited liability company. (ii) Has program wide credit enhancements including, but not limited to, over collateralization, letters of credit, or surety bond. (iii) Has commercial paper that is rated “A-1” or higher, or the equivalent, by a nationally recognized statistical-rating organization.

Purchases of eligible commercial paper may not exceed 270 days maturity nor represent more than 10 percent of the outstanding paper of an issuing corporation. No more than 10 percent of SANDAG surplus funds may be invested in Commercial Paper of any one U.S. corporation.

Purchases of commercial paper may not exceed 25 percent of SANDAG surplus money which may be invested.

8.9. **Medium-Term Notes:** Medium-term notes, defined as all corporate and depository institution securities with a maximum remaining maturity of five years or less, issued by corporations organized and operating within the United States or depository institutions licensed by the United States or any state and operating within the United States.
Medium-term notes shall be rated in a rating category of “A” or its equivalent or better by a nationally recognized statistical-rating organization.

Purchase of medium-term corporate notes may not exceed 30 percent of SANDAG surplus money. No more than 10 percent of SANDAG surplus funds may be invested in the Medium-Term Notes of any one corporation.

8.10. **Certificates of Deposit**: The maximum term for certificates of deposit shall be five years. The combined amount invested in negotiable certificates of deposit and certificates of deposit shall not exceed 30 percent of SANDAG surplus money.

8.10.1 **Negotiable Certificates of Deposit**: Negotiable certificates of deposit issued by a nationally or state-chartered bank or a state or federal savings and loan association or by a state-licensed branch of a foreign bank or by a federally licensed branch of a foreign bank; provided that the senior debt obligations of the issuing institution are rated in a rating category of “A” or its equivalent or better by one of the nationally recognized statistical-rating organizations.

8.10.2 **Nonnegotiable Certificates of Deposit**: Nonnegotiable certificates of deposit shall meet the conditions in either paragraph (a) or paragraph (b):

(a) Certificates of deposit shall meet the requirements for deposit under Government Code Section 53635 et. seq. To be eligible to receive SANDAG deposits, the financial institution must have received a minimum overall satisfactory rating for meeting the credit needs of California Communities in its most recent evaluation, as provided in Government Code Section 53635.2. Deposits are required to be collateralized as specified under Government Code Section 53630 et. seq. The Director of Finance, at his or her discretion, may waive the collateralization requirements for any portion that is covered by federal deposit insurance. SANDAG shall have a signed agreement with the depository per Government Code Section 53649.

(b) Certificates of deposit placed through a deposit placement service shall meet the requirements of Government Code Section 53601.8. The full amount of the principal and the interest that may be accrued during the maximum term of each certificate of deposit shall at all times be insured by federal deposit insurance.

8.11. **State of California’s Local Agency Investment Fund**: State of California’s Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) may be invested in for the benefit of local agencies up to the current limit set by LAIF for regular accounts. For ongoing due diligence, the Director of Finance shall maintain on file a copy of LAIF’s current investment policy and its requirements for participation, including limitations on deposits or withdrawals.

8.12. **San Diego County Treasurer’s Pooled Investment Fund**: Deposits in the County pooled investment fund shall be limited to the dollar maximums of the State LAIF. For ongoing due diligence, the Director of Finance shall maintain on file a copy of the County
pool's current investment policy and its requirements for participation, including limitations on deposits or withdrawals.

8.13. **Savings/Money Market Accounts:** Savings/Money Market Accounts deposits placed with commercial banks and savings and loans in California. The amount on deposit shall not exceed the shareholder’s equity in the financial institution. To be eligible to receive SANDAG deposits, the financial institution must have received a minimum overall satisfactory rating for meeting the credit needs of California Communities in its most recent evaluation, as provided in Government Code Section 53635.2. Deposits are required to be collateralized as specified under Government Code Section 53630 et. seq. The Director of Finance, at his or her discretion, may waive the collateralization requirements for any portion that is covered by federal insurance. SANDAG shall have a signed agreement with the depository per Government Code Section 53649.

8.14. **California Asset Management Program:** Shares in a portfolio of the California Asset Management Program, so long as the portfolio is rated among the top two rating categories by one of the nationally recognized statistical-rating organizations. For ongoing due diligence, the Director of Finance shall maintain on file a copy of the Program’s current information statement to include its requirements for participation, including limitations on deposits or withdrawals.

8.15. **Money Market Funds:** Shares of beneficial interest issued by diversified management companies that are money market funds registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. Sec. 80a-1 et seq.). To be eligible for investment pursuant to this subdivision, these companies shall either: (1) attain the highest ranking letter or numerical rating provided by not less than two of the three largest nationally-recognized statistical-rating organizations, or (2) have an investment advisor registered or exempt from registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission with not less than five years experience managing money market mutual funds with assets under management in excess of $500,000,000.

The purchase price of shares shall not include any commission that the companies may charge. The purchase of shares may not exceed 20 percent of SANDAG surplus money. For ongoing due diligence, the Director of Finance shall maintain on file a copy of the money market fund’s current information statement to include its requirements for participation, including limitations on deposits or withdrawals.

8.16. **Mortgage and Asset-Backed Obligations:** Any mortgage pass-through security collateralized mortgage obligation, mortgage-backed or other pay-through bond, equipment lease-backed certificate, consumer receivable-pass-through certificate, or consumer receivable-backed bond of a maximum of five years maturity. Securities eligible for investment under this subdivision shall be issued by an issuer rated in a rating category of “A” or its equivalent or higher rating for the issuer’s debt as provided by an NRSRO and rated in a rating category of “AA” or its equivalent or better by an NRSRO. Purchases of securities authorized by this section may not exceed 20 percent of SANDAG surplus funds that may be invested pursuant to this section.
8.17. **Supranationals**: United States dollar denominated senior unsecured unsubordinated obligations issued or unconditionally guaranteed by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Finance Corporation, or Inter-American Development Bank, with a maximum remaining maturity of five years or less, and eligible for purchase and sale within the United States. Investments under this subdivision shall be rated in a rating category of “AA” or its equivalent or better by an NRSRO and shall not exceed 30 percent of the SANDAG funds that may be invested pursuant to this section.

8.18. **Ineligible Investments**: Security types which are thereby prohibited include, but are not restricted to:

(a) Reverse repurchase agreements.

(b) “Complex” derivative securities such as range notes, dual index notes, inverse floating-rate notes, leveraged or deleveraged floating-rate notes, or any other complex variable-rate or structured note.

(c) Interest-only strips that are derived from a pool of mortgages, or any security that could result in zero interest accrual if held to maturity.

(d) Securities lending.

In the event that SANDAG possesses ineligible investments purchased prior to the adoption of this policy, SANDAG may hold these investments to their maturity dates. The limitation in this section shall not apply to SANDAG investments in shares of beneficial interest issued by diversified management companies registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940.

9. **Maximum Maturity**

9.1. Investment maturities shall be based upon a review of cash flow forecasts. Maturities will be scheduled so as to permit SANDAG to meet all projected obligations.

9.2. Where the investment policy does not specify a maximum remaining maturity at the time of the investment, no investment shall be made in any security, other than a security underlying a repurchase agreement, that at the time of the investment has a term remaining to maturity in excess of five years, unless the Board has granted express authority to make that investment either specifically or as a part of an investment program approved by the Board no less than three months prior to the investment. The Board authorizes the investment of endowment funds in securities exceeding five (5) years, as long as the investment has been approved by the Director of Finance and either the Executive Director or the Chief Deputy Executive Director, and the maturity of such investments does not exceed the expected use of funds.

10. **Performance Standards**

The investment performance of the SANDAG portfolio shall be evaluated and compared to appropriate indices in order to assess the success of the investment program. The comparable
benchmarks should be consistent with the SANDAG portfolio in terms of maturity and composition, which includes credit quality and security type.

11. Reporting Requirements

11.1. The Director of Finance shall submit to the Board annually a statement of investment policy, which the Board shall consider at a public meeting.

11.2. A monthly report of all investment transactions shall be submitted to the Board Members.

11.3. A quarterly investment report shall be submitted to the Board Members. The reports should include information in accordance with Section 53646(b) of the California Government Code.

12. Safekeeping and Custody

12.1. All security transactions, including collateral for repurchase agreements, entered into by SANDAG shall be conducted on a delivery-versus-payment (DVP) basis. Securities shall be held by a third-party custodian and evidenced by safekeeping receipts.

12.2. The only exception to the foregoing shall be securities purchases made with: (i) LAIF, (ii) San Diego County Treasurer’s Investment Pool, (iii) CAMP pool, (iv) Nonnegotiable Certificates of Deposit, (v) bank deposits, and, (vi) money market mutual funds, since the purchased securities are not deliverable. The Director of Finance shall keep a record of any funds in any of these investments.
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EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY (EEO) AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PROGRAMS

The purpose of this policy is to establish an equal employment opportunity program for employees and contractors.

Federal regulations require the adoption of an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Program as a condition of receipt of federal funds. The SANDAG administrative manuals, policies, and procedures mandate equal employment opportunities in recruitment, hiring, and employment for applicants to, and employees of, SANDAG. SANDAG also has separate written policies which forbid discrimination and provide grievance procedures for employees and visitors to SANDAG who believe they have been a victim of discrimination. In addition, SANDAG incorporates an EEO requirement and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) requirements in its contracts with third parties.

1. EEO and DBE Programs

1.1 It is the policy of SANDAG to actively recruit, hire, train, promote, and make all other employment decisions for all applicants and employees in accordance with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. SANDAG will ensure that procedures for recruiting, selecting, hiring, promoting, training, termination, compensation, benefits, as well as decisions regarding terms and conditions of employment do not adversely affect the employment of persons protected by Title VII and, in addition, that all SANDAG hiring and promoting criteria, requirements, and tests are job-related. SANDAG will adhere to the affirmative action provisions of Executive Order 11246, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP), the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Guidelines, and all other applicable standards to the extent required by applicable law.

1.2 It is SANDAG policy to assure that discrimination based on race, color, religious creed, religion, creed, national origin, ancestry, age (over 40), gender (including gender identity and/or gender expression), sex (including pregnancy, childbirth, breastfeeding and/or related medical conditions related to pregnancy, childbirth or breastfeeding), medical condition (including AIDS/HIV, history of cancer), physical or mental disability, (including mental or physical), genetic information, sexual orientation, marital status, military or veteran's status or any other category protected by federal, state or local law does not occur in relationships that may exist between SANDAG and any employee or applicant for employment. Such relationships include, but are not limited to, recruitment, selection, hiring, promotion, compensation, benefits, terminations, transfers, layoffs, recalls, or SANDAG-sponsored training, education, or social and recreational programs.

1.3 It is SANDAG policy to require the contractors and consultants that it contracts with to have EEO policies in place that forbid discrimination in violation of Title VII.
1.4 SANDAG maintains a DBE Program as required by the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration that sets forth a triennial goal for participation by DBEs. The Director of Administration shall serve as the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Liaison Officer.

1.5 Responsibility for implementation of the EEO Program is assigned to the Director of Administration. All management personnel within SANDAG are expected to support and implement the EEO Program in performance of their job duties and responsibilities. Any employee or applicant who feels they have been discriminated against, has a right to file a complaint under SANDAG policies.

1.6 When developing and implementing its employment and contracting policies, SANDAG will base its decisions solely on the individual's qualifications and merit, the evaluation criteria in the solicitation, and the feasibility of any necessary accommodations.

2. Procedures

2.1 The Director of Administration will review employment statistics to determine whether there is a need to set goals for any under-represented groups and then recommend goals to the Executive Director if necessary.

2.2 The Executive Director will approve or disapprove the Director of Administration's recommendation(s) at his/her discretion.

2.3 The Director of Administration will maintain current contact lists of community resource organizations, community leaders, media sources, and colleges/vocational schools for the use of SANDAG staff in recruiting for employees, consultants, and contractors.

2.4 The Director of Administration will communicate the EEO and DBE Programs to all employees.

2.5 SANDAG staff will solicit community involvement by under-represented groups on issues of importance to the region that fall within its jurisdiction.

2.6 All SANDAG requests for proposals, requests for qualifications, and invitations for bids with federal funding will contain language encouraging participation by DBE consultants, contractors, and subcontractors.

2.7 Consultants and contractors awarded contracts with DBE Program goals will be required to submit a DBE Final Utilization Report with their final invoice.

2.8 A report on DBE Program results will be provided to the Board of Directors on an annual basis.

2.9 The Director of Administration will maintain records on recruitment efforts, new employees, promotional opportunities, disciplinary actions, training, and employee
separations which document whether the affected individuals are in a class protected by Title VII.

2.10 The Board of Directors will review an EEO report prepared by the Director of Administration on an annual basis. The report will include employment results and a review of EEO Program goals for the upcoming year.

2.11 The EEO Program policy will be posted in employee breakrooms and will be incorporated into the SANDAG employee website.

2.12 All employment ads and job postings will contain a reference that SANDAG is an equal employment opportunity employer.

2.13 Required federal and state posters concerning EEO will be displayed in employee breakrooms.

2.14 All successful consultants and contractors will be notified of their obligations under the EEO and DBE Programs in their contracts with SANDAG.
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RECORDS MANAGEMENT

These procedures are intended to ensure the safekeeping of SANDAG records with administrative, legal, fiscal, programmatic, or historical value; provide ease of access to SANDAG records by staff; provide ease of access to SANDAG records by members of the public in accordance with SANDAG’s Public Records Request Guidelines; ensure compliance with the California Public Records Act (CPRA) and Government Code section 60201 et seq., and provide the necessary guidance to ensure proper records management, including retention and disposition.

SANDAG’s records are a valuable resource. This policy provides procedures to ensure SANDAG’s records are maintained in a consistent, orderly, secure, and accessible manner.

Procedures

1. Applicability

   This policy applies to SANDAG employees and non-SANDAG employees (NSEs) who create business records. NSEs include, but are not limited to officials, such as the Board of Directors and committee members as well as consultants, contractors, partners, affiliates, volunteers and SANDAG member agency employees.

2. Policy Statement

   2.1 Records kept by SANDAG employees or NSEs because they are necessary or convenient to the discharge of SANDAG business are public records. Any and all records generated in the course of SANDAG business are the property of SANDAG, unless otherwise agreed to in a contract document. Public records include, but are not limited to, correspondence through email, text message, voicemail, memoranda, or other means; audio or video recordings, contracts, project files, reports, digital imagery data, prints, charts, maps and drawings. Persons to whom this policy applies should pay particular attention when using email or other less formal forms of communication to ensure that matters discussed are handled with due care and reviewed for professionalism, accuracy, and objectivity as they are discoverable public records that can be used as evidence in litigation.

   2.2 Records must be maintained in accordance with the SANDAG Records Retention Schedule (Schedule) until their retention period expires, after which the records should be disposed of promptly and appropriately. The periods shown in the Schedule are minimum time periods that do not start until the document and/or project is complete. Records can be maintained for time periods in excess of the retention period in the Schedule if the records are still needed for reference, but should be disposed of as soon as possible to conserve storage space.
Unless otherwise mandated by law, all Records subject to retention on a temporary or permanent basis may be retained in an electronic format so long as the electronic retention system employs a combination of technologies, policies, and procedures that allows no plausible scenario in which a document retrieved from or reproduced by the system could differ substantially from the document that is originally stored.

3. Public Records

3.1 SANDAG Business Records are records that contain information relating to the conduct of SANDAG business and generally include any record kept because it is prepared, owned, used, or retained by SANDAG in furtherance of official SANDAG duties. A record prepared by a SANDAG employee or NSE conducting SANDAG business has been “prepared by” SANDAG within the meaning of the CPRA even if the record is prepared using a personal account, on a personal device for which the SANDAG employee or NSE receives no public reimbursement or on off-duty hours. SANDAG Business Records are subject to disclosure if they are in SANDAG’s actual or constructive possession. Constructive possession includes SANDAG Business Records in the possession of an employee or NSE. If a public records request seeks SANDAG Business Records held in a SANDAG employees’ or NSE’s non-SANDAG email, phone, or accounts, SANDAG may reasonably rely on its employees, officials or NSE’s to search their own personal files, accounts, and devices for responsive material.

3.2 Records that pertain to “housekeeping” matters that will not be needed for future reference should be disposed of as soon as possible. Communications that are primarily personal, containing no more than incidental mentions of SANDAG business, generally will not constitute public records. In addition, records that are purely personal in nature such as personal email or correspondence from a friend should not be treated as SANDAG Business Records. In order to prevent a claim that such records are subject to disclosure, and to prevent an unnecessary burden on SANDAG resources, records unrelated to SANDAG business should be purged from SANDAG computers and files.

3.3 SANDAG employees and NSEs may determine that certain records are not needed for future use or reference because they are notes or drafts that have been superseded by later versions. Consistent with the Secretary of State Records Management Guidelines, which recommends that records that have fulfilled their administrative, fiscal, or legal function should be disposed of as soon as possible, preliminary drafts, notes, and interagency and intra-agency memoranda that have been retained for less than 60 days and that are no longer needed for use or reference should be disposed of prior to the end of the 60-day time period. All such records that are kept for more than 60 days for use or reference, and that are not otherwise exempt, must be kept for a minimum of two years. Some records must be kept for longer than two years and the retention period for most records is contained in the Schedule. The time periods shown in the Schedule should be followed unless a document needs to be retained for a longer time period than that shown because the custodian believes the record is still needed for reference. All of the time periods shown for retention begin no sooner than the date the record is put in its final form.
3.4 After a SANDAG business record has been maintained for the required time period it should be disposed of promptly consistent with the Schedule. If records contain confidential or trade secret information, steps should be taken to ensure the records are not disclosed when they are destroyed.

3.5 At least once each year the Schedule will be reviewed and revised as needed. The Schedule will be circulated to the department directors for recommended changes and additions and reviewed by the Office of General Counsel. Changes to the Schedule must be approved by the Executive Director and Office of General Counsel and substantive changes shall be communicated to all SANDAG employees. Information regarding the Schedule will be included in the annual public records training conducted for employees. The most recent version of the Schedule shall be made available on the SANDAG website at www.sandag.org/legal.

3.6 Retention periods for records required for litigation, auditing, environmental review, or public records requests must be suspended and the records maintained in their original condition and format until the matter is resolved through consultation with the Office of General Counsel.

3.7 SANDAG is required to undertake reasonable efforts to assist the public in identifying records or information sought. In response to public records requests the Office of General Counsel works with employees and NSEs to identify responsive records. Records should be kept in an organized fashion and be easily identifiable. Electronic SANDAG Business Records shall be stored in a file storage location approved for active use by the SANDAG Information Systems Manager. Records that have been saved in electronic format do not need to be maintained in hardcopy unless otherwise stated in the Schedule.

4. File Maintenance

All SANDAG Business Records should be maintained in an organized fashion in a location that is easily identifiable in the event of a public records request. For example, project manager(s) for a project and Contracts and Procurement personnel shall maintain centralized files for each project or procurement. Files should not contain records that are not needed for future use or reference such as preliminary drafts, working papers, or notes that have been superseded and are less than 60 days old, or “housekeeping” memoranda or emails.
5. Records Containing Confidential or Trade Secret Information

Records created at or received by SANDAG containing confidential or trade secret information must be marked as such and filed in a location where the records will be secure and inaccessible to third parties. Employees and NSEs should take all necessary steps to ensure that such records are not copied or disclosed to third parties. Once a record is submitted to SANDAG by a company or individual it immediately becomes a public record unless that party has expressly designated the record or portion thereof as confidential, proprietary, or trade secret. For example, unless a proposal or price list from a consultant or contractor is clearly marked as confidential or trade secret it will automatically become a public record. Note, however, that even if a consultant or contractor marks a document as “confidential,” “proprietary,” or “trade secret” this will not necessarily exempt the document from disclosure under the California Public Records Act or other applicable laws.

6. CPRA Requests

6.1 Responses to records requests shall be fully compliant with the CPRA and all other applicable laws.

6.2 All CPRA requests received from members of the public shall be treated as urgent and immediately referred to the Office of General Counsel. Timing on responses to CPRA requests is very important. Under the law SANDAG shall determine within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of the CPRA request if the request, in whole or in part, seeks disclosable records in the possession of SANDAG.

6.3 SANDAG’s Public Records Request Guidelines shall be available to view on the SANDAG website, and shall be consistent with this policy and applicable law.
DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

The purpose of this policy is to establish the authority granted by the Board of Directors to the Executive Director. It also provides the Executive Director with the authority to delegate functions he or she has been delegated by the Board to SANDAG staff.

Definitions

The following words shall have the meanings indicated when used in this policy:

“Agreement” shall be interpreted to include contracts, memorandums of understanding, agreement amendments, purchase orders, invoices, money transfers, or any other document that could be enforced against SANDAG in a court of law.

“Budget” shall be interpreted to include SANDAG’s annual budget, revisions and amendments thereto, and the Overall Work Program.

“Emergency or Urgent Need” for purposes of this policy shall mean a situation in which, in the Executive Director’s or his/her designee’s opinion, injury to persons, or significant injury to property, covered species, habitats, linkages, and/or corridors identified in the San Diego County Natural Communities Conservation Planning program, or interruption of a public service will occur if immediate action is not taken.

Procedures

1. Adoption of a budget by the Board shall automatically authorize the Executive Director to enter into any agreements or take any other actions necessary to implement the budget items or other actions approved by the Board.

2. Any authority delegated to the Executive Director shall automatically vest with a Chief Deputy Executive Director when business must be conducted in the absence of the Executive Director.

3. In the event of emergency or an urgent need, the Executive Director is authorized to take all necessary actions to prevent significant unnecessary loss to SANDAG, a shut-down of public services, or to address a situation threatening the health or safety of persons or property, including, but not limited to, authorization to contract with a contractor or consultant on a sole source basis, consistent with applicable state or federal law without prior approval from the Board. In the event such an emergency or urgent need occurs, the Executive Director will consult with the Chair of the Board, promptly communicate all actions taken to the Board members, and submit a report to the Board at its next regular meeting in order to obtain ratification for those actions.
4. The Executive Director is hereby authorized to carry out the actions set forth below. In the event any of the authorities in this paragraph are exercised, the Executive Director will report actions taken to the Board in summary written form at the next regular meeting of the Board.

4.1 Enter into agreements not currently incorporated in the budget and make other modifications to the budget in an amount up to $100,000–$300,000 per transaction so long as the overall budget remains in balance. This provision may not, however, be used multiple times on the same budget line item or contract in order to circumvent the $100,000–$300,000 limit.

4.2 Approve all design plans, specifications and estimates for capital improvement projects.

4.3 Execute all real property transfer documents, including but not limited to, rights of entry, licenses, leases, deeds, easements, escrow instructions, and certificates of acceptance.

4.4 Approve the establishment of an offer of just compensation based on a qualified appraisal and within approved project budget for property sought to be acquired, and direct payment to persons for such property so long as the payment amount does not exceed 110 percent of the appraised value, or $100,000 above the appraised value, whichever is greater, or the full satisfaction of court judgments regarding property valuation.

4.5 Reject all bids and/or suspend the competitive procurement process.

4.6 Provide the final determination to persons or firms filing a protest regarding SANDAG’s procurement or contracting process or procedures.

4.7 File administrative claims and to initiate and maintain lawsuits on behalf of the Board to recover for damage to or destruction of SANDAG property, or interruption of a public service.

4.8 Settle all lawsuits initiated under paragraph 4.7.

4.9 Settle all lawsuits that SANDAG must defend when the settlement amount does not exceed $100,000.

4.10 Accept reimbursement from member agencies for use of SANDAG on-call contracts.

4.11 Execute tolling agreements to extend the statute of limitations for litigation involving SANDAG as a potential plaintiff or defendant when deemed in the best interest of SANDAG by the Executive Director and Office of General Counsel.

4.12 Authorize transfers of funds in the SANDAG budget for capital improvement projects following approval of such a transfer by the affected transit operator’s board of directors or designated governing body.

4.13 Authorize the expenditure of Emergency Land Management Funds designated in the most recent Board-adopted Environmental Mitigation Program Funding Strategy based upon support from a cross-section of technical experts not affiliated with the request.
4.14 Modify the Board of Directors meeting agenda regarding issues that arise after the most recent Executive Committee meeting with the concurrence of Chair of the Board.

4.15 Execute Right-of-Way Certifications for submittal to the California Department of Transportation, and take all other actions necessary to facilitate the timely filing of such certifications, for SANDAG projects that are either on the State Highway System or for those off-system projects with federal funding.

4.16 Authorize writing off or compromising uncollectable debt in an amount not exceeding $5,000 per account when, in the judgment of the Director of Finance, after using all appropriate collection tools, it is likely that the full debt is uncollectible and that it would not be cost efficient to pursue collection of the entire debt.

4.17 Approve an addendum to a previously-approved Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration consistent with CEQA Section 15164 where only minor technical changes or additions are necessary.

5. The Executive Director shall act as the appointing authority for SANDAG with the authority to appoint, promote, transfer, discipline, and terminate all employees of SANDAG subject to the provisions of SANDAG’s Administrative Rules and Regulations.

5.6 The Executive Director shall prepare for the Board’s consideration, and shall update on a regular basis, an administrative policy that includes a process to conduct staff performance evaluations on a regular basis to determine if the knowledge, skills, and abilities of staff members are sufficient to perform their respective functions in order to allow the Board monitor the staff evaluation process on a regular basis.

6.7 Pursuant to Article V, Section 4, paragraph c of the Bylaws, the Executive Director shall promulgate an administrative policy governing the procedures for delegating his/her authority to other SANDAG staff.

Adopted October 2003
Amended November 2004
Amended December 2006
Amended December 2008
Amended February 2012
Amended November 2012
Amended October 2013
Amended November 2014
Amended ________
PROJECT PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS AND ESTIMATES

This policy provides direction concerning the design of major transit projects and for preparing and approving contract plans, specifications, and cost estimates.

Section 14085 et seq. of the State Government Code states that whenever any public entity is to receive state or federal funds for the purposes of project planning, design, rights-of-way, construction, acquisition, or improvement of exclusive public mass transit guideways (and their related fixed facilities, power systems, passenger facilities, vehicles, and equipment), it shall prepare plans for the complete project that are applicable to the type of project, and transmit them to the Department of Transportation for its review and approval of policies, procedures, and performance standards, prior to the implementation of the project or the project phases affected. This policy is intended to cover the following components of Section 14085: preliminary engineering investigations; plans, specifications, and cost estimates.

Procedures

1. Plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&Es) for SANDAG projects shall be prepared in the most functional and timely manner possible, by competent engineers in any combination of public agency staff, consultants, or SANDAG staff as appropriate.

2. PS&Es shall generally be prepared in accordance with SANDAG’s practices and standards and/or accepted practices as defined by major project administrators, such as Caltrans, North County Transit District (NCTD), and/or Metropolitan Transit System (MTS).

3. Design criteria shall be in compliance with accepted engineering standards, laws, and practices applicable to transportation systems. In the case of projects to be constructed on the NCTD/MTS-owned railroad right-of-way, such design standards shall include, but not be limited to:

   3.1 NCTD’s/MTS’s adopted System Safety Program Plan
   3.2 49 CFR Part 213: Track Safety Standards
   3.3 49 CFR Part 236: Installation, Inspection Maintenance and Repair of Signal and Train Control Systems, Devices, and Appliances
   3.4 Amtrak MW 1000 Limits and Specifications for the Safety, Maintenance, and Construction of Track
3.5 SDNR Bridge Inspection and SDNR Signal Maintenance, Inspection, and Testing Manuals

3.6 American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) standards

3.7 California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) general orders and standards as applicable

3.8 Americans with Disabilities Act statutes and regulations

3.9 Approved SANDAG Design Criteria.

4. As a guideline, PS&E packages should generally contain the following:

4.1 Plans -- The official project plans and Standard Plans and Profiles, typical cross sections, general cross sections, working drawings and supplemental drawings, or reproductions thereof, approved by the responsible Engineer licensed in California, which show the location, character, dimensions and details of the work to be performed.

4.2 Specifications -- Special provisions shall contain specific clauses setting forth conditions or requirements peculiar to the work and supplementary to the standard specifications. Standard Specifications shall provide the directions, provisions and requirements contained in published documents setting forth conditions and requirements that are reoccurring in like work.

4.3 Estimate -- The engineer’s estimate shall list the estimated quantities of work to be performed and estimated costs of each item and for the total project construction.

Adopted November 2003
Amended December 2008
PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTING – CONSTRUCTION

Purpose

To establish a method for administering SANDAG construction contracts.

Background

Public Utilities Code section 132352.4 states that if the estimated total cost of any construction project or public works project will exceed fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), SANDAG must solicit bids in writing and award the work to the lowest responsible bidder or reject all bids. Section 132352.4 further mandates that SANDAG establish rules for procurement of construction of public works projects. Additionally, Government Code section 14085 et seq. requires that any public entity receiving state funds for a guideway project adopt policies and procedures for contract administration. Code of Federal Regulations, Volume 49, Part 18, and Federal Transit Administration Circular 4220.1F also establish procedures which SANDAG must be follow when administering contracts using federal funds. All references to the Executive Director in this policy also apply to the Executive Director’s designee.

Policy

1. Bidding Process

A competitive bidding process shall be utilized to the greatest extent possible for all construction contracts.

1.1. Bid Procedure for Small Contracts

1.1.1 For construction contracts estimated to cost $3,500 or less, the work may be awarded without competition so long as the price is determined to be fair and reasonable. Otherwise, staff shall seek a minimum of three bids which may be either written or oral to permit prices and other terms to be compared.

1.1.2 For construction contracts estimated to cost more than $3,500 but not more than $50,000, the following procedures shall be followed:

1.1.2.1 Written Notices Inviting Bids (NIBs) will be sent to a minimum of three qualified bidders by mail or facsimile on the same date. The bid period will be a minimum of three calendar days. When possible, NIBs should be sent to at least two certified Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) firms. The NIB will contain the time and location for receiving and opening bids.

1.1.2.2 The contract will be awarded to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder after a Notice of Intent to Award has been issued to all bidders and a protest period of five working days has expired.
1.1.2.3 Bid bonds will only be required on bids that are $50,000 or less when requested by the Director of Mobility Management & Project Implementation or his or her designee.

1.2. Bid Procedure for Contracts in Excess of $50,000

1.2.1 Public notice of a construction contract estimated to cost more than $50,000 shall be given by publication once a week for at least two consecutive weeks, with the first publication occurring at least three weeks before the day set for receiving bids, as follows:

1.2.1.1 In a newspaper of general circulation, published in San Diego County;

1.2.1.2 In a trade paper of general circulation published in Southern California devoted primarily to the dissemination of contract and building news among contractors and building materials supply firms (optional for projects estimated to cost less than $100,000); and

1.2.1.3 In at least one minority or community newspapers as appropriate to best meet SANDAG’s DBE goals.

1.2.2 Advertisements may also be placed in other minority and community newspapers, as appropriate. Appropriate DBEs listed in the current SANDAG vendor database will be notified of any work advertised under this policy.

1.2.3 The notice shall state the time and place for receiving and opening sealed bids and shall describe, in general terms, the work to be done.

1.3. Contractor’s Prequalifications

1.3.1 SANDAG may, for prospective contractors whose bid could exceed $500,000, adopt and apply a uniform prequalification system for rating bidders, on the basis of a standard experience questionnaire and financial statement verified under oath in respect to the contracts upon which each bidder is qualified to bid. A contractor may request to be prequalified for a predetermined contract amount prior to bidding.

1.3.2 In no event shall any bidder be awarded a contract if such contract award would result in the bidder having under contract(s), work cumulatively in excess of that authorized by its qualification rating.

1.4. Form of Bids

1.4.1 SANDAG shall furnish each bidder with a standard proposal form, to be filled out, executed, and submitted as its bid.

1.4.2 All bids shall be submitted as a sealed bid, which shall mean either submission in a sealed envelope or electronically through the use of SANDAG’s web-based solicitation system. All bids shall be accompanied by one of the following forms of bidder’s security: cash, a cashier’s check, certified check, or a bidder’s bond executed by an
admitted surety insurer and made payable to SANDAG. A bid shall not be considered unless accompanied by one of the forms of bidder's security, which may be in either hard copy or electronic format. Bidder's security shall be at least 10 percent of the amount bid. Bidder's bonds must be issued by bonding companies registered in the State of California.

1.4.3 Late bids shall not be accepted after the time and date designated in the notice.

1.4.4 Any bid may be withdrawn any time prior to the time fixed in the notice for bid opening only by written request to the SANDAG Executive Director. The request shall be executed by the bidder or its designated representative. Bids shall not be withdrawn after the time fixed for public opening.

1.4.5 On the day specified in the notice, staff shall publicly open sealed bids and announce the apparent lowest bidder(s), and if electronic bids are accepted then also immediately post the bid results on the SANDAG web-based solicitation system.

1.5. Review of Bids

1.5.1 After the bids are publicly opened, the Director of Mobility Management & Project Implementation or his or her designee (hereinafter "Director"), shall review all bids in order to determine which bidder is the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. The term "lowest responsive and responsible bidder" shall mean the lowest monetary bidder (excluding taxes) whose bid is responsive and who is responsible to perform the work required by the solicitation and contract documents.

1.5.2 SANDAG may investigate the responsibility and qualifications of all bidders to whom the award is contemplated for a period not to exceed 90 days after the bid opening. The 90-day review period may be extended upon the written request by the Director and written approval by the affected bidders.

1.5.3 SANDAG reserves the right to reject any or all bids and to waive any immaterial irregularity. No bid shall be binding upon SANDAG until after the contract is signed by both the contractor and SANDAG.

1.5.4 The lowest monetary bidder's bid will be evaluated by the Director in order to determine whether or not that bid is responsive. The term "responsive" generally means that the bid has been prepared and submitted in accordance with the requirements of the solicitation and bid documents. These requirements shall generally include, but will not be limited to, the following:

1.5.4.1 Bid Booklet - with all bid amounts filled in

1.5.4.2 Designation of Suppliers and Subcontractors - including dollar amounts

1.5.4.3 Acknowledgment of Addenda

1.5.4.4 Contractor's License Requirements

1.5.4.5 Ability to Meet Minimum Insurance Requirements
1.5.4.6 Public Contract Code 10162 Questionnaire
1.5.4.7 Bidder's Bond
1.5.4.8 Noncollusion Affidavit
1.5.4.9 Certification of Restrictions on Lobbying
1.5.4.10 Disclosure of Lobbying Activities
1.5.4.11 Certification Regarding Debarment

1.5.5 If the lowest monetary bidder's bid is responsive, then the bidder's qualifications will be evaluated by the Director to determine whether or not the bidder is responsible to perform the work required by the contract documents. The term "responsible" generally means that the bidder is able to demonstrate that it possesses: (1) the capacity to perform the work required by the contract documents with respect to financial strength, resources available, and experience; and (2) the integrity and trustworthiness to complete performance of the work in accordance with the contract documents. The Director shall review "responsibility" of bidders based upon factors set forth below.

1.5.6 For all contracts in excess of $500,000, the following uniform system of determining whether or not a bidder is "responsible" shall be applied. The Director will consider the following non-exclusive list of factors in relation to the work to be performed for this project:

1.5.6.1 Financial Requirements:

1.5.6.1.1 Contractors shall have evidence of the availability of sufficient working capital;

1.5.6.1.2 For design-bid-build projects, the largest value of all work any bidding contractor has had under contract over a previous similar time frame as the subject contract shall meet or exceed the total amount of the bid; or in the case of a Job Order Contract, the value of the maximum amount of the Job Order Contract; and

1.5.6.1.3 For design-bid-build projects, the dollar value of at least one of the previous individual contracts listed shall be at least 50 percent of the dollar value bid on the SANDAG contract, or in the case of a Job Order Contract, at least 50 percent of the maximum amount of the Job Order Contract; and

1.5.6.1.4 For design-bid-build projects, the contractor shall have successfully completed contracts during the previous five years that together exceed five times the annual value of the SANDAG contract.
1.5.6.2 Experience Requirements:

1.5.6.2.1 The contractor must demonstrate organization experience on work similar to the SANDAG contract by submitting a list, covering at least the previous five years, of all projects of any type that have been completed or are under construction that the contractor provides to be considered in determining its requisite experience. The list shall contain a name, title, email address, and phone number for staff to contact to verify the contract details;

1.5.6.2.2 The contractor shall demonstrate individual experience by submitting a list of all key personnel, including project managers, who will be involved in the SANDAG contract. These key personnel shall have at least three years of experience on contracts where the work is similar to the SANDAG contract. The individuals listed shall have been involved at the same level of responsibility on successfully completed contracts during the previous five years that together exceeds the value of the SANDAG contract. For each individual listed, the contractor shall include the name, title, address, and phone number of an individual or organization who can verify the individual's experience;

1.5.6.2.3 The contractor shall submit a summary of all claims made in the last five years arising out of previous contracts listed (this summary shall include all claims by owner against bidder or bidder against owner, and the final status of each claim);

1.5.6.2.4 The contractor shall state whether or not it has defaulted on a construction project within the last two years;

1.5.6.2.5 The contractor shall list any violation of the Apprenticeship Requirements under the State Business and Professions Code or Labor Code found by an appropriate authority within the last two years;

1.5.6.2.6 The contractor shall state whether they have been found guilty of failure to pay required prevailing wages on a public contract within the last two years;

1.5.6.2.7 The contractor shall state whether they have been formally found to be a nonresponsible bidder, for reason other than being nonresponsive, by a public agency within the last two years;

1.5.6.2.8 The contractor shall list how many construction projects the bidder will be working on concurrently with the SANDAG project;
1.5.6.2.9 The contractor shall state whether they have ever been terminated by an owner or client, or rejected from bidding in a public works project in the last five years;

1.5.6.2.10 The contractor shall state whether a surety ever completed any portion of the work of the bidder's project within the last five years;

1.5.6.2.11 The contractor shall state whether the bidder, any officer of such bidder, or any employee of such bidder who has a proprietary interest in such bidder, has ever been disqualified, removed, or otherwise prevented from bidding on, or completing a federal, state, or local government project because of a violation of a law or safety regulation, and if so, explain the circumstances; and

1.5.6.2.12 For all items identified under 1.5.6.2.1 through 1.5.6.2.11 above, the contractor shall provide name of owner, title of project, contract amount, location of project, date of contract, and name of bonding company.

1.5.6.3 Reporting Forms: In order to demonstrate that the SANDAG financial and experience requirements are met, the contractor shall submit, when requested by SANDAG, a standard experience questionnaire and financial statement verified under oath that shall meet the requirements adopted herein.

1.5.6.4 Failure to provide accurate information relative to its financial status or experience may result in the debarment of the contractor from future SANDAG work.

1.5.6.5 Questionnaires and financial statements shall not be considered public records nor open for public inspection.

1.5.7 SANDAG will make its determination of responsibility based upon information submitted by bidders, and, if necessary, interviews with previous owners, clients, design professionals, or subcontractors with whom the bidder has worked. If a bidder is determined to be nonresponsible, it shall be afforded an administrative hearing upon the submission of a timely protest of such issue. Any additional evidence submitted in the course of the protest procedure shall be considered in making the recommendation to the Executive Director regarding determination of the lowest responsive and responsible bidder and award of the contract.

1.6. Award or Rejection of Bids

1.6.1 If the Director finds that the lowest monetary bidder submitted a responsive bid and that the bidder is responsible, then that bidder shall be deemed the apparent lowest responsive and responsible bidder, and the Director shall report the findings as recommendation to the Executive Director.
1.6.2 If the Director finds that the lowest monetary bidder's bid is not responsive or that the lowest monetary bidder is not responsible, then the Director may review the responsiveness and responsibility of the next low monetary bidder. If the Director finds that the next low monetary bidder is responsive and responsible, then that next low bidder shall be deemed the apparent lowest responsive and responsible bidder, and the Director shall report the findings as recommendations to the Executive Director. The Director may continue to review the responsiveness and responsibility of the next low monetary bidders until he/she finds the lowest monetary bidder that is also responsive and responsible, and deemed lowest responsive and responsible bidder. In the event that one or more low monetary bidders are found by the Director to be nonresponsive or nonresponsible, those bidders will be given notice and a reasonable opportunity to present additional evidence to the Director within five working days after the bidder receives the notice.

1.6.3 The Executive Director may authorize a Limited Notice to Proceed (LNTP) to the apparent lowest responsive and responsible bidder for an amount not to exceed $250,000 prior to the award of the construction contract if the Executive Director determines that the award of an LNTP is justified.

1.6.4 If it is for the best interest of SANDAG, the Executive Director may, on refusal or failure of the successful bidder to execute the contract, award it to the second-lowest responsive and responsible bidder.

1.6.5 If the second-lowest responsive and responsible bidder fails to execute the contract, the Executive Director may likewise award it to the third-lowest responsible bidder.

1.6.6 On the failure or refusal of any bidder to execute the contract, its bidder's security shall be forfeited to SANDAG.

1.6.7 For all contract awards in excess of $25,000, the successful bidder must furnish a performance bond equal to at least one-half of the contract price and a payment bond equal to one hundred percent of the contract price. Federally funded contract awards shall require a performance bond equal to one hundred percent of the contract price. Notwithstanding the foregoing, depending upon authorization from the funding source(s), the performance and payment bond requirements may be modified within the Invitation for Bids with prior approval of the Director.

1.6.8 Failure to furnish the required bonds shall constitute failure to execute the contract.

1.7. Return of Bidder's Security

1.7.1 SANDAG may withhold the bidder's security of the second- and third-lowest responsive and responsible bidders until the contract has been finally executed. SANDAG shall, upon request, return cash, cashier's checks, and certified checks submitted by all other unsuccessful bidders within 30 days after the bid opening, and the bidder's bonds shall be of no further effect.

1.8. Protests to Solicitation, Responsibility, Bid, or Award
1.8.1 SANDAG shall include in all procurements a procedure to be followed by interested parties who wish to protest a specification, procedure, or finding of nonresponsibility. The procedure shall include the following:

1.8.1.1 A requirement that protest submittals shall be in writing, be specific to the specification or procedure being protested, state the grounds for protest, and include all documentation needed to enable SANDAG to reach a decision.

1.8.1.2 A statement that the protest shall be submitted within clearly defined time limits prior to receiving proposals or opening bids or prior to award of contracts.

1.8.1.3 A statement specifying the review and determination process by SANDAG, including time limits for response.

1.8.1.4 Requirements for submittal of a protest reconsideration.

1.8.1.5 A statement regarding review of the initial protest by a protest review committee, or in the case of a protest regarding a finding of nonresponsibility by an administrative hearing officer or panel, and review of protest reconsiderations by the Executive Director, as appropriate.

1.8.1.6 A statement that protests will be rejected if they are not complete.

1.9. Procedure for Subcontractor Substitution Protest

1.9.1 Subcontractor substitutions shall be made only pursuant to the provisions of the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act, Public Contract Code section 4100 et seq., as it may be amended from time to time. Notwithstanding the foregoing, nothing in this policy is intended to require SANDAG to strictly comply with the Subcontracting Fair Practices Act. The Executive Director is hereby designated to carry out all functions of the awarding authority under Section 4100 et seq.

1.10. Procedure for Contractors with Claims Against SANDAG on Construction Contracts

1.10.1 On all SANDAG construction contracts estimated to cost more than $25,000, a section shall be included in the contract provisions that specifies how a contractor should file a “Notice of Potential Claim” and the procedures for review and disposition thereof.

1.10.2 Federal Transit Administration review and concurrence is required for claim settlements that exceed $1 million if FTA funds are involved.

1.10.3 A list of all outstanding claims exceeding $100,000 which involve the use of federal funds shall be included in the federal grants quarterly report.

1.11. Debarment Procedures for Procurement and Construction Contracts
In addition to all other remedies permitted by law, SANDAG may, upon advice of the Executive Director and Office of General Counsel, by resolution declare a bidder or contractor ineligible to bid on SANDAG procurement and construction contracts for a period not to exceed three years for any of the following grounds:

1.11.1.1 two or more claims of computational, clerical, or other error in bid submission within a two-year period;

1.11.1.2 unjustified failure or refusal to timely provide or properly execute contract documents;

1.11.1.3 unsatisfactory performance of contract;

1.11.1.4 false, excessive and/or unreasonable claims while performing work for SANDAG;

1.11.1.5 two or more occasions within a two-year period of failure to submit bond or insurance documents acceptable to SANDAG in the time periods required;

1.11.1.6 unjustified refusal to properly perform or complete contract work or warranty performance;

1.11.1.7 unjustified failure to honor or observe contractual obligations or legal requirements pertaining to the contract;

1.11.1.8 conviction under a state or federal statute or municipal ordinance for fraud, bribery, theft, falsification or destruction of records, receiving stolen property or of any other similar crime;

1.11.1.9 any offense or action which indicates a lack of business integrity and which could directly affect the reliability and credibility of performance of the contractor on future contracts with SANDAG;

1.11.1.10 any debarment of the contractor by another governmental agency; and

1.11.1.11 false statements or certifications in documents submitted as part of a bid or any supplementary documentation thereto.

1.11.2 SANDAG may permanently debar such bidder or contractor for a conviction under federal or state antitrust statutes involving public contracts or the submission of bid proposals, for any corrupt practices involving the administration or award of a contract with SANDAG, or permanent debarment of the bidder or contractor by another governmental agency.

1.11.3 The bidder or contractor shall be provided notice and an opportunity to present evidence and show cause before the Board why such ineligibility shall not be declared after the Executive Director has established a factual basis for debarment.
1.11.4 A contractor’s debarment shall be effective amongst SANDAG and any subsidiary entity. Debarment prohibits SANDAG and any subsidiary entity from executing contracts with the debarred contractor.

1.11.5 Debarment constitutes debarment of all divisions or other organizational elements of the contractor, unless the debarment decision is limited by its terms to specific divisions, organizational elements, or commodities. The debarment decision may be extended to include any affiliate of the contractor if the affiliate is (1) specifically named, and (2) given written notice of the proposed debarment and an opportunity to respond.

1.11.6 Notwithstanding the debarment of the contractor, the Board may continue contracts in existence at the time the contractor is debarred, unless the Board directs otherwise, after receiving advice from the Executive Director as to the effects of termination of an existing agreement.

2. **Contract Administration and Contractor Assurances**

2.1 SANDAG contractors must meet all applicable laws concerning labor law, labor rates, EEO and licenses. SANDAG shall ensure that the following requirements are carried out:

2.1.1 All bidders and contractors shall be licensed in accordance with the laws of California. Additionally, contractor requirements shall be guided by the provisions of Chapter 9 of Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code concerning the licensing of contractors.

2.1.2 The contractor may not, in any case, pay workers less than the stipulated prevailing rates paid for such work or craft in the San Diego area by the contractor or any of its subcontractors, unless it is otherwise authorized by law.

2.1.3 The contractor will be responsible for complying with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended.

2.1.4 SANDAG contractors shall be required to provide Workers’ Compensation Insurance to their employees in accordance with the provisions of Section 3700 of the Labor Code. Prior to commencement of work, the contractor shall sign and file with SANDAG a certification of compliance.

2.1.5 Labor compliance requirements on SANDAG contracts shall be consistent with the California Labor Code.

2.1.6 Contracts including construction services in excess of $1 million shall include a provision requiring the entity contracting with SANDAG to commit that the entity and its subcontractors at every tier will use a skilled and trained workforce to perform all construction work on the project consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 132354.7 unless one of the exceptions in Section 132354.7(a) are met.

2.1.7 The contractor shall comply with the EEO requirements set forth by Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act on any project where Federal funds are included.
2.1.8 The contractor shall also comply with Sections 1431 and 1735 of the Labor Code and Sections 300 and 317 through 323 of Title 8 of the California Administrative Code, which prohibits labor discrimination and requires the contractor to submit an Equal Opportunity Program and certification fee to the Fair Employment Practice Commission for contracts over $200,000.

2.1.9 The Board’s Equal Employment Opportunity Program and adequate audit provisions to allow the SANDAG independent performance auditor access to the contracted entity’s records needed to verify compliance with the terms specified in the contract will be incorporated by reference in all SANDAG construction contract templates.

3. Construction Contract Change Orders

3.1 All construction and procurement contracts may be amended by a suitable change order. The contract change orders shall be processed in accordance with SANDAG procurement and construction manual(s).

3.2 Construction contract change orders shall be approved by the Executive Director in accordance with SANDAG Board policies, administrative policies, and procedural manuals.

3.3 Except in an emergency, or in the case of a justifiable sole source procurement, a change order shall not be awarded without competitive bidding where the amount of such change order exceeds 25 percent of the price of the original or altered contract, or the change order is out of the original contract scope.

3.3.1. For purposes of this section, an emergency is defined as a sudden or unforeseen situation in which, in the Executive Director’s opinion, injury to persons, or significant injury to property or interruption of a public service will occur if immediate action is not taken.

3.4 All change orders that conflict or potentially conflict with Board-adopted policies shall be brought before the Board for decision.

3.5 All change orders which utilize federal funds shall conform to the Code of Federal Regulations, Volume 49, Part 18 and Federal Transit Administration Circular 4220.1F and any successors thereof, that are applicable by law.

4. Other Than Full and Open Competition

Normally, SANDAG will utilize a full and open competition when soliciting bids or proposals for procurements in excess of $50,000. Under certain circumstances, however, a procurement may be justified that does not utilize full and open competition. These procurements are known as limited competition procurements. When less than full and open competition is used, SANDAG shall solicit offers from as many potential sources as is practicable under the circumstances.

Noncompetitive procurement is known as sole source procurement. Noncompetitive and limited competition procurements shall only be permitted when the conditions below are met.

4.1 When the project will be paid for in whole or in part by federal funds one of the conditions allowing a limited competition or sole source procurement set forth in the
latest version of FTA Circular 4220.1, or the equivalent from other federal funding agencies, must be met.

4.2 When there are no federal funds involved, additional factors may be used to justify a limited competition or sole source procurement as being within the best interest of SANDAG. For these types of procurements one of the conditions in this section (4.2) or section 4.1 must be met:

4.2.1. There is only one contractor capable of providing the work because the work is unique or highly specialized.

4.2.2. The work should be carried out by a particular contractor in the interest of economy or efficiency as a logical follow-on to work already in progress under a competitively awarded contract.

4.2.3. The cost to prepare for a competitive procurement exceeds the cost of the work.

5. Relief from Maintenance and Responsibility and Acceptance of Work

5.1 SANDAG will, upon written application by the contractor, consider granting relief from maintenance and responsibility on major elements of each major construction project as permitted in the contract specifications. The Executive Director is hereby delegated authority to grant said relief in writing to the contractor and shall report actions on contracts over $25,000 to the Board.

5.2 SANDAG will, upon written application by the contractor, accept the entire work on major construction contracts, provided that the work has been completed, in all respects, in accordance with the contract plans and specifications. The Executive Directors is hereby delegated the authority to accept such work on behalf of the Board and shall report to the Board all acceptances over $25,000.

5.2.1 In determining whether to accept the entire work on major construction projects, these procedures should be followed:

5.2.1.1 The contractor shall request acceptance in writing.

5.2.1.2 Concurrence with the request by the SANDAG Resident Engineer shall be in writing to the Executive Director and include these findings: (1) that the contract has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, (2) a statement as to the financial condition of the contract, and (3) a statement as to whether the contract was completed on time or with an apparent overrun.

5.2.1.3 The Executive Director shall accept the action and report the findings to the Board.

6. Conflict of Interest

6.1 A contractor is eligible for award of service contracts by SANDAG so long as the contract in question does not create an actual, potential, or apparent conflict of interest. A
prohibited conflict of interest exists when, because of other activities, relationships, or contracts, a firm is or may be unable to render impartial, objective assistance or advice to SANDAG; or a firm’s objectivity in performing the contract work is or might be otherwise impaired; or where a firm would receive an unfair competitive advantage. Prohibited conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to, the following situations:

6.1.1 Except in the case of design-build contracting, any firm that provides design services or project management services to SANDAG will be ineligible for award of a construction contract to construct the improvements, which are the subject of the design services.

6.1.2 Any firm that provides design services to SANDAG will be ineligible for award of any contract to provide construction management services resulting from the specific project for which design services were provided.

6.1.3 Any firm that provides construction management services to SANDAG will be ineligible for award of a construction contract for which construction management services were or will be provided.

6.1.4 Any firm that assists SANDAG or any of its member or affiliated agencies in the preparation of a construction procurement document will not be allowed to participate as a bidder/offeror or join a team submitting a bid/offer in response to that procurement document except under the provisions in Section 7.1.4 of Board Policy No. 016.

6.2 SANDAG shall not contract with, and will reject any bid or proposal submitted by, the following persons or entities, unless the Executive Director finds that special circumstances exist which justify the approval of such contract:

6.2.1 Persons employed by SANDAG;

6.2.2 Profit-making firms or businesses in which SANDAG employees serve as officers, principals, partners, or major shareholders; Persons who, within the immediately preceding twelve (12) months, were employed by SANDAG and (1) were employed in positions of substantial responsibility in the area of service to be performed by the contract, or (2) participated in any way in developing the contract or its service specifications; or

6.2.3 Profit-making firms or businesses in which the former employees described in subsection 6.2.3 serve as officers, principals, partners or major shareholders.

6.3 SANDAG staff and third parties with whom SANDAG does business shall comply with SANDAG administrative policies concerning Standard of Conduct and all relevant Board Policies.

6.4 A Notice of Potential for Conflict of Interest shall be included when relevant in any procurement issued by SANDAG. The Notice shall be the policy of the Board as listed herein. Any agreement issued in accordance with this policy shall include or make reference to the policy listed herein.
6.5 A “firm” shall be defined as any company or family of companies where there is a single parent board of directors or staff of officers who can influence the policies and actions of the design company, construction management company, and the construction company.

6.6 “Ineligible” firms shall include the prime consultant for the services, subcontractors for portions of the services, and affiliates of either. An affiliate is a firm that is subject to the control of the same persons through joint ownership or otherwise.

6.7 If there is any doubt by a firm regarding a potential conflict of interest for a specific project or function, the appropriate member of management staff, depending on type of project, will, upon written request, provide a written ruling. This procedure is encouraged prior to submittal of proposals or bids. In the event a conflict of interest is determined to exist, a written appeal may be made by the affected firm to the Executive Director within five calendar days of notice from SANDAG the conflict. The Executive Director shall determine the adequacy of the appeal and make a subsequent final decision. No further appeal shall be considered.

7. Job Order Contracting

A Job Order Contract (JOC) is a competitively bid, firm fixed price, indefinite quantity contract that is based upon specific unit pricing contained in a unit price book (prepared by the public agency or by independent commercial sources) setting forth detailed repair and construction items of work, including descriptions, specifications, units of measurement and individual unit prices for each item of work. The JOC includes unit pricing for work at time of award, but not the specified quantity and location of the work to be performed. At the time a Job Order is issued, the scope of work will identify the quantity and specific location of the work to be performed. A JOC may be used when it will result in a cost savings through economies of scale or expedite the delivery of work.

7.1 General Requirements

7.1.1 JOCs shall be awarded under written agreement subject to the following limitations:

7.1.1.1 The specifications were advertised in accordance with Board Policy No. 024, Section 1, “Bidding Process” based on the maximum potential value of the JOC.

7.1.1.2 The specifications provided for sealed competitive bidding on unit-cost terms for all labor, material, and equipment necessary to perform all work contemplated for individual Job Orders.

7.1.1.3 The JOC does not exceed a term of three years in duration.

7.1.1.4 The JOC shall only be used for the performance of minor routine or recurring construction, or for the renovation, alteration, or repair of existing public facilities.
7.1.2 JOC may not contain any provision which would guarantee the contractor cumulative Job Orders in excess of $50,000.

7.2 Issuance of Job Orders

7.2.1 Following award of a JOC, Job Orders may be issued by the Executive Director in accordance with SANDAG Board Policies, administrative polices, and procedural manuals upon certification by that individual that it is not in conflict with other Board Policies and it is the best interest of SANDAG to use the JOC procurement process because one or more of the following criteria have been met:

7.2.1.1. Use of the JOC process will result in a cost savings through economies of scale or expedite the delivery of work; or

7.2.1.2. Compliance with the traditional competitive bidding requirements will not produce an advantage to SANDAG; or

7.2.1.3. Advertising for bids is undesirable because it will be practically impossible to obtain what is needed or required by an unforeseen deadline if the traditional competitive bidding method is used; or

7.2.1.4. The entity or entities providing funds for the project have authorized use of the JOC process.

7.2.2 An individual Job Order may not exceed the sum of $2,000,000, except in the case of an emergency as defined in Section 3.3.1 of this Policy, or as specifically authorized by the Executive Director, whose authorization shall not be delegated.

7.2.3 No public work that logically should be performed as a single contractual transaction requiring the expenditure of more than $2,000,000 shall be separated into separate Job Orders for purposes of avoiding this limitation.

7.2.4 Non-prepriced items of work may be included in Job Orders provided that the non-prepriced items are within the scope and intent of the JOC and are priced reasonably and in conformity all applicable laws, regulations and policies.

7.3 Job Order Contract Intergovernmental Agreements

7.3.1 The SANDAG Executive Director may permit, subject to requirements of this section and subject to such terms and conditions that the Executive Director may prescribe, any public entity, including the California Department of Transportation, or any municipal corporation, school or other special district within San Diego County, to participate via the Service Bureau in JOCs entered into by SANDAG, and may enter into any agreements necessary to do so.

8. Design-Build Contracting

“Design-build” contracting is a project delivery method in which both the design and construction of a project are procured from a single entity. Notwithstanding Section 1 of this Policy, SANDAG is permitted to use the design-build contracting method on transit projects.
accordance with Public Contracts Code section 20209.522160 et seq. A competitive negotiation process similar to the process described in Board Policy No. 016 for the procurement of services will be used to procure design build services. Selection criteria for design-build procurements shall be subject to Board approval.

9. **Construction Manager/General Contractor Contracting**

Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) contracting is a project delivery method using a best value procurement process in which a construction manager is procured to provide pre-construction services during the design phase of the project and construction services during the construction phase of the project. Notwithstanding Section 1 of this Policy, SANDAG is permitted to use the CM/GC contracting method on transit projects in accordance with Public Contracts Code 6950-6958. A competitive negotiation process similar to the process described in Board Policy No. 016 for the procurement of services will be used to procure CM/GC services. Selection criteria for CM/GC procurements shall be subject to Board approval.

10. **Design Sequencing Contracting**

"Design sequencing" contracting is a method of project delivery that enables the sequencing of design activities to permit each construction phase to commence when the design for that phase is complete, instead of requiring design for the entire project to be completed before commencing construction. This is a variation of the design-bid-build project delivery method. SANDAG is permitted to use the design sequencing contracting method on transit projects in accordance with Public Contracts Code 6950-6958.
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ASSET OWNERSHIP AND DISPOSITION

Purpose

This policy establishes guidelines and procedures for the ownership and disposal of SANDAG assets.

1. OWNERSHIP OF ASSETS

1.1 SANDAG, North San Diego County Transit Development Board ("NCTD"), and the Metropolitan Transit Development Board, a California Public Agency operating the Metropolitan Transit System ("MTS"), are parties to a Master Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which among other things, describes the manner in which acquired real property and personal property will be owned and managed by the three agencies. This policy is consistent with the terms of the Master MOU and its addenda. In addition, from time to time a transfer of property from SANDAG to another entity will be appropriate if that entity will operate, maintain or have liability for the property.

1.2 Real Property

1.2.1 Real property owned by NCTD, MTS, or an owner other than SANDAG ("Third Party Owner") prior to construction of a project by SANDAG shall be referred to as "Pre-Owned Property" in this Policy.

1.2.2 When SANDAG constructs physical improvements on Pre-Owned Property, the real property, including the improvements constructed by SANDAG, will be owned by the Third Party Owner, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the parties or prohibited by an entity funding the project.

1.2.2.1 To enable SANDAG to construct improvements on MTS or NCTD Pre-Owned Property, the parties will enter into one or more addenda to the Master MOU that will set forth the legal rights and remedies between or among SANDAG and the affected operating agency(ies) ("Affected Parties") to enable SANDAG to construct the project and MTS and/or NCTD to continue necessary operations during construction.

1.2.2.2 To convey improvements developed on Pre-Owned Property to NCTD and MTS, the Affected Parties may enter into one or more addenda to the Master MOU that will set forth the legal rights and remedies amongst the parties to make the Affected Party responsible to operate and maintain the property and allocate liability for claims involving the property.
1.2.3 When SANDAG constructs physical improvements to property acquired for the purpose of a project ("Subsequently Acquired Property"), the real property, including the improvements constructed by SANDAG, may be transferred to another entity, if permitted by the funding source of the procurement and agreed to by the parties. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the parties involved with the project may agree to have one or more other entities own Subsequently Acquired Property.

1.2.3.1 To convey the real property including improvements developed on Subsequently Acquired Property to NCTD or MTS, the Affected Parties will enter into one or more addenda to the Master MOU that will set forth the legal rights and remedies amongst the parties to make the operating agency responsible to operate and maintain the property, and allocate liability for claims involving the property to the operating agency.

1.2.3.2 In the event Subsequently Acquired Property may offer the opportunity to be further developed for other public transportation uses, SANDAG will retain the appropriate real property interest to enable it to develop such public transportation projects on the property in the future.

1.2.4 In the event real property is procured by SANDAG utilizing Federal Transit Administration ("FTA") grants, said real property may be conveyed to a Third Party Owner with FTA approval, and if agreed to by the parties.

1.3 Personal Property

1.3.1 All property other than real property and its associated bundle of rights will be referred to herein as “Personal Property.”

1.3.2 Personal Property procured by SANDAG for the operating purposes of NCTD or MTS may be owned, operated and maintained by the operating agency if permitted by the funding source of the procurement, and if agreed to by the Affected Parties.

1.3.3 To the extent the funding source of the procurement of Personal Property requires SANDAG to retain ownership, SANDAG may convey possession of the Personal Property to one or more Third Party Owners pursuant to a lease which will obligate the Third Party Owner to operate and maintain the Personal Property and account for its use and maintenance. Said lease will require the operating agency to retain full responsibility for the operation, maintenance, and liability associated with the use and possession of the Personal Property.

1.3.4 In the event Personal Property is procured by SANDAG utilizing FTA grants, the Personal Property may be conveyed to a Third Party Owner with FTA approval, and if agreed to by the parties.
2. DISPOSITION PROCEDURES

2.1 SANDAG has various assets which, over time, will be deemed obsolete due to normal use and wear, or new technology, or no longer needed due to project completion, underutilization, or surplus status. Therefore, these assets become candidates for disposal. Laws governing SANDAG’s purchase of such assets require the use of a competitive procurement process. Likewise, the disposal or sale of property purchased with public funds should be done so in an open competitive process, unless the property will be assigned to government or nonprofit entities and designated for public purposes. It is SANDAG policy to capitalize assets with a unit purchase value of $5,000 or more. This policy is intended to ensure that when SANDAG disposes of personal assets or real property assets, it will be done in a manner which is in the best interests of SANDAG, within the standards and procedures set forth.

2.2 Surplus properties are made available for various public purposes, including negotiated sale to state and local governments and eligible nonprofit institutions, or are sold competitively to the general public. State and local governments, eligible public institutions, and nonprofit organizations may acquire surplus property that SANDAG no longer needs on terms that SANDAG’s Transportation Committee deems are in the best interest of SANDAG’s goals and public need.

2.3 Surplus property that is not conveyed to state/local governments or other eligible recipients for public purposes may be sold to private individuals and companies by competitive bid.

2.4 Methods. The method of disposal must be approved by the Transportation Committee for capital assets with an individual or aggregate actual or depreciated value of $100,000 or more. For assets valued under $100,000, the Executive Director may authorize disposal and the method. For audit purposes, a memorandum must be filed which certifies the depreciated value of the asset and indicates the method of disposal. Such methods may include, but are not limited to, the following:

2.4.1 Trade-in allowance - provided that an independent appraisal is conducted to determine the value, or an analysis is conducted which certifies that the sale price is fair and reasonable.

2.4.2 Use of other government agency-sponsored competitive auctions, such as a government agency-sponsored auction or a competitive public auction in the County of San Diego.

2.4.3 Competitive sale.

2.4.4 Negotiated sale.

2.4.5 Destruction

2.4.6 Trash
2.5 Competitive Sale. Under a competitive sale, the following procedures must be followed:

2.5.1 Notification to the public. This would include, at a minimum, the placing of an advertisement in a newspaper(s) of general circulation. The ad must specify the item(s) to be sold, the condition and the terms for the sale, and the date/time/place sealed bids are to be received.

2.5.2 All bids must be sealed.

2.5.3 Prospective bidders may be afforded an opportunity to view the item(s) being disposed.

2.5.4 Award. The award will be to the highest responsive, responsible bidder.

2.6 Negotiated Sale. Capital assets with an individual or aggregate value in excess of $100,000 may be disposed of on a negotiated sale basis provided a finding by the Transportation Committee by a two-thirds vote that special circumstances exist that make it in the best interest of SANDAG. Such circumstances may include the following:

2.6.1 Unique item(s) may have a limited resale market.

2.6.2 The financial interest of SANDAG would be best served by negotiation.

2.6.3 In the case of used buses, the Transportation Committee will give specific direction on the method of disposal to be followed on a case-by-case basis considering potential financial return and available alternatives, including the sale for scrap or other nonoperating purposes to avoid use of the vehicles and resultant air pollution in California and the San Diego region. A method of disposal may be approved even though the financial benefit may be less than other methods of disposal.

2.6.4 If approved, the Executive Director may be authorized to negotiate a sale price.

2.7 Ineligible Participants. SANDAG, NCTD, MTDB, SDTC, and SDTI employees, Board members and members of their immediate family may not participate in a competitive or negotiated sale of SANDAG capital assets.

2.8 Federal Grant Funded Assets. Capital assets which have been purchased with federal capital grant funds must be disposed of in a manner consistent with any applicable laws, including FTA regulations. The proceeds from such disposal will be distributed in the percent of which was provided for the original purchase if the per unit fair market value of the asset exceeds $5,000 unless fully depreciated.
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CONTINGENCY RESERVE POLICY

1. Purpose

SANDAG has historically relied upon budget savings to provide adequate fiscal flexibility to accommodate unavoidable and unanticipated costs. As SANDAG has taken on more responsibilities and funding sources have become more constrained, additional tools for managing financial fluctuations and risks are warranted. Establishing contingency reserves provides a means for dealing with emergency or high priority situations that may arise during the course of delivering projects or programs that could not otherwise be funded in the near-term.

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines for a contingency reserve, such as the required balance, allowable uses, required approvals, and method of replenishment. The nature of SANDAG’s work includes regional planning, capital project development, and regional operations. The guidelines established below coincide with the agency’s project and program needs as identified in the corresponding section of the annual Program Budget.

2. Scope

A. Regional Planning (Overall Work Program)

Contingency Reserve Fund Required Balance - The targeted minimum amount to be maintained in the Overall Work Program (OWP) reserve account shall be equal to 10 percent of total budgeted annual expenditures of the OWP. Total annual expenditures are defined as the amount of the OWP Expense Budget contained in the Revenue and Expense Summary chapter of the annual OWP. The year-end revenue and expense reconciliation process will include the amount necessary to replenish or increase the contingency reserve to achieve this minimum balance, unless explicitly approved otherwise by the Executive Committee.

Applicable Fund Sources - Local matching funds such as Transportation Development Act and TransNet, which are more discretionary in nature, will be used as the source to build and replenish this fund.

Qualifying Uses of the Reserve Fund – The Reserve Fund shall be used for one-time non-recurring purposes, unless otherwise approved by the Executive Committee. The following occurrences shall qualify as potential eligible uses, subject to individual approval by the Executive Committee:

a. opportunities to advance urgent, high-priority needs;

b. unanticipated needs relating to a crucial existing commitment; and

c. unforeseen withdrawal or cutback of a revenue source.
Approval for the Use of Reserve Funds - Each proposed use of the contingency reserve fund will be subject to approval by the SANDAG Executive Committee. Each request for approval will include the specific amount needed, a justification of the need, how the need fits the funding criteria, and a discussion of any other alternatives that were examined.

Replenishment of the Reserve Fund - Replenishment up to the minimum target of 10 percent will be planned in the budget process as needed and directed by the Board of Directors. Budgetary savings of discretionary funding will be transferred into the reserve fund to maintain the minimum target.

B. Capital Program

Project Level Contingency

Contingency Reserve Fund Required Balances – Capital projects vary in nature and shall have individual contingency reserve targets to address project risks. The annual SANDAG Program Budget shall identify contingency reserve funds for each SANDAG lead capital project.

Applicable Fund Sources – Each SANDAG lead capital project shall include a line item for contingency reserves as part of its approved budget using the fund sources associated with the project.

Qualifying Uses of the Reserve Funds – The contingency reserve funds shall be used in a manner appropriate to the project’s specified purposes including unanticipated costs in delivering the project or unforeseen withdrawal or cutback of a revenue source.

Approval for the Use of Reserve Funds - The proposed use of contingency reserve funds for capital projects will be authorized through the inclusion of the line item in the budget.

Replenishment of the Reserve Fund - Replenishment of capital project contingency reserves will correspond to the risks associated with the work. Should a project’s funds be exhausted and if opportunities to down scope the work are not available, the project will rely on new monies/revenue or the deferral of a future capital project.

TransNet Major Corridors Program Contingency Reserve

Contingency Reserve Fund Required Balances – In conjunction with the annual Program Budget update conjuncture with the annual Plan of Finance update, program level contingency will be calculated based on risk level and the size of the TransNet construction program.

Applicable Fund Sources — TransNet Major Corridor revenues will be used to fund the program contingency reserve.

Qualifying Uses of the Reserve Funds - The program contingency reserve funds shall be used in a manner appropriate to the project’s specified purposes which have not been included in the project budget.
Approval for the Use of Reserve Funds – The transfer of program contingency reserve funds into project budgets will be consistent with the current delegation of authority policies.

Replenishment of the Reserve Fund - Replenishment of program contingency reserves will correspond to the risks associated with the current and upcoming work. The annual Plan of Finance will confirm capacity to fund the program contingency reserve account at the level required by the risk assessment.

C. Regional Operations

Contingency Reserve Fund Required Balances – Operational programs vary in nature and shall have individual contingency reserve targets to address project risks. The annual SANDAG Program Budget shall identify contingency reserve funds for each Operations Program.

Applicable Fund Sources – Each Operations program shall directly fund its reserves through service fees or program revenue as applicable.

Qualifying Uses of the Reserve Funds – The reserve funds shall be used in a manner appropriate to the program’s specified purposes, including unanticipated costs in delivering or operating the project; or unforeseen withdrawal or cutback of a revenue source.

Approval for the Use of Reserve Funds - The proposed use of contingency reserve funds for each Operations program will be authorized through inclusion in the budget.

Replenishment of the Reserve Fund - Replenishment of operational program shall be provided through annual budgetary savings, service/member fees, or program revenue as applicable.
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Amended December 2006
Amended November 2014
Amended _____________
TransNet ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN RULES

The following rules have been adopted and amended by the SANDAG Board of Directors in its role as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). The purpose of these rules is to implement the provisions of the original TransNet Ordinance (87-1) and the TransNet Extension Ordinance (04-01) and amendments thereto.

Rule #1: Procedure for Distribution of Revenues for Transportation Services for Seniors and the Disabled

Adoption Date: February 26, 1988 (Resolution RC88-2)

Amendment: Repealed November 18, 2005. This rule was superseded by Rule #11.

Rule #2: Loan of Funds for Privately Funded Projects

Adoption Date: April 22, 1988 (Resolution RC88-5)

Amendment: Amended November 18, 2005

Text: The Commission may approve a loan of sales tax funds to a city or county from its formula-based share of Local Street and Road funds to finance a project which is prohibited from receiving funding under Section 9 of Commission Ordinance 87-1 or Section 8 of Ordinance 04-01 if the following terms and conditions are met.

1. A finding is made by the Commission that absent private sector funding, the project would be an eligible street and road project.

2. The City or County agrees to enter into an agreement to repay the loan plus interest (at a rate determined by the Commission) prior to the termination of the sales tax in accordance with Section 3 of Commission Ordinance 87-1 or Section 3 of Ordinance 04-01.

3. That the City or County agrees to guarantee repayment of the loan if private developer funding is determined to be inadequate to repay the loan prior to termination of the sales tax.

Rule #3: Reimbursement of Local Funds to Advance Approved Projects

Adoption Date: May 27, 1988 (Resolution RC88-6)

Amendment: Amended November 18, 2005

Text: A city or county may advance improvements on a project(s) which is included in the approved transportation sales tax Program of Projects with local agency funds (other than private developer funds as set forth in Section 9 of Ordinance 87-1 or Section 8 of Ordinance 04-01) prior to sales tax
funds being available and receive reimbursement including interest from sales tax funds if it is determined by the Commission that the following terms and conditions are met.

1. The project(s) is included in the approved transportation sales tax Program of Projects, and no other financing technique is found to be more desirable or cost effective to utilize in order to advance the improvement.

2. The city or county shall be reimbursed for the local funds expended as soon as sales tax funds become available, or on a schedule agreed to between the local agency and the Commission.

3. That no more than 30 percent of the funds will be used for maintenance projects if the funds are borrowed from TransNet revenues pursuant to Section 2(C)(1) of Ordinance 04-01.

Rule #4: SR 78 Corridor Reserve Fund Allocation Policies

Adoption Date: Originally Adopted May 26, 1989 (Resolution R-89-82), Wording changed December 14, 1990 (Resolution RC91-10)

Amendment: Amended November 18, 2005

Text: For purposes of allocating funds under Section 2(a)(3) in Ordinance 87-1:

1. Only those projects designated as “funded” on the SR 78 Corridor project list approved on December 13, 1990 by the SR 78 Corridor Policy Committee are eligible to receive SR 78 Corridor Reserve Funds.

2. The list of SR 78 Corridor projects and their priority and funding eligibility may be revised by a majority vote of the SR 78 Corridor Policy Committee and the approval of the Board of Directors.

3. The basic contribution for a non-Caltrans project on the SR 78 Corridor Reserve funded list is 50 percent of the estimated right-of-way, engineering, and construction costs. However, the total amount of Corridor Reserve Funds designated for projects within one jurisdiction may be allocated to vary from the basic 50 percent for any given project as long as the cumulative total for programmed projects at any point in time does not exceed 50 percent.

4. The basic contribution for a Caltrans project on the SR 78 Corridor Reserve funded list is 100 percent of the estimated right-of-way, engineering, and construction costs.

5. Contributions from the SR 78 Corridor Reserve Fund to any one jurisdiction cannot exceed 50 percent (100 percent for Caltrans) of the project cost estimates shown on the approved funded list of December 13, 1990. If actual project costs are less than estimated, a maximum contribution of 50 percent (100 percent for Caltrans) of the new costs shall be in effect.

6. A project that for any reason is removed from the funded list can only be replaced by the next highest ranked unfunded project (or projects), regardless of jurisdiction and only if the funded list of projects does not exceed the total Corridor Reserve dollars available. As with other funded projects, Corridor Reserve funds can only be used to improve the replacement project(s) to minimal four-lane standards (six lanes at freeway interchanges).
Added June 22, 1990 (Resolution RC90-40):

7. SR 78 Corridor Reserve funds for right-of-way will not be encumbered until a project has environmental clearance and the first 25 percent of the total value of the right-of-way is acquired. When a total of 75 percent of the right-of-way has been acquired, the construction funds will be encumbered at the request of the agency.

Added December 14, 1990 (Resolution RC91-10):

8. All agencies submitting projects from the SR 78 Corridor Funded Project List for programming are encouraged to pursue matching funds from the state’s SB 300 program.

Added February 22, 1991 (Resolution RC91-13):

9. Any new source of state highway funds for the San Diego region should be considered for allocation to the TransNet SR 78 Corridor Reserve to offset local funds which were used for projects which are normally the responsibility of the State, such as freeway-freeway interchange improvements and ramp metering systems.

Rule #5: Use of Local Street and Road TransNet Funds for the Development of Transportation Demand Management Programs

Adoption Date: August 25, 1989 (Resolution RC90-23)

Amendment: Amended November 18, 2005

Text: The development and implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Program shall be an eligible use of Local Street and Road funds pursuant to Section 19(E) of Ordinance 87-1 and Section 21(c) of Ordinance 04-01. Transportation Demand Management shall mean a comprehensive set of strategies designed to influence travel behavior with respect to mode, time, frequency, route, or distance in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of local streets and roads. Principal strategy measures involve, but are not limited to, ridesharing, alternative work hours, and parking management.

Rule #6: Fund Accounting and Interest Allocation

Adoption Date: March 23, 1990 (Resolution RC90-35)


Text: For the purposes of determining compliance with Section 12 of Ordinance 87-1 and Section 13 of Ordinance 04-01, each agency shall maintain a separate fund (fund accounting) for TransNet revenues, if possible. Where the creation of a separate fund is not possible due to accounting methodology used by the agency, an alternative approach to maintaining separate accountability for TransNet revenue and expenditures must be developed and submitted to the Commission staff for concurrence. Interest earned on TransNet revenues received by the agency must be allocated to the TransNet fund and used only for projects approved by the Commission in the Program of Projects. Except as allowed below for the Local Street and Road Program and Transit System Service Improvements Program, interest accrued must be applied to each active project that carries an
outstanding balance. The agency can determine the method of the interest distribution to be validated by the audit.

For the Local Street and Road Program and Transit System Service Improvements Program that receive annual funding allocations, interest accrued may be pooled and must be applied to one or more active projects in accordance with the RTIP process. All interest earned on Local Street and Road Programs is subject to Section 2.C.1. of Ordinance 04-01.

**Rule #7: Program of Projects Approval Process and Amendments**

**Adoption Date:** March 23, 1990 (Resolution RC90-35)


**Text:** Each local agency shall develop a five-year list of projects to be funded with TransNet revenues under Section 2D of Ordinance 87-1 and Section 4D of Ordinance 04-01 in accordance with the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) update schedule. All projects a local agency wishes to include in its Program of Projects (POP) must be consistent with the long-range Regional Transportation Plan and approved by the Commission for inclusion in the RTIP. A local agency’s projects shall not receive Commission approval until the Commission receives a resolution from the local agency that documents that the local agency held a noticed public hearing with an agenda item that clearly identified the proposed list of projects prior to approval by the local agency’s legislative body of the projects. The language that must be included in the resolution and the deadlines for submission shall be prescribed by the Commission. The resolution shall contain the provisions set forth in Rule #15.

A POP amendment shall be initiated when a local agency desires to revise the approved POP, which includes but is not limited to, adding a new project, deleting an existing project, revising the project scope, or otherwise changing the TransNet funds programmed. A TransNet POP amendment must be consistent with the requirements outlined in the RTIP. Projects proposed in the amendment must first be approved by the governing body of the local agency within the preceding 12 months. The local agency shall initiate the amendment process by holding a noticed public hearing with an agenda item that clearly identifies the proposed project amendments and submitting a resolution using the language and deadlines prescribed by the Commission as documentation of governing body approval. The amendment must be approved by the Commission prior to the expenditure of funds on the new or amended projects.

**Rule #8: Determination of New Transit Services**

**Adoption Date:** March 23, 1990 (Resolution RC90-35)

**Amendment:** Amended November 18, 2005

**Text:** For the purpose of determining compliance with Section 4(B)(2)(c) of Ordinance 87-1, the level of service provided in FY 1988 shall be considered at the base level of service in existence prior to the availability of TransNet revenues which must be maintained through other funding sources. Compliance with the “new” service requirement shall be determined using the following procedure:
1. Determine the number of vehicle service miles operated during the fiscal year using TransNet revenues for any given operator by dividing the TransNet revenues for operations by the total systemwide operating cost for that operator and multiplying the total vehicle service miles operated by the quotient.

2. Subtract the number of miles determined in Step 1 from the total system vehicle service miles operated during the year.

3. If the adjusted number of miles from Step 2 is greater than or equal to the FY 1988 base level, then the compliance test is met.

4. The attached table of base statistics from FY 1988 (Attachment 1) will be used to determine compliance. These figures reflect all publicly funded operators within the MTDB (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) service areas (Articles 4, 4.5, and 8) because TransNet revenues could potentially be used by the operators to fund service improvements on any of these systems.

**Rule #9: Use of TransNet Revenue for Bus Purchases**

**Adoption Date:** March 23, 1990 (Resolution RC90-35)

**Amendment:** Amended November 18, 2005

**Text:** TransNet revenues may be used to support the purchase of buses required to operate new services funded with TransNet revenues. The number of buses which can be purchased with TransNet revenues shall be determined using the following procedures.

1. Determine the number of annual new vehicle service miles service being operated in accordance with Rule Number 8 – Determination of New Transit Services.

2. Divide the number of new miles of service by the systemwide average annual vehicle services miles per bus for a given operator to determine the equivalent number of buses required to operate the new service. Round up to the nearest whole number of bus equivalents.

The TransNet revenues used for bus purchases shall come out of the revenues available under Section 4(B)(2)(c) of Ordinance 87-1. The use of TransNet revenues for bus purchases shall be used to the maximum extent possible as matching funds for available state and federal capital funds. If, at some point in the future, the number of buses purchased with TransNet revenues cannot be justified based on the number of new miles being operated with TransNet revenues, then a pro-rated reimbursement to the TransNet fund will be required based on the remaining useful life of the vehicles. TransNet revenues may not be used to support the purchase of replacement buses for the “existing” (FY 1988) level of service. Any buses purchased with TransNet revenues will remain under the ownership of MTDB (MTS) or NCTD and be made available to the operator chosen to operate the new services.

**Rule #10: Use of TransNet Revenues to Replace Reduced State and Federal Operating Support**

**Adoption Date:** March 23, 1990 (Resolution RC90-35)

**Amendment:** Amended November 18, 2005
Text: For purposes of determining compliance with Section 4(B)(2)(c) of Ordinance 87-1, the maximum amount of TransNet funds that MTDB (MTS) or NCTD are eligible to use to replace federal funds in a given year is equal to the FY 1987 base year levels of federal and state operating support ($6,113,307 for MTS and $2,511,816 for NCTD) less the amount of state and federal operating support available in that year. The priority on the use of funds under this section is to provide new service improvements. MTS and NCTD are encouraged to use other available revenues, such as Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds, to offset reductions in state and federal funds, if possible, and to use TransNet funds under these sections for new service improvements.

Rule #11: Use of TransNet Revenues for Transportation Services for Seniors and the Disabled

Adoption Date: March 23, 1990 (Resolution RC90-35)

Amendment: Amended November 18, 2005, and December 21, 2007

Text: The funds made available under Section 4(B)(1) of Ordinance 87-1 or Section 4(c)(1) of Ordinance 04-01 for improved transportation services for seniors and the disabled shall be used to augment the revenues made available under the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4.5 program for the same purposes. These TransNet funds shall be allocated to eligible service providers using the fund distribution formula approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors for use in distributing the TDA Article 4.5 funds. For accounting purposes, following the expenditure of fare revenues and other local and other local operating revenues, the interest earnings on the TransNet and TDA funds shall be considered to be spent first, followed by the TDA funds, then the TransNet funds.

Rule #12: Use of TransNet Revenues for Accessibility Improvements

Adoption Date: March 23, 1990 (Resolution RC90-35)

Text: In the development of TransNet-funded local street and road projects, local jurisdictions may include, within the street right-of-way, improvements to enhance accessibility to the transportation system, including, but not limited to, accessibility improvements to bus stop areas.

Rule #13: Investments

Adoption Date: July 27, 1990 (Resolution RC91-2)

Amendment: Repealed November 18, 2005. This rule has been superseded by the Annual Investment Policy Update (see Resolution No. 2006-06 approved at the September 23, 2005, SANDAG Board of Directors meeting).

Rule #14: Capital Equipment Acquisition Loans to SANDAG

Adoption Date: November 16, 1990 (Resolution RC91-6)

Text: The loan of unused administrative allocations from TransNet funds to SANDAG for the purpose of acquiring office and computer equipment is authorized when lower cost financing is not available. The repayment schedule shall be based upon funding authorized in the SANDAG-approved budget
and will include interest at a rate equal to the interest earning rate of the San Diego County Pooled Money Fund.

**Rule #15: Local Agency Hold Harmless Agreements**

**Adoption Date:** October 25, 1992 (Resolution RC92-7)

**Text:** Each local agency shall be required to hold harmless and defend the Commission against challenges related to local TransNet projects. This rule is to be implemented by requiring that each local agency agree in its resolution approving its projects for TransNet funding to hold the Commission harmless.

**Rule #16: Repayment of Commercial Paper Program Proceeds**

**Adoption Date:** September 23, 2005

**Amendment:** Amended November 18, 2005, and October 25, 2013

**Text:** Each agency receiving proceeds from the TransNet Commercial Paper Program shall be responsible for its proportionate share of the ongoing interest and related administrative costs from the date the proceeds are received until the principal amount of the loan is fully repaid. Repayment of the principal amount shall commence within three years of the agency’s receipt of the proceeds and shall be completed within five years of the agency’s receipt of the proceeds. Unless otherwise prohibited by law or regulation, repayment of the proceeds may be accomplished by rolling the outstanding amount into a long-term bond issue during the five-year repayment period. In such cases, the agency would then be responsible for its proportionate share of the bond issuance costs and annual debt service costs. The repayment of debt, in all cases, is the first priority on the use of the agency’s share of annual TransNet revenues.

**Rule #17: Fiscal and Compliance Audits**

**Adoption Date:** November 18, 2005


**Text:**

I. Fiscal and Compliance Audit Procedures

The fiscal and compliance audit is an essential tool to determine that TransNet funds are being used for the intended purposes. The Commission has the fiduciary responsibility to ensure that the public funds are used in accordance with the TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plans (87-01 and 04-01).

Pursuant to the TransNet Extension Ordinance (04-01), the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) is responsible for the conduct of an annual fiscal audit and compliance audit of all TransNet-funded activities beginning with the FY 2009 audit. In order to complete the audits in a timely manner, the following audit schedule is set forth:
A. July/August: ITOC designee and appropriate SANDAG staff coordinate with the auditors to review the audits required for the year and provide all necessary documentation/information for the auditors to begin work.

B. September to November: Auditors schedule and perform site visits. Recipient agencies must be ready and available to meet with the auditors and provide requested financial schedules and other information necessary for the completion of the audit.

C. December 1 (required deadline): Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) expenditure plan and financial records must be submitted for a review and audit.

D. November/December: Auditors issue preliminary draft reports to both SANDAG and the recipient agencies no later than December 31. Recipient agencies must be available to review and comment on the draft report in a timely manner. All outstanding issues should be resolved within four weeks of preliminary draft report issuance.

E. March: Auditors issue a report of compliance audit results and present to ITOC at its March meeting. ITOC presents initial finding(s) of the audit and its recommendations to the Transportation Committee.

F. May: ITOC issues all compliance reports and adopts the annual report.

G. June: The ITOC annual report, which includes results of the annual audit and its process, is presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

ITOC Responsibility: In accordance with the ITOC Responsibilities Section of the attachment to Commission Ordinance CO-04-01 entitled “STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE FOR THE TRANSNET PROGRAM,” ITOC will conduct an annual fiscal and compliance audit of all TransNet-funded activities using the services of an independent fiscal auditor to assure compliance with the voter-approved Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, and will prepare an annual report for presentation to the SANDAG Board of Directors that includes the results of the annual audit process.

SANDAG Responsibility: SANDAG will provide all information necessary to complete the audit.

Agency Responsibility: All agencies must be ready for the site visit, provide requested information, and review and comment on the draft reports in a timely manner.

If the auditor is unable to complete the audit for initial draft acceptance by the ITOC (per Rule #17(I)(E)), because an agency was not ready or did not provide the required information or reviews in a timely manner, then the agency will be deemed in noncompliance of the Ordinance. SANDAG will withhold future TransNet payments (except for required debt service payments) until the audit draft is completed and accepted by the ITOC.

II. Ordinance Requirements

Section 4(C)(5) of the TransNet Extension Ordinance contains the fiscal and compliance audit requirements applicable beginning in FY 2009.
Section 8 of the Ordinance contains the Maintenance of Effort requirements for the local agencies.

Section 9 of the Ordinance and the attachment “TransNet EXTENSION REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM” contain the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) requirements for the local agencies.

Section 11 of the Ordinance and the attachment to Commission Ordinance CO-04-01 entitled “STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE FOR THE TRANSNET PROGRAM” contains the ITOC spending requirements.

Section 12 of the Ordinance contains the Administrative Expenses requirements for SANDAG.

III. Audit Adjustments

The audit identifies the status of each project funded with TransNet funds – i.e., completed projects, projects that have negative balances, inactive projects, and ongoing projects. The agencies are responsible to work with the auditors to make proper adjustments as follows:

A. This section applies to funding allocated for the specified projects under the Highway and Transit Programs under Ordinance 87-1, including funding allocated for bicycle facility improvements. Under the TransNet Extension (Ordinance 04-01), this section applies to the Major Corridor funding – Section 4(A) and (B) and the four discretionary programs: (1) Transit Senior program – Section 4(C)(2); (2) Local Environmental Mitigation program – Section 4(D)(2); (3) Local Smart Growth Incentive program – Section 4(D)(3); and (4) Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety Program – Section 2(E).

1. Completed projects: once a project is identified as completed and there are TransNet funds remaining with that project, the agency is required to return the money back to the program. After the fiscal audit determines that the project has been completed, SANDAG will transmit a letter to the agency to return the unexpended funds, including any unexpended interest earned, to the Commission. The agency must remit the balance within 60 days of the letter. Should an agency fail to respond in a timely manner, all future TransNet payments (including funds from the other programs) to that agency will be suspended until the funds are returned.

2. Projects with negative balances: if a project ending balance is negative, then a footnote should be provided detailing the subsequent year’s intended action.

3. Inactive projects: if a project has had no activity over a period of two audits, the agency must either close out the project or note when the project will be completed (see Board Policy No. 035 for project completion deadlines and other Competitive Grant Program Procedures). Closed projects should no longer show in the following year’s audit and any funds remaining must be returned to SANDAG (see instructions in Section III(A)(1)).

B. This section applies to funding allocated for the specified projects under the Local Street and Road Formula Program (Section 4(C) of Ordinance 87-1 and Section 4(D)(1) of Ordinance 04-01) and Transit Funding (Section 4(B) of Ordinance 87-1 and Sections 4(C)(1), 4(C)(3), and 4(C)(4) of Ordinance 04-01).
1. Completed projects: once a project is identified as completed and there are TransNet funds remaining with that project, the agency is required to transfer the unexpended principal balance to another TransNet-eligible project (projects included in the approved Program of Projects and in accordance with Section 2(C)(1) of the Ordinance 04-01 for Local Street and Road Formula projects) while the interest may be so transferred or pooled in accordance with Rule #6. The audit should make note to which project the principal funds will be transferred. Completed projects should no longer show in the following year’s audit.

2. Projects with negative balances: if a project ending balance is negative, then a footnote should be provided detailing the subsequent year’s intended action.

3. Inactive projects: if a project has had no activity over a period of two audits, other than interest earnings, the agency must either close out the project or note when the project will be completed. Closed projects should no longer show in the following year’s audit. Any remaining TransNet funds must be transferred to another TransNet-eligible project (projects included in the approved Program of Projects and in accordance with Section 2(C)(1) of the Ordinance 04-01 for Local Street and Road Formula projects).

4. Transfer of funds: any transfer of TransNet funds from one project to another requires the local agency to provide documentation that its governing body consents to the transfer proposed prior to or concurrent with the final issuance of the annual fiscal and compliance audit. Such documentation shall consist of a signed staff report or resolution. Transfers that require an amendment to the RTIP must follow the amendment process outlined in Rule #7. Transfers between Local Street and Road Formula projects are subject to Rule #18.

IV. Local Agency Balance Limitations

Based on the audit, an agency that maintains a balance of more than 30 percent of its annual apportionment (after debt service payments) must use the remaining balance to fund projects. SANDAG will defer payment until the recipient agency’s Director of Finance, or equivalent, submits to SANDAG a certification that the unused balance has fallen below the 30 percent threshold, and will remain below the threshold until such time that a new threshold is determined.

V. Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audit Report to the Board

Pursuant to the TransNet Extension Ordinance, beginning with the FY 2009 audits, ITOC is responsible for the annual fiscal and compliance audit of all TransNet-funded activities.

Rule #18: Local Street and Road Program

Adoption Date: June 23, 2006

Amendment: Amended July 24, 2009

Text: As specified in Section 2(C)(1) of the Ordinance 04-01, at least 70 percent of the revenues provided for local street and road purposes should be used for congestion relief purposes and no more than 30 percent for maintenance purposes. Grade separation projects are identified in Section 2(C)(1) of Ordinance 04-01 as projects that qualify as congestion relief projects. Attachment 2 provides a set of guidelines to be used in the implementation of this 30 percent maintenance limitation
beginning with the 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) update. These guidelines apply to the programming of all available local TransNet funding (annual formula funds and prior year original TransNet carry-over balances) beginning with July 1, 2008 (Fiscal Year 2008-09).

It is the intent of this Section that over the life of Ordinance 04-01, local agencies do not cumulatively use more than 30 percent of the revenues for maintenance-related projects.

**Rule #19: Conflict of Interest for ITOC Representatives**

**Adoption Date:** December 15, 2006

**Text:** The Board intends to make every effort to ensure the representatives selected to serve on the Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC) are free from any bias that would interfere with objective decision making by the ITOC. The Conflict of Interest section of the “Statement of Understanding Regarding the Implementation of the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for the TransNet Program,” which is part of the TransNet Extension Ordinance, states in part: “ITOC members shall not have direct commercial interest or employment with any public or private entity, which receives TransNet sales tax funds authorized by this Ordinance.” The Board interprets this language to impose the same level of restrictions on the ITOC representatives as those that apply to SANDAG Board members pursuant to California state law found at Government Code sections 87100 et seq. and 1090 et seq.

**Rule #20: Selection Procedures for ITOC Representatives**

**Adoption Date:** December 21, 2007

**Text:** The “Statement of Understanding Regarding the Implementation of the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for the TransNet Program,” which is part of the TransNet Extension Ordinance, Section 3 under the heading “Membership and Selection Process” of that document states that a Selection Committee shall be established to select the ITOC members from the list of qualified candidates recommended by the technical screening committee. The Selection Committee is to consist of two members of the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors; the Mayor of the City of San Diego; and a mayor from each of the four subregions. It is the mayors from each of the subregions that are to select from among themselves to sit on the Selection Committee, not the representatives who sit on the Board who may or may not be a mayor. The members of the Selection Committee who are mayors from the subregions shall serve for a period of two years or until the designee no longer holds the office of mayor. At the end of this term, the mayors from the affected subregion(s) shall either inform the Clerk of the SANDAG Board that the same representative is being redesignated or identify the new mayor who they have selected to represent their subregion on the Selection Committee.

**Rule #21: Accommodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians**

**Adoption Date:** February 22, 2008

**Text:** Adequate provisions for bicycle and pedestrian travel is determined within the context of the roadway type, its existing and planned surrounding land uses, existing bicycle and pedestrian plans, and current or planned public transit service. When addressing the access needs dictated by land use, the responsible agency must consider demand created by current and expected land uses
(as determined by the local general plan) within the useful life of the *TransNet* project. The table Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures provides a guide to appropriate accommodation measures for each transportation facility type and land use context. In the table, “urban” means within the urbanized area as defined by U.S. Census Bureau.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Urban Highway**         | • Required facility type will be based on the recommendations for any regional bikeway corridors in urban highway alignments developed through the 2007 Regional Bicycle Plan. Pending completion of this plan, appropriate bicycle accommodation will be developed on a project by project basis by local and regional authorities in consultation with appropriate stakeholders.  
  • Freeways and freeway interchanges may not eliminate existing bikeways or preclude planned bikeways on local streets and roads. |  
  • Continuous sidewalks and marked crosswalks through freeway interchanges where sidewalks exist or are planned on the intersecting roadway.  
  • Where new freeway construction severs existing pedestrian access, grade separated pedestrian crossings with no more than 0.3 mile between crossings. |
| **Transit Project**       | • Bicycle lockers and racks at stations sufficient to meet normal expected demand.  
  • Bicycle access to all transit vehicles except those providing exclusive paratransit service to the disabled as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act.  
  • Transit priority measures on roadways may not prevent bicycle access. |  
  • Direct sidewalk connections between station platforms and adjacent roadway sidewalks.  
  • Pedestrian crossings where a new transit way severs existing pedestrian access with no more than 0.3 miles between crossings. |
| **Major Urban Street**    | • Class 2 bike lanes                                                             |  
  • Continuous sidewalks or pathways\(^2\), both sides of the street with marked crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections.  
  • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street</td>
<td>• Class 2 bike lanes</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways² both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(design speed &gt;35 mph)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways² both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street</td>
<td>• Shared roadway. Where planned</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways² both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(design speed ≤ 35 mph)</td>
<td>average daily motor vehicle traffic exceeds 6,500, the</td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside travel lane should be at least 14 feet wide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Local Street</td>
<td>• Shared roadway</td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways² both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Highway</td>
<td>• Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not required with no fronting uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fronting uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Collector Road</td>
<td>• Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>• Not required with 85th percentile speeds ≤ 25 mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fronting uses and 85th percentile speeds &gt; 25 mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Local Road</td>
<td>• Minimum 6-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>• Not required with 85th percentile speeds ≤ 25 mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fronting uses and 85th percentile speeds &gt; 25 mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application of these accommodation measures is subject to sound planning and engineering judgment to ensure the facility is reasonable and appropriate within the land use and transportation context of the overall project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved pathways of decomposed granite or other suitable material that are set back from the roadway where feasible would be considered appropriate only on roads serving areas that are rural in nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where a local jurisdiction has a bicycle or pedestrian master plan adopted by the city council or Board of Supervisors and approved by SANDAG, the local agency may use that plan to determine the appropriate means of accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians in a given project and at a minimum provide the facilities called for in the plan. These plans must be updated and approved no less than every five years to qualify as a means of satisfying this provision.

**Best Available Standards.** All bicycle facilities must be designed to the standards established in the California Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000. Bicycle parking facilities should conform to the guidelines established in the Regional Bicycle Plan adopted by SANDAG. Shared roadways on collector streets should have a curb lane or curb lane plus shoulder that measures at least 14 feet. Where parallel parking is in place, consideration should be given to installing the shared lane pavement marker. All sidewalks must be designed consistent with the design standards established in the AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities, the Department of State Architect's California Access Compliance Reference Manual, and the U.S. Department of Transportation ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG). Consistency with the design recommendations in SANDAG's *Planning and Designing for Pedestrians* is encouraged.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation in Reconstruction Projects.** Street and road reconstruction is the time to re-evaluate the function of a road and its context, and to reallocate the right-of-way if appropriate to meet the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. An agency is not required to acquire additional right of way to improve bicycle and pedestrian access. However, the agency should consider reduced motor vehicle lanes and lane widths, and reduced median widths as a means of providing the appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facility. While such an evaluation is recommended for reconstruction projects of any size, compliance with these guidelines is required for “major” reconstruction projects meeting the definitions established under Rule 18 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031 regarding the guidelines for implementing the “70/30” requirement.

**When Provisions for Bicyclists and Pedestrians Accommodation May Be Excluded.** Section 4(E)(3) is based on the premise that pedestrians and bicyclists need safe and convenient access to the same destinations as other users of the public right of way. Consequently, those portions of the transportation network where pedestrians and bicyclists need not be accommodated are the exception, and the decision not to provide for them in a construction or major reconstruction project must be made by the responsible agency for good cause such as severe topographic or biological constraints. Any impacts on the roadway’s motor vehicle capacity that result from providing for pedestrian and bicycle access would not, in themselves, justify excluding bicycle and pedestrian facilities. However, these impacts and their mitigation costs should be considered in determining if the cost of providing the facilities is disproportionate to the probable use.
This provision only requires an agency to provide appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facilities that are within the construction or reconstruction area of the project. Consideration of the provision of sidewalks as part of major rehabilitation roadway projects involving only new pavement overlays of 1-inch thickness or greater (see Rule 18 under Board Policy 031) on streets where sidewalks do not currently exist would only be required if curb, gutter, and related drainage facilities were already in place.

The cost of providing for bicycle and pedestrian access can vary significantly relative to the overall project cost. For this reason, specifying a proportional or absolute limit on spending for bicycle or pedestrian improvements relative to probable use would not allow the kind of discretion necessary to make a significant investment in facilities when necessary, or to withhold an investment when the benefits are marginal. Therefore, the decision to exclude accommodations for bicyclist and pedestrians must be a policy-level decision made by the Board or city council based on the body of information about context, cost, and probable use available at the time. Such a decision must be made in the public hearing required by Section 5(A) of the Ordinance.

Pedestrian Access. Sidewalks or other walkways may be excluded from a project when it can be demonstrated that there are no uses (including bus stops) that would create demand for pedestrian access. In making this determination, the agency must consider the potential for future demand within the useful life of the project. Access to and from public transit, including crossing improvements, also must be considered and accommodated where there is existing or planned transit service.

Bicycle Access. A new project or major reconstruction project may not include the expected bikeway treatment when a suitable parallel route with the appropriate accommodations exists that would require no more than ¼-mile total out of direction travel.

Procedures for Excluding Accommodations for Pedestrians and Bicyclists from Projects. When an agency determines not to include bicycle or pedestrian accommodations in a project because the cost of doing so would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use, the agency must include a notice of that decision in the notice of the public hearing required by Sections 5(A) and Section 6 of the Ordinance. In submitting the project to SANDAG for inclusion in the TransNet Program of Projects as part of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process, the agency must notify SANDAG that bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, as described in Table 1 or in its bicycle or pedestrian master plan, will not be included in the project along with written justification for that decision. The decision and justification is subject to review and comment by SANDAG through the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, which would forward its comments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee also would review and comment on such projects as part of its role in the RTIP process. The Transportation Committee in approving the TransNet Program of Projects must make a finding that the local decision not to provide bicycle or pedestrian facilities is consistent with the provisions of this Ordinance prior to approving the project for funding under the TransNet Program. If this consistency finding is not made, the agency would have the opportunity to revise its fund programming request for consideration in a future RTIP amendment.

Effective Implementation. This rule will be effective for projects added to the TransNet Program of Projects subsequent to their adoption by the SANDAG Board of Directors. Within three years of their adoption, the rule will be re-evaluated by SANDAG to ensure they are effectively encouraging
provision of a balance transportation network without imposing an excessive cost burden on projects funded under the program.

**Rule #22: TransNet Extension Ordinance Maintenance of Effort (MOE) base level implementation guidelines**

**Adoption Date:** March 28, 2008

**Text:** Section 8 of the Extension Ordinance provides guidelines regarding the MOE base level calculation and implementation.

Section 8 of the Extension Ordinance states the intended purpose of the MOE requirement is to ensure that revenues provided from TransNet be used to augment, not supplant, existing local revenue. Some flexibility in accounting for spikes in expenditures would be consistent with the intent of ensuring that the local agencies do not supplant local funds with TransNet funds. Therefore, one-time expenditures that were a result of “banking” general fund monies and subsequently expending those funds during the base period Fiscal Years 2001 – 2003 may be isolated and removed so that the MOE is representative of a normal annual spending level, subject to review by the ITOC and approval by the Board of Directors.

In addition, the language in Section 8 of the Extension Ordinance states the MOE will be determined on the basis of “discretionary funds expended for street and road purposes...as was reported in the State Controller’s Annual Report of Financial Transactions for Streets and Roads.” The Extension Ordinance also states “the MOE also shall apply to any local agency discretionary funds being used for the other purposes specified under Section 4.” Based on this language, the MOE levels are to be established separately for each category in Section 4 of the Ordinance: major highway and transit congestion relief projects; transit programs to support seniors and disabled persons; specialized transportation services for seniors; monthly transit passes for seniors, disabled, and youth riders; transit operations; local streets and roads; habitat-related mitigation costs of local transportation projects; and the smart growth incentive program. The annual audits of the MOE expenditure requirement will report the expenditures for each of these separate categories.

**Rule #23: Application of TransNet Extension Ordinance Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) Requirements**

**Adoption Date:** July 10, 2009

**Amendment:** Amended January 22, 2010, and November 19, 2010, and ____ 2018

A. Section 9 of Ordinance 04-01 provides that starting on July 1, 2008, each local agency in the San Diego region shall contribute $2,000 in exactions from the private sector, for each newly constructed residential housing unit in that jurisdiction to the RTCIP. Each agency is required to establish its own collection program, known as its RTCIP Funding Program. Each jurisdiction is required to either establish a new Fund for the RTCIP or to set up accounts specific to the RTCIP for tracking purposes. Interest earned on RTCIP revenues received by the jurisdiction must be allocated to the RTCIP Fund.

B. Local agencies, SANDAG staff, hired auditors, and the Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC) are subject to the timelines set forth in Rule #17, Section I (Fiscal and
Compliance Audit Procedures) in this Board Policy, Ordinance 04-01, and the attachment to Ordinance 04-01 entitled “REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM” (RTCIP Attachment). Section 9 of Ordinance 04-01 states that any local agency that does not provide its “full” RTCIP contribution in a given fiscal year will not be eligible to receive funding for local streets and roads for the immediately following fiscal year. It further provides that any funding not allocated under 4(D)(1) as a result of this requirement shall be reallocated to the remaining local agencies that are in compliance with Section 9. This Rule #23 is intended to provide clarification regarding how this language will be implemented.

1. By June 30 of each year, which is the last day of SANDAG’s fiscal year, each local agency must record as revenue, the full amount of each RTCIP exaction due for any new residential unit subject to the RTCIP within its jurisdiction. This means that if the RTCIP exaction is not yet collected, the local agency should invoice, but does not need to collect all of the RTCIP exactions due in a given fiscal year by June 30. Each local agency may choose when the exaction is due, but in no event can the local agency allow a residential unit subject to the RTCIP to be occupied by a resident prior to receipt of the RTCIP exaction. The local agency must record the revenue in the fiscal year the exaction is due according to its Funding Program or when the revenue is received, whichever occurs first.

2. Section G(4) of the RTCIP Attachment states that each local agency shall have up to, but no more than seven years after receipt of the revenue to expend the revenues on Regional Arterial System or regional transportation infrastructure projects. To ensure consistency in implementation, this provision shall mean that the seven-year term shall begin on the July 1 following the date on which the local agency recorded the exaction as revenue or received the revenue, whichever occurred first. If it is not spent within seven years it will be subject to the reallocation process in Section G(4) of the RTCIP Attachment.

3. Pursuant to Ordinance 09-01, which amended Ordinance 04-01, the audit reports for all RTCIP Funding Programs are to be completed by June of the fiscal year immediately following the end of the fiscal year being audited. If during the audit process it is determined that a local agency failed to collect the full amount of exactions due under its Funding Program, the local agency may cure the defect by recording the amount due as an account receivable for the fiscal year being audited and avoid losing its TransNet funding. If the local agency has already closed out its books for the fiscal year being audited by the time the RTCIP audit discloses the defect, the local agency may record the revenue and cure the defect in the current fiscal year in order to avoid losing its TransNet funding. The seven-year period discussed in Section B(2) of this Rule will commence from the fiscal year in which the revenue is recorded if this latter situation occurs.

4. The following exceptions will be permitted to the requirement that each local agency record as revenue, the full amount of each RTCIP exaction due for any new residential unit subject to the RTCIP within its jurisdiction by the June 30 deadline. These exceptions are permissible because the purpose of the RTCIP exactions is to mitigate residential traffic impacts on the regional transportation infrastructure. If a new unit subject to the RTCIP is not occupied this impact does not occur.

   a. If litigation, bankruptcy, or other similar situation occurs that delays occupation of a new residential unit pending resolution by the courts or another body assigned to resolve the
dispute, and the local agency has invoiced, but been unable to collect amounts due under its Funding Program, the local agency may delay recording the account receivable until the outcome is known or the unit is occupied, whichever occurs first. The local agency shall provide documentation to the auditor establishing litigation, bankruptcy, etc. has occurred that has precluded the local agency from collecting the exaction.

b. If a local agency records an RTCIP exaction as revenue and subsequently determines that the amount is uncollectible (i.e., the developer never completes the project or goes bankrupt), the local agency may write-off the RTCIP exaction until such time, if ever, the unit is occupied and subject to the RTCIP. The local agency shall provide documentation to the auditor establishing that the write-off was justified.

5. Due to the timeline for completion of RTCIP audits, it may be up to one year after the fiscal year being audited has ended before ITOC adopts a final report that includes a finding that a local agency failed to provide the full amount of RTCIP exactions due under its Funding Program. During this interim audit period, SANDAG will make the payments due to local agencies for local streets and roads pursuant to Section 4(D)(1) of Ordinance 04-01 in good faith by presuming that the audit will establish each local agency is in compliance. If, however, the audit establishes a local agency did not provide its full monetary contribution under the RTCIP and the local agency does not cure defects of which it was notified by the time the audit is finalized and adopted by the ITOC, then the local agency will have forfeited its Section 4(D)(1) contribution. Any amount paid to the local agency in the fiscal year following the year that was the subject of the audit will be retroactively owed to the Commission. SANDAG will deduct any such amount, with interest at the monthly Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) rate. This amount will be deducted from the local agency annual allocation during the next fiscal year in which the local agency is eligible for Section 4(D)(1) funding.

C. The purpose of the RTCIP’s requirement that each local agency have a Funding Program is “to provide additional revenue to fund those facility and service improvements on the Regional Arterial System necessitated by development of newly constructed residences.” If a new unit will have a lower impact on the Regional Arterial System (RAS) than a typical residential unit, then it is unlikely to necessitate facility and service improvements on the RAS. The Board has determined that a nursing home, home for the aged, assisted living facility, or similar institutional unit (“institutional unit”) is not the type of unit the RTCIP was intended to cover. Local agencies are not required to charge for a new institutional unit for purposes of compliance with the Ordinance’s RTCIP Funding Program requirements when the local agency documents that it has made the following findings prior to issuance of a final certificate of occupancy:

1. The individual unit will not have both a bathroom and permanent built-in kitchen facilities equipped with a cooking range, refrigerator, and sink; and

2. The principal reason a person will live in the unit is because the person needs medical and/or nursing care; and

3. The unit will cause a lower impact on the RAS than a typical residential unit in a similar location; and
4. The local agency has required that the developer agree that the unit in substance will be used as health care facility rather than as a residence.

Additionally, the Ordinance exempts specified development types from the Funding Program requirements. One such exemption applies to “Guest Dwellings”, which shall mean not more than one attached or detached residential dwelling unit, accessory structure, or accessory dwelling unit on the same parcel as an existing single-family dwelling which provides independent living facilities for one or more persons.

D. Section G(2) of the TransNet EXTENSION REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, as amended on July 24, 2009, states that ‘each jurisdiction must submit its Funding Program documents, including an expenditure plan and financial records pertaining to its Funding Program, to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for a review and audit by December 1 of each year beginning December 1, 2009.

\[\text{Footnote: All references to “unit” in these criteria are intended to apply to an individual living unit, not the institutional facility as a whole.}\]

Adopted: February, April, and May 1988; August 1989; March, July, and November 1990; October 1992; September and November 2005

Amended: June and December 1990; February 1991; November 2005; December 2006; December 2007; February 2008; March 2008; September 2008; July 2009; January and November 2010; February and July 2012; October 2013; \text{and January 2017; and}\]
## Attachment 1
**FY 1988 Base Year Statistics**
*(for use in TransNet Ordinance Rule #8)*

Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTS) Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Operator/Service</th>
<th>Vehicle Service Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article 4.0</td>
<td>Chula Vista Transit</td>
<td>559,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National City Transit</td>
<td>276,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Transit System:</td>
<td>Suburban Service</td>
<td>646,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Bus</td>
<td>170,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poway Fixed Route</td>
<td>313,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Transit</td>
<td>10,473,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Trolley</td>
<td>1,033,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand Express Agency</td>
<td>400,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,874,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 8</td>
<td>County Transit System:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Express Bus</td>
<td>189,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 4.0 Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td>El Cajon Express</td>
<td>308,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Mesa Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td>251,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lemon Grove Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td>62,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Transit System:</td>
<td>Poway Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td>23,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poway Airporter</td>
<td>103,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Valley Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td>73,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Transit DART</td>
<td>309,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,131,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 4.5</td>
<td>Chula Vista Handytrans</td>
<td>2 128,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Transit System – WHEELS</td>
<td>219,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National City Wheels</td>
<td>15,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poway Call-A-Ride</td>
<td>60,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td>1,149,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,573,623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MTDB (MTS) Area Total** 16,768,923
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Operator/Service</th>
<th>Vehicle Service Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article 4.0</td>
<td>NCTD Fixed Route</td>
<td>7,651,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD FAST</td>
<td>126,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,778,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 4.5</td>
<td>NCTD Lifeline</td>
<td>386,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>386,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDCTDB (NCTD) Area Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,164,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,933,755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The TransNet Ordinance requires that at least 70 percent of the revenues provided for local street and road purposes should be used to fund direct expenditures for facilities contributing to congestion relief. No more than 30 percent of these funds should be used for local street and road maintenance purposes. The required multi-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) project lists submitted by local agencies that are found to be out of compliance with this requirement will not be approved. Local agencies may request an exception to this requirement and must provide justification for such a request as part of its project list submittal.

The following table categorizes and lists the more typical types of facilities that are considered to contribute to congestion relief. For other facilities not listed, it must be demonstrated that congestion relief can be obtained before the project can be considered part of the 70 percent Congestion Relief category. Maintenance costs of items listed in the 70 percent Congestion Relief category are eligible under the 30 percent category. Facilities that are not considered to contribute to congestion relief (Items 28-30) are eligible under the 30 percent category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congestion Relief (at least 70%)</th>
<th>Maintenance and Non-Congestion Relief (no more than 30%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New or Expanded Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. New roadways and bridges</td>
<td>Lane removal for bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roadway and bridge widening</td>
<td>Pavement overlay (less than 1 inch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Roadway widening for bike lanes</td>
<td>Pot hole repair, chip seal, fog seal, crack seal (except when part of roadway rehabilitation project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Rehabilitation and Reconstruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Roadway rehabilitation (grinding and overlay, or new structural pavement, or new overlay 1-inch thick or greater)</td>
<td>Roadway realignment that does not increase roadway capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roadway realignment</td>
<td>Bridge replacement for aesthetic purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bridge retrofit or replacement</td>
<td>Minor drainage improvements not part of a congestion relief project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Roadway drainage improvements for the purpose of improving capacity-impeding conditions such as significant and frequent roadway flooding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. New sidewalk or sidewalk widening</td>
<td>Stand-alone landscaping project of an existing median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Operations</strong></td>
<td>Stand-alone landscaping project of an existing median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median installation for safety improvement or left-turn movement</td>
<td>Traffic signal replacement, bulb replacement, hardware, software, inductive loop repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New traffic signal, passive permissive left turn (PPLT) installation, signal removal for congestion relief reasons, traffic signal upgrades, intersection lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signal coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Relief (at least 70%)</td>
<td>Maintenance and Non-Congestion Relief (no more than 30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signal interconnection</td>
<td>Light bulb replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally controlled traffic signal optimization system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic surveillance or detection system (video)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic data collection system for performance monitoring purposes (in pavement detection,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth-Related Infrastructure*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian ramps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian traffic signal activation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossings/overcrossings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer area between sidewalk and street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian roadway lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop enhancements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus-only lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue jumper lanes for buses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signal priority measures for buses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit operational costs for shuttle and circulator routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Congestion Relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion control (unless required as part of a congestion relief project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping (unless required as part of a congestion relief project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway signing and delineation (unless it is a congestion relief project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Staff costs for congestion relief project development (environmental, preliminary engineering, design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction management) are eligible expenditures under the 70 percent category. Staff costs for transportation infrastructure maintenance or traffic operations efforts are eligible under the 30 percent category. Costs for general TransNet fund administration and transportation planning are eligible up to 1 percent of annual revenues.

* To receive credit for providing congestion relief under the 70 percent category, smart growth-related infrastructure must be provided in one of the existing or planned (not potential) seven Regional Comprehensive Plan smart growth land use type characteristic areas: Metropolitan Center, Urban Center, Town Center, Community Center, Transit Corridor, Special Use Center, or Rural Community. Smart growth-related infrastructure built outside of one of the seven types of characteristic areas is eligible under the 30 percent category.
SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
INTEREST RATE SWAP POLICY

The purpose of the Interest Rate Swap Policy of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (SANDAG) is to establish guidelines for the use and management of interest rate swaps and options. The “Interest Rate Swap Policy” or the “Policy” is intended to provide general procedural direction regarding the use, procurement and execution of interest rate swaps. The Policy is intended to relate to various interest rate hedging techniques, including the contractual exchange of different fixed and variable rate payment streams through interest rate swap agreements and is not intended to relate to other derivative products that SANDAG may consider.

SANDAG is authorized under California Government Code Section 5922 to enter into interest rate swaps to manage the amount and duration of rate, spread, or risk when used in combination with the issuance of bonds or notes.

1. Scope and Authority

This Interest Rate Swap Policy shall govern SANDAG’s use and management of all interest rate swaps and options. While adherence to this Policy is required in applicable circumstances, SANDAG recognizes that changes in the capital markets, SANDAG’s programs and other unforeseen circumstances may from time to time produce situations that are not covered by the Policy and will require modifications or exceptions to achieve policy goals. In these cases, management flexibility is appropriate provided specific authorization from the Board of Directors is obtained.

The Interest Rate Swap Policy shall be reviewed and updated at least annually and presented to the Board of Directors for approval. Day-to-day responsibility for management of interest rate swaps shall fall within the responsibilities of the Director of Finance.

SANDAG shall be authorized to enter into interest rate swap transactions only with qualified swap counterparties. The Director of Finance, in consultation with SANDAG’s bond counsel and financial advisor, shall have authority to select the counterparties, so long as the criteria set forth in the Interest Rate Swap Policy are met.

2. Approach and Objectives

Interest rate swaps and options are appropriate interest rate management tools that can help SANDAG meet important financial objectives. Properly used, these instruments can increase SANDAG’s financial flexibility, hedge exposure to interest rate risk, provide opportunities for interest rate savings or enhanced investment yields, and help SANDAG manage its balance sheet through better matching of assets and liabilities. Swaps should be integrated into SANDAG’s overall debt program and should not be used for speculation or leverage.
Swaps are appropriate to use when they achieve a specific objective consistent with SANDAG’s overall financial strategies. They may be used, for example, to lock in a current market fixed rate or create additional variable rate exposure. They may also be used to produce interest rate savings, to limit or hedge variable rate exposure, to alter the pattern of debt service payments or for asset/liability matching purposes. Swaps may be used to cap, limit or hedge variable rate payments. Options granting the right to commence or cancel an underlying swap may be used to the extent the swap itself is consistent with these guidelines or SANDAG determines there are other advantages to be derived in purchasing or granting the option; however, SANDAG must determine if the use of any such option is appropriate and warranted given the potential benefit, risks, and SANDAG’s objectives. SANDAG, together with SANDAG’s financial advisor and bond counsel, shall periodically review SANDAG’s swap guidelines and recommend appropriate changes.

3. **Conditions for Use of Interest Rate Swaps and Options**

3.1. **Rationale**

SANDAG may use interest rate swaps and options if it is reasonably determined that the proposed transaction is expected to:

3.1.1 Optimize capital structure, including schedule of debt service payments and/or fixed vs. variable rate allocations.

3.1.2 Achieve appropriate asset/liability match.

3.1.3 Reduce risk, including:

3.1.3.1 Interest rate risk;

3.1.3.2 Tax risk; or

3.1.3.3 Liquidity renewal risk.

3.1.4 Provide greater financial flexibility.

3.1.5 Generate interest rate savings.

3.1.6 Enhance investment yields.

3.1.7 Manage exposure to changing markets in advance of anticipated bond issuances (through the use of anticipatory hedging instruments).

3.2. **Benefit Expectation**

Financial transactions, using fixed rate swaps or other derivative products, should result in debt service savings of at least 2% when compared to the projected debt service SANDAG would consider for traditional bonds or notes. This threshold will serve as a guideline and will not apply should the transaction, in SANDAG’s sole judgment, meet any of the other objectives outlined herein. The debt service savings target reflects the
greater complexity and higher risk of derivative financial instruments. Such comparative savings analyses shall include, where applicable, the consideration of the probability (based on historical interest rate indices, where applicable, or other accepted analytic techniques) of the realization of savings for both the derivative and traditional structures.

For example, assuming a refunding of $100 million of existing bonds, if a traditional fixed rate advance refunding that does not use derivative products would have a present value savings threshold of $5.0 million, which is 5.0% of the refunded par, then a refunding structure utilizing a derivative product would have to achieve a threshold of $7.0 million in present value savings, or 7.0% of the refunded par. Therefore, the transaction utilizing a swap or other derivative product would have to generate an additional $2.0 million to meet the target. Such analysis should consider structural differences in comparing traditional vs. derivative alternatives, e.g., the non-callable nature of derivative transactions.

For variable rate or other swap transactions that do not result in a fixed interest rate, SANDAG will evaluate any additional value generated through the transaction in assessing the benefits of proceeding, including the ability to meet the objectives outlined herein. These benefits include, for example, managing interest rate or tax risk, optimizing the capital structure or further reducing interest expense.

In determining any benefit in implementing a fixed-to-variable swap, the cost of remarketing, in addition to the cost of credit enhancement or liquidity fees, must be added to the projected variable rate of the bonds or notes. Such a calculation should consider the trading performance of comparable bonds or notes and any trading premium resulting from a specific form of credit enhancement or liquidity and/or any impact related to broader industry trends.

3.3. Maximum Notional Amount

SANDAG will limit the total notional amount of outstanding interest rate swaps based on the proper management of risks, calculation of termination exposure, and development of a contingency plan. The total “net notional amount” of all swaps related to a bond or note issue should not exceed the outstanding or expected to be issued par amount of the related bonds or notes. For purposes of calculating the net notional amount, credit shall be given to any fixed versus variable rate swaps that offset for a specific bond or note transaction.

3.4. Maximum Maturity

SANDAG shall determine the appropriate term for an interest rate swap agreement on a case-by-case basis. In connection with the issuance or carrying of bonds or notes, the term of the swap agreement between SANDAG and a qualified swap counterparty shall not extend beyond the final maturity date of the related bonds or notes.
3.5. Liquidity Considerations

SANDAG shall consider the impact of any variable rate bonds or notes issued in combination with an interest rate swap on the availability and cost of liquidity support for other variable rate programs. SANDAG recognizes that there is a limited supply of letter of credit or liquidity facility support for SANDAG’s variable rate bonds or notes, and the usage of liquidity support in connection with an interest rate swap may result in higher overall financing costs. SANDAG shall consider the benefits of not using liquidity when using a fixed rate bond in conjunction with a swap to variable to create synthetic variable rate debt.

3.6. Call Option Value Considerations

When considering the relative advantage of an interest rate swap to fixed rate bonds, SANDAG will consider the value of the call option on fixed rate bonds, or the cost of including a call or cancellation option in a swap. The value derived from the ability to call bonds at a future date is foregone when using a “non-callable” swap for the remaining term of the bonds. While fixed rate bonds are typically structured with a call provision at a certain time, after which the bonds may be refunded, this opportunity may be lost through the utilization of a long-dated “non-callable” swap, impairing SANDAG’s ability to reap economic savings, unless this option is specifically included under the swap.

4. Interest Rate Swap Features

4.1 Interest Rate Swap Agreement

SANDAG will use terms and conditions as set forth in the International Swap and Derivatives Association, Inc. (“ISDA”) Master Agreement. The swap agreement between SANDAG and each swap counterparty shall include payment, term, security, collateral, default, remedy, termination, and other terms, conditions, provisions and safeguards as SANDAG, in consultation with its bond and general counsel and financial advisor, deems necessary or desirable.

Subject to the provisions contained herein, the terms of SANDAG’s swap agreement shall use the following guidelines:

4.1.1 SANDAG’s downgrade provisions triggering termination shall in no event be worse than those affecting the counterparty.

4.1.2 Governing law for swaps will be New York or California.

4.1.3 The specified indebtedness related to credit events in any swap agreement should be narrowly defined and refer only to indebtedness of SANDAG that could have a materially adverse affect on SANDAG’s ability to perform its obligations under the swap.

4.1.4 Collateral thresholds for the swap provider, and for SANDAG if applicable, should be set on a sliding scale reflective of credit ratings of the swap provider or guarantor. Collateral should be held by an independent third party.
4.1.5 Eligible collateral is outlined in Appendix A.

4.1.6 Termination value should be set by a “market quotation” methodology, unless SANDAG deems an alternative methodology to be appropriate.

4.1.7 SANDAG will consider the use of swap insurance to mitigate possible termination risk and also to mitigate the need for SANDAG to post collateral under the Credit Support Annex.

4.2 Interest Rate Swap Counterparties

4.2.1 Credit Criteria

SANDAG will only do business with highly rated counterparties or counterparties whose obligations are supported by highly rated parties. SANDAG will structure swap agreements to protect itself from credit deterioration of counterparties, including the use of credit support annexes or other forms of credit enhancement to secure counterparty performance. Such protection shall include any terms and conditions in SANDAG’s sole discretion are necessary or appropriate or in SANDAG’s best interest.

SANDAG will make its best efforts to work with qualified swap counterparties that at the time of execution of a swap transaction have a general credit rating of: (i) at least “Aa3” or “AA-” by one of the nationally recognized rating agencies and not rated lower than “A2” or “A” by any nationally recognized rating agency, or (ii) have a “AAA” subsidiary as rated by at least one nationally recognized credit rating agency. The nationally recognized rating agencies are Moody's Investors Services, Inc., Standard and Poor's Rating Services, and Fitch Ratings.

For lower rated (below “AA-”) counterparties, SANDAG will seek credit enhancement in the form of:

4.2.1.1 Contingent credit support or enhancement;

4.2.1.2 Collateral consistent with the policies contained herein;

4.2.1.3 Ratings downgrade triggers; or

4.2.1.4 Guaranty of parent, if any.

In addition, qualified swap counterparties must have a demonstrated record of successfully executing swap transactions as well as creating and implementing innovative ideas in the swap market.
4.2.2 Swap Dealers

Each swap counterparty with which SANDAG executes a swap transaction will be registered with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC") as a “swap dealer.”

4.3 Limitations on Termination Exposure to a Single Counterparty

In order to diversify SANDAG’s counterparty credit risk, and to limit SANDAG’s credit exposure to any one counterparty, limits will be established for each counterparty based upon both the credit rating of the counterparty as well as the relative level of risk associated with each existing and proposed swap transaction. The guidelines below provide general termination exposure guidelines with respect to whether SANDAG should enter into an additional transaction with an existing counterparty. SANDAG may make exceptions to the guidelines at any time to the extent that the execution of a swap achieves one or more of the goals outlined in these guidelines or provides other benefits to SANDAG. In general, the maximum Net Termination Exposure, as defined below, to any single counterparty should be set so that it does not exceed a prudent level as measured against the available financial resources of SANDAG.

Such guidelines will also not mandate or otherwise force automatic termination by SANDAG or the counterparty. Maximum Net Termination Exposure is not intended to impose retroactively any terms and conditions on existing transactions. Such provisions will only act as guidelines in making a determination as to whether or not a proposed transaction should be executed given certain levels of existing and projected net termination exposure to a specific counterparty. Additionally, the guidelines below are not intended to require retroactively additional collateral posting for existing transactions. Collateral posting guidelines are described in the “Collateral Requirements” section below. The calculation of net termination exposure per counterparty will take into consideration multiple transactions, some of which may offset the overall exposure to SANDAG.

Under this approach, SANDAG will set limits on individual counterparty exposure based on existing as well as new or proposed transactions. The sum of the current market value and the projected exposure shall constitute the Maximum Net Termination Exposure. For outstanding transactions, current exposure will be based on the market value as of the last quarterly swap valuation report provided by the financial advisor. Projected exposure shall be calculated based on the swap’s potential termination value taking into account possible adverse changes in interest rates as implied by historical or projected measures of potential rate changes applied over the remaining term of the swap.

For purposes of this calculation, SANDAG shall include all existing and projected transactions of an individual counterparty and all transactions will be analyzed in aggregate such that the maximum exposure will be additive.

The exposure thresholds, which will be reviewed periodically by SANDAG to ensure that they remain appropriate, will also be tied to credit ratings of the counterparties and whether or not collateral has been posted as shown in the table below. If a counterparty
has more than one rating, the lowest rating will govern for purposes of the calculating the level of exposure.

The following chart provides the Maximum Net Termination Exposure to a swap counterparty given the lowest credit rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Rating Category</th>
<th>Maximum Collateralized Exposure</th>
<th>Maximum Uncollateralized Exposure</th>
<th>Maximum Total Termination Exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>$50 million</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>$50 million</td>
<td>$50 million</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
<td>$15 million</td>
<td>$45 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below A</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the exposure limit is exceeded by a counterparty, SANDAG shall conduct a review of the exposure limit per counterparty. SANDAG, in consultation with its bond counsel and financial advisor, shall explore remedial strategies to mitigate this exposure.

4.4 Collateral Requirements

As part of any swap agreement, SANDAG may require collateralization or other forms of credit enhancements to secure any or all swap payment obligations. As appropriate, SANDAG may require collateral or other credit enhancement to be posted by each swap counterparty under the following circumstances:

4.4.1 Each counterparty to SANDAG may be required to post collateral (subject to applicable thresholds) if the credit rating of the counterparty or parent falls below the “AA” category. Additional collateral for further decreases in credit ratings of each counterparty shall be posted by each counterparty in accordance with the provisions contained in the Credit Support Annex of the ISDA Agreement between each counterparty and SANDAG.

4.4.2 Threshold amounts shall be determined by SANDAG on a case-by-case basis. SANDAG will determine the reasonable threshold limits for the initial deposit and for increments of collateral posting thereafter.

4.4.3 In determining maximum uncollateralized exposure, SANDAG shall also consider and include, as applicable, financial exposure to the same corporate entities that it may have through other forms of financial dealings, such as securities lending agreements and commercial paper investments.

4.4.4 Collateral shall be deposited with a third party trustee, or as mutually agreed upon between SANDAG and the counterparty.

4.4.5 A list of acceptable securities that may be posted as collateral and the valuation of such collateral will be determined and mutually agreed upon during negotiation of
the swap agreement with each swap counterparty. A complete list of acceptable securities and valuation percentages are included as Attachment A.

4.4.6 The market value of the collateral shall be determined on at least a weekly basis, or more frequently if SANDAG determines it is in SANDAG’s best interest given the specific collateral security.

4.4.7 SANDAG shall determine on a case-by-case basis whether other forms of credit enhancement are more beneficial to SANDAG.

4.5 Swap Insurance

If, after a cost/benefit analysis, it is determined that it would be beneficial to insure the interest rate swap, swap insurance will be pursued.

4.6 Security and Source of Repayment

SANDAG will generally use the same security and source of repayment (pledged revenues) for the interest rate swap as is used for the related bond or note issue.

4.7 Prohibited Interest Rate Swap Features

SANDAG will not use interest rate swaps that are: (i) speculative or create extraordinary leverage or risk, (ii) lack adequate liquidity to terminate without incurring a significant bid/ask spread, (iii) provide insufficient price transparency to allow reasonable valuation, or (iv) are used as investments.

5. Evaluation and Management of Interest Rate Swap Risks

Prior to the execution of any swap transaction, SANDAG’s Director of Finance, financial advisor and bond counsel shall evaluate the proposed transaction and report the findings to SANDAG’s Board. Such a review shall include the identification of the proposed benefit and potential risks. As part of this evaluation, SANDAG shall compute the Maximum Net Termination Exposure to the proposed swap counterparty.

5.1 Evaluation Methodology

SANDAG will review the following areas of potential risk for new and existing interest rate swaps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Risk</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis Risk</td>
<td>The mismatch between actual variable rate debt service and variable rate indices used to determine swap payments.</td>
<td>SANDAG will review historical trading differentials between the variable rate bonds or notes and the index.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Risk</td>
<td>The risk created by potential tax events that could affect swap payments.</td>
<td>SANDAG will review the tax events in proposed swap agreements. It will also evaluate the impact of potential changes in tax law on LIBOR indexed swaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Risk</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Evaluation Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterparty Risk</td>
<td>The risk that the counterparty fails to make required payments.</td>
<td>SANDAG will monitor exposure levels, ratings thresholds and collateralization requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Risk</td>
<td>The risk that the transaction is terminated in a market dictating termination payment by SANDAG.</td>
<td>SANDAG will compute its termination exposure for all existing and proposed swaps at market value and under a worst-case scenario. SANDAG will consider use of swap insurance to mitigate this risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollover Risk</td>
<td>The mismatch of the maturity of the swap and the maturity of the underlying bonds or notes.</td>
<td>SANDAG will determine its capacity to issue variable rate bonds or notes that may be outstanding after the maturity of the swap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity Risk</td>
<td>The inability to continue or renew a liquidity facility.</td>
<td>SANDAG will evaluate the expected availability of liquidity support for swapped and unhedged variable rate debt and will consider the use of variable rate debt that does not require liquidity (e.g., auction rate securities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Risk</td>
<td>The occurrence of an event modifying the credit rating of the issuer or its counterparty.</td>
<td>SANDAG will monitor the ratings of its counterparties and insurers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Managing Interest Rate Swap Risks

5.2.1 Annual Report to the Board

Staff will evaluate the risks associated with outstanding interest rate swaps at least annually and provide a written evaluation to the Board of Directors. This evaluation will include the following information:

5.2.1.1 A description of all outstanding interest rate swaps, including related bond series, types of swaps, rates paid and received by SANDAG, existing notional amount, average life and remaining term of each swap agreement and the current termination value of outstanding swaps.

5.2.1.2 Separately for each swap, the actual debt service requirements versus the projected debt service on the swap transaction. For any swap used as part of a refunding, the actual cumulative savings versus the projected savings at the time the swap was executed.

5.2.1.3 The credit ratings of each swap counterparty, parent, guarantor and credit enhancer insuring the swap payments, if any.

5.2.1.4 Actual collateral posting by swap counterparty, if any, per swap agreement and in total by swap counterparty.
5.2.1.5 Information concerning any material event involving outstanding swap agreements, including a default by a swap counterparty, counterparty downgrade or termination.

5.2.1.6 An updated contingency plan to replace, or fund a termination payment in the event an outstanding swap is terminated.

5.2.1.7 The status of any liquidity support used in connection with interest rate swaps, including the remaining term and current fee.

SANDAG shall review the Interest Rate Swap Policy with the Board at least annually.

5.2.2 Contingency Plan

SANDAG shall determine the termination exposure of each of its swaps and its total swap termination payment exposure at least annually and prepare a contingency plan to either replace the swaps or fund the termination payments, if any, in the event one or more outstanding swaps are terminated. SANDAG shall assess its ability to obtain replacement swaps and identify revenue sources to fund potential termination payments.

5.3 Terminating Interest Rate Swaps

5.3.1 Optional Termination

SANDAG will structure interest rate swaps to include optional termination at the current market valuation, which would allow SANDAG to terminate a swap prior to its maturity if it is determined that it is financially advantageous to do so, but will not provide this right to the counterparty.

5.3.2 Mandatory Termination

In the event a swap is terminated as a result of a termination event such as a default or credit downgrade of either counterparty, SANDAG will evaluate whether it is financially advantageous to obtain a replacement swap or, depending on market value, make or receive a termination payment.

In the event SANDAG makes a swap termination payment, SANDAG shall attempt to follow the process identified in its swap contingency plan. SANDAG shall also evaluate the economic costs and benefits of incorporating a provision into the swap agreement that will allow SANDAG to make termination payments over time.

6. Disclosure and Financial Reporting

SANDAG will take steps to ensure that there is full and complete disclosure of all interest rate swaps to the SANDAG Board of Directors, rating agencies and in disclosure documents. With respect to its financial statements, SANDAG will adhere to the guidelines for the financial reporting of interest rate swaps as set forth by the Government Accounting Standards Board.
7. **Dodd-Frank Act**

7.1 Conformance to Dodd-Frank

It is the intent of SANDAG to conform this Policy to the requirements relating to legislation and regulations for derivatives transactions under Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, as supplemented and amended from time to time, including any regulations promulgated in connection therewith (herein collectively referred to as “Dodd-Frank”). Pursuant to such intent, it is the policy of SANDAG that, with respect to each interest rate swap: (i) each swap advisor engaged or to be engaged by SANDAG will function as the designated qualified independent representative of SANDAG, sometimes referred to as the “Designated QIR”; (ii) each swap advisor will agree to meet and meets the requirements specified in CFTC Regulation 23.450(b)(1) or any successor regulation thereto (herein referred to as the “Representative Regulation”); (iii) each swap advisor will provide a written certification to SANDAG to the effect that such swap advisor agrees to meet and meets the requirements specified in the Representative Regulation; (iv) SANDAG will monitor the performance of each swap advisor consistent with the requirements specified in the Representative Regulation; (v) SANDAG will exercise independent judgment in consultation with its swap advisor in evaluating all recommendations, if any, presented by any swap dealer with respect to transactions authorized pursuant to this Policy; and (vi) SANDAG will rely on the advice of its swap advisor with respect to interest rate swaps authorized pursuant to this Policy and will not rely on recommendations, if any, presented by any swap dealer with respect to interest rate swaps authorized pursuant to this Policy.

7.2 Legal Entity Identifier

SANDAG shall obtain and maintain current at all times a “legal entity identifier” from a firm designated by the CFTC to provide such numbers.

7.3 Clearing

In connection with the execution of any swap entered into on or after September 9, 2013, SANDAG shall complete and maintain, as required by the CFTC, an annual filing regarding how it generally meets its financial obligations associated with entering into uncleared swaps.

7.4 Recordkeeping

Comprehensive records shall be maintained, either in paper or electronic form, of any interest rate swap entered into by SANDAG for at least five (5) years following the termination thereof. Such records shall be retrievable within five (5) business days and shall be open to inspection by the CFTC.

Adopted November 2005
Amended November 2013
Amended November 2014
### APPENDIX A: ACCEPTABLE COLLATERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECURITY</th>
<th>VALUATION PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(A)</strong> Cash</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(B) (x)</strong> Negotiable debt obligations issued by the U.S. Treasury Department or the Government National Mortgage Association (“Ginnie Mae”), or (y) mortgage backed securities issued by Ginnie Mae (but with respect to either (x) or (y) excluding interest only or principal only stripped securities, securities representing residual interests in mortgage pools, or securities that are not listed on a national securities exchange or regularly quoted in a national quotation service) and in each case having a remaining maturity of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) less than one year</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) greater than one year but less than 10 years</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) greater than 10 years</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C) (x)</strong> Negotiable debt obligations issued by the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (“Freddie Mac”), or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Association (“Fannie Mae”) or (y) mortgage backed securities issued by Freddie Mac or Fannie Mae but excluding interest only or principal only stripped securities, securities representing residual interests in mortgage pools, or securities that are not listed on a national securities exchange or regularly quoted in a national quotation service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(D)</strong> Any other collateral acceptable to SANDAG’s sole discretion.</td>
<td>The valuation percentage shall be determined by the Valuation Agent from time to time and in its reasonable discretion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, if a counterparty is required to post $1.0 million of collateral and wished to use Ginnie Mae’s with five years remaining to maturity, it would be required to post $1,052,632 ($1.0 million/0.95) to satisfy the collateral requirement.
APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Asset/Liability Matching
Matching the term and amount of assets and liabilities in order to mitigate the impact of changes in interest rates.

Bid/Ask Spread
The difference between the bid price (at which a market maker is willing to buy) and the ask price (at which a market maker is willing to sell).

Call Option
The right to buy an underlying asset (e.g. a municipal bond) after a certain date at a certain price. A call option is frequently embedded in a municipal bond, giving the issuer the right to buy, or redeem, the bonds at a certain price.

Collateral
Assets pledged to secure an obligation. The assets are potentially subject to seizure in event of default.

Downgrade
A negative change in credit ratings.

Forward Starting Swap
Interest rate swap that starts at some time in the future. Used to lock-in current interest rates.

Hedge
A transaction that reduces the interest rate risk of an underlying security.

Interest Rate Exchange Agreement
An agreement detailing the contractual exchange of interest payment streams between counterparties. Often the exchange of a fixed and a floating interest rate between two parties. Also called an interest rate swap.

Interest Rate Swap
An agreement detailing the contractual exchange of interest payment streams between counterparties. Often the exchange of a fixed and a floating interest rate between two parties. Also called an interest rate exchange agreement.

Liquidity Support:
An agreement by a bank to make payment on a variable rate security to assure investors that the security can be sold.

LIBOR
London Interbank Offered Rate. Often used as an index to compute the variable rate paid on an interest rate swap.

Maximum Net Termination Exposure
The aggregate termination payment for all existing and projected swap transactions that would be paid by an individual counterparty. For purposes of this calculation, the aggregate termination payment is equal to: (i) the termination payment based on the market value of all existing swaps, plus (ii) the expected worst-case termination payment of the proposed transaction. The expected worst-case termination payment shall be
calculated assuming interest rates, as measured by the appropriate index (typically the Bond Buyer Revenue Bond Index or Bond Market Association), increase (or decrease) by two standard deviations from the sample mean over a period of time corresponding to the term of the swap.

**Notional Amount**
The amount used to determine the interest payments on a swap.

**Termination Payment**
A payment made by a counterparty that is required to terminate the swap. The payment is commonly based on the market value of the swap, which is computed using the rate of the initial swap and the rate on a replacement swap.
1. **Purpose**

The purpose of this policy is to specify the functions of the Audit Committee and the SANDAG independent performance auditor.

2. **Governance and Role of the Audit Committee**

   2.1. The Audit Committee shall be overseen by the SANDAG Board of Directors and shall govern itself in accordance with Public Utilities Code Sections 132351.4 and 132354.1, and the policies and procedures applicable to all SANDAG Policy Advisory Committees.

   2.2. Membership of the Audit Committee shall be as set forth in Board Policy No. 002: Policy Advisory Committee Membership. The Audit Committee shall consist of five voting members with two members of the Board of Directors and three members of the public, all of which shall be appointed by the Board of Directors. Due to the qualification requirements and selection process described in this policy, Audit Committee members and alternates shall be selected according to the processes below.

   2.3. The Chair of the Board will select which members of the Audit Committee will hold the Chair and Vice Chair positions on the Audit Committee every two years or whenever a position is vacant.

   2.4. The role of the Audit Committee is to assist the Board in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities and provide a forum for pursuing the opportunities for improvements in operations, financial reporting and internal controls identified through the agency’s audit products.

3. **Authority of the Audit Committee**

   3.1. The Audit Committee may hear items within the subject areas of audits, internal controls and investigations into fraud, waste, or impropriety, and may be asked to provide actions or recommendations on other matters within the Audit Committee’s purview. The responsibilities of the Audit Committee include:

      3.1.1. Recommend to the Board which firm to contract with to conduct the annual financial statement audits and oversee the conduct of such audits.

      3.1.2. Meet with management and the independent performance auditor to review and discuss SANDAG’s annual financial statement audits, internal control reports and other audits performed by external auditors.

      3.1.3. Review and oversee the implementation of corrective action to address noted audit deficiencies.
3.1.4 Based on the Board’s direction regarding whether to hire an individual or firm, recommend to the Board which individual or firm to hire to carry out independent performance auditor responsibilities.

3.1.5 Recommend to the Board the annual compensation of the independent performance auditor.

3.1.6 Oversee the work of the independent performance auditor in preparing and issuing audit and investigative reports and other audit, review or attest activities.

3.1.7 Approve the annual audit plan after discussion with the independent performance auditor pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 132354.1(b), and make recommendations to the Board regarding the budget needed to carry out the annual audit plan of the independent performance auditor.

3.1.8 Monitor the implementation of the annual audit plan and provide an annual report to the Board.

3.1.9 Monitor the implementation of corrective action identified in audit and investigative reports and inform the Board when corrective action is insufficient or untimely.

3.1.10 Conduct the independent performance auditor’s annual performance evaluation against performance measures established and adopted by the Audit Committee.

3.1.11 Vote on whether to remove the independent performance auditor for cause including, but not limited to incompetence, dishonesty, unethical behavior, violation of state or federal laws, or failure to maintain required professional certifications; such removal being subject to an approving vote by two-thirds of the Audit Committee and the Board.

3.1.12 Recommend internal control guidelines to be adopted by the Board to prevent and detect financial errors and fraud based on the internal control guidelines developed by the State Controller pursuant to Government Code Section 12422.5 and the standards adopted by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

4. **Selection of Audit Committee Members**

4.1 The Board members serving on the Audit Committee shall be appointed by the Board using the procedures in this subsection 4.1.

4.1.1 The two Board members and any Board member alternates serving on the Audit Committee shall be recommended for appointment by the Chair of the Board. The Chair of the Board shall select Board members to recommend to the Board based on the following criteria:

4.1.1.1 The Board member shall have served on the Board for at least three years;

4.1.1.2 The Board member shall have a basic understanding of the role of the Audit Committee; and
4.1.3 The Board member shall express a willingness to work through the Audit Committee to pursue opportunities for improvements in operations, financial reporting, and internal controls identified through the agency's audit products.

4.1.2 The Board members recommended by the Chair of the Board shall be subject to approval by a majority vote of the Board.

4.1.3 Audit Committee members shall serve until their successors are appointed. In the event that the Board member who has been appointed to serve on the Audit Committee is no longer a primary or alternate member of the Board of Directors, the position shall be considered vacant. If and when vacancies in the voting membership of the Audit Committee occur, the same selection process as outlined above shall be followed to select a replacement.

4.1.4 Board members appointed to the Audit Committee shall serve a term of two years. At the completion of a term, eligible incumbent members will need to apply for reappointment for another term. In no case shall any member serve more than five years on the Audit Committee.

4.2 The public members serving on the Audit Committee shall be appointed by the Board using the procedures in this subsection 4.2.

4.2.1 Whenever there is a vacancy for a public member seat on the Audit Committee, application forms will be made available on the SANDAG website for persons interested in applying for an Audit Committee position. Applications shall be due within 30 days after the application forms are posted. Only candidates who submit an application by the deadline will be considered.

4.2.2 Applicants shall possess the independence, experience, and technical expertise necessary to carry out the duties of the Audit Committee. This expertise includes, but is not limited to, knowledge of accounting, auditing, and financial reporting. The minimum professional standards for public members shall include at least ten years of experience as a certified public accountant or as a certified internal auditor, or ten years of other professional accounting, financial, or legal experience in audit management.

4.2.3 The candidates shall be recommended by a majority vote of a screening committee composed of a member of the Board selected by the Chair of the Board, the chief financial officer or finance director of a SANDAG member agency, and at least one outside financial expert appointed by the other two members of the screening committee and confirmed by the Board. Persons serving on the screening committee shall sign a declaration establishing that they do not have a conflict of interest.

4.2.4 The screening committee may interview one or more of the candidates. The screening committee shall submit its recommended nominee(s) for the position(s). The screening committee also may nominate alternates from among the applicants.

4.2.5 In the event that the screening committee is unable to recommend any of the applicants for any or all positions, or an insufficient number of applications have been received, the screening committee may recommend a supplemental process, subject
to Board approval. The constraints set forth in the normal nomination process shall not be mandated to apply to the supplemental process.

4.2.6 The public members nominated by the screening committee shall be subject to approval by a majority vote of the Board.

4.2.7 Audit Committee members shall serve until their successors are appointed. If and when vacancies in the voting membership of the Audit Committee occur, the same selection process as outlined above shall be followed to select a replacement to fill the remainder of the term.

4.2.8 Public members appointed to the Audit Committee shall serve a term of two years. At the completion of a term, eligible incumbent members will need to apply for reappointment for another term. In no case shall any member serve more than five years on the Audit Committee.

5. **Selection of Independent Performance Auditor**

5.1 The independent performance auditor shall serve a two-year term and shall be selected by the Board on the basis of qualifications and experience, which include, but are not limited to:

5.1.1 At least ten years of experience performing audits under Government Audit Standards;

5.1.2 At least five years of management experience;

5.1.3 A Bachelors or higher degree in business, public administration, finance, accounting or a related field; and

5.1.4 Possession of a Certified Public Accountant or Certified Internal Auditor license or certificate.

6. **Scope of Authority and Responsibilities of Independent Performance Auditor**

6.1 The independent performance auditor shall report to the Audit Committee and shall annually prepare an audit plan and conduct audits in accordance therewith, including performance audits of all SANDAG departments, offices, boards, activities, agencies, and programs and perform those other duties as may be required by the Board or as provided by the California Constitution and general laws of the state. The independent performance auditor shall follow Government Auditing Standards.

6.2 All officers and employees of SANDAG shall furnish to the independent performance auditor unrestricted access to employees, information, and records, including electronic data, within their custody regarding powers, duties, activities, organization, property, financial transactions, contracts, and methods of business required to conduct an audit or otherwise perform audit duties. It is also the duty of any consolidated agency officer, employee, or agent to fully cooperate with the auditor, and to make full disclosure of all pertinent information, with the exception of information that is protected by law from disclosure.
6.3 The independent performance auditor shall prepare a proposed budget and submit it to the Audit Committee for a recommendation to the Board of Directors for its approval 180 days prior to the beginning of each fiscal year or as otherwise requested by the Director of Finance.

6.4 The independent performance auditor shall have the power to appoint, employ, and remove assistants, employees, and personnel as deemed necessary for the efficient and effective administration of the affairs of the independent performance auditor. The independent performance auditor may prescribe the duties, scope of authority, and qualifications of employees and consultants overseen by the independent performance auditor. The independent performance auditor’s authority shall be subject to the annual audit plan and the budget approved by the Board, SANDAG rules and policies related to the management and hiring of SANDAG employees and consultants, and the scope of the independent performance auditor’s purview as determined by the Board.

6.5 The independent performance auditor may investigate any material claim of financial fraud, waste, or impropriety within SANDAG and for that purpose may summon any officer, agent, or employee of the consolidated agency, any claimant, or other person, and examine him or her upon oath or affirmation relative thereto. The independent performance auditor will conduct investigations generally following the procedures recommended by the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners’ Fraud Examiners Manual for any allegations of financial fraud, waste or impropriety. Prior to questioning any person under oath, the independent performance auditor shall advise the members of the Audit Committee of that intention, seek legal counsel from the Office of General Counsel or outside counsel under contract to SANDAG regarding the relevant legal issues, and document the reasons why the questioning must be done under oath instead of by some other form of affirmation.

6.6 The independent performance auditor shall coordinate audit functions such that there is no duplication of effort between the audits undertaken by the independent performance auditor and audits undertaken by the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee.

6.7 All SANDAG contracts with consultants, vendors, or agencies will be prepared with an adequate audit provision to allow the independent performance auditor access to the entity’s records needed to verify compliance with the terms specified in the contract.

6.8 Results of all audits and reports shall be made available to the public in accordance with the requirements of the California Public Records Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 6250) of Division 7 of the Title 1 of the Government Code). Final versions of formal reports also shall be posted on the SANDAG website.

6.9 All materials or services needed by the independent performance auditor shall be procured using an open and competitive basis with solicitation of proposals from the widest possible number of qualified firms as prescribed by SANDAG’s procedures for procurement. The scope of work of all such consultant work shall be subject to approval by the independent performance auditor prior to any such solicitation.

Adopted December 2017

Amended
Proposed FY 2019 Program Budget Amendment: Airport Development Planning

Overview
On December 21, 2018, the Board of Directors approved the membership list and charter for the Airport Connectivity Subcommittee and the use of up to $1 million from the Contingency Reserve for Airport Connectivity Subcommittee-related expenses.

Key Considerations
The Airport Connectivity Subcommittee is leading discussions and exploring options for how best to build consensus around transportation solutions for improved connectivity to the San Diego International Airport for generations to come and has committed to developing a ground access plan for inclusion in the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority’s Airport Terminal 1 Expansion Environmental Impact Report by June 30, 2019.

In order to meet this schedule, the proposed budget amendment would allow SANDAG to supplement existing staff capacity with experts in the field of planning, engineering, communications, legal, real estate, and modeling.

Tasks undertaken by the consultant teams would include alternatives analysis for a possible people mover, site design for a San Diego Grand Central Station, environmental constraints analysis, real estate proformas, strategic advice for navigating the Federal Aviation Administration, regulatory framework, legal assistance for agreements, and outreach to the public and stakeholders.

Next Steps
Pending approval of the proposed budget amendment, the consultants would be tasked with developing concepts to bring back to the Subcommittee and SANDAG Board for consideration in May/June 2019.

Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Coleen Clementson, (619) 699-1944, coleen.clementson@sandag.org

Action Requested: Approve
The Board of Directors is asked to approve an amendment to the FY 2019 Program Budget, allocating $1 million in Contingency Reserve funds and $152,000 in Transportation Development Act funds to Overall Work Program Element No. 3101500: Airport Development Planning for consulting services and staffing.

Fiscal Impact:
The proposed budget amendment would allow $1 million of Contingency Reserve funds to be used for consulting services related to the Airport Connectivity Subcommittee.

Schedule/Scope Impact:
The Airport Connectivity Subcommittee has committed to developing a ground access plan by June 30, 2019.
**WORK ELEMENT:** 3101500  | **NEW – Airport Development Planning**

**FY 2019 BUDGET:** $1,152,000

**AREA OF EMPHASIS:** Sustainable Development: Planning and Funding Strategies

**Amendment Title:** Airport Connectivity Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Source</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020 - 2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG Contingency Reserve Fund</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning / Administration</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$152,000</td>
<td>$1,010,000</td>
<td>$1,162,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,152,000</td>
<td>$1,010,000</td>
<td>$2,162,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Application</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2019 Budget</th>
<th>FY 2020 - 2022 Budget</th>
<th>Multi-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits, Indirect</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$152,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$652,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,152,000</td>
<td>$1,010,000</td>
<td>$2,162,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJECTIVE**

The objective of this work element is to develop an airport ground access plan, including the potential development of a people mover, a comprehensive multi-use development to support connections to regional transit, direct access for Interstate 5 ramps, pricing components, and to provide a central hub. Emphasis in FY 2019 will be on working with regional stakeholders to develop a comprehensive financial plan for the project.

**PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

Various planning level studies by stakeholder agencies.

**Project Manager:** [Williamson, Jennifer](#)

**Committee(s):** None

**Working Group(s):** Airport Connectivity Subcommittee

¹ Future year funding subject to availability.
## PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES FOR FY 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>% of Effort</th>
<th>Task Description / Product / Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | 25          | **Task Description:** Staff development of subcommittee, charter, project development, stakeholder meetings.  
**Product:** Charter, Subcommittee Meetings, Project Planning Development, Legal Agreements, Consultant Contract Development.  
**Completion Date:** 6/30/2019 |
| 2        | 25          | **Task Description:** Planning Analysis  
**Product:** Viability analysis, cost/benefit analysis, Return on Investment Study, Federal Aviation Administration coordination  
**Completion Date:** 6/30/2019 |
| 3        | 25          | **Task Description:** Engineering Study  
**Product:** Three concepts for ground access, alternatives analysis, site development, land use integration, coordination with modeling.  
**Completion Date:** 6/30/2019 |
| 4        | 10          | **Task Description:** Legal Oversight  
**Product:** Development of agreements between stakeholders on airport mitigation measures.  
**Completion Date:** 6/30/2019 |
| 5        | 15          | **Task Description:** Communications  
**Product:** Development of outreach materials, coordination with stakeholders, website, working group.  
**Completion Date:** 6/30/2019 |

### FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Future activities will build off the work effort done in 2019. These efforts include site development, Environmental Impact Report preparation, the people mover feasibility and route analysis, and continuation of the development and implementation of the funding plan.
Data Science and Big Data

Overview

The nation and world are witnessing one of the fastest evolutions in personal mobility and technological capability in modern history.

SANDAG has a unique opportunity to take a leadership role to work with other public entities and institute a regional data platform that leverages the latest technology and industry best practices to standardize the creation and delivery of accurate, open, and transparent data products and services. This concept is known as Big Data and Data Science.

Big data refers to huge volumes of data that cannot be handled using traditional database programming.

Data science is the system of using scientific programming, modeling, and data mining techniques to process big data and uncover the insights and meaning of the underlying data.

Key Considerations

SANDAG, as well as other public partner agencies, currently provide a wide range of data and information to the region through independently-operated websites, web-based applications and tools, reports, and documents. While these platforms have supported the region for many years, more meaningful data intelligence is needed to support innovative regional initiatives to improve the transportation system.

The creation of a Regional Data Science and Big Data Platform at SANDAG would enable public and private partners to access real-time information including economic, demographic, land use, and transportation data like traffic volumes, congestion, transit passenger counts, tolling, and financial information. It would integrate big data from multiple public and private sources and include easy to use mapping, visualization, and reporting tools that add intelligence to the data.

As a result, the Regional Data Science and Big Data Platform would help to turn big data into information that can be used more easily and efficiently to improve regional mobility. For instance, using big data analytics could help predict safety hot spots identifying intersections, time of day, and traffic volumes when pedestrians or bicyclists are most vulnerable. This kind of insight can help jurisdictions proactively address these issues in advance and potentially reduce injuries and fatalities.

To support the development of a Regional Data Science and Big Data Platform, funding would be included in the FY 2020 Program Budget, subject to availability, to: (1) begin developing partnerships with other government and private agencies to standardize, access, and analyze big data; (2) perform an assessment of SANDAG current data science and big data environments including data sources, analytical capabilities and workflows, and dissemination tools and methods; and (3) develop an implementation roadmap that identifies funding sources, defines staffing and workflow requirements, data acquisition and development needs, and software delivery systems for deployment of the regional data platform.

Action Requested: Information

Staff will provide an overview of a regional data initiative proposed to be included in the FY 2020 Program Budget.

Fiscal Impact:

Funding for the initial phase of the Data Science and Big Data initiative will be subject to funding availability in the FY 2020 Program Budget.

Schedule/Scope Impact:

If approved as part of the FY 2020 Program Budget, work on the Data Science and Big Data initiative would begin in FY 2020.
Next Steps
If approved as part of the FY 2020 Program Budget, work on the Data Science and Big Data initiative would begin in FY 2020.

Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director
Key Staff Contact: Ray Major, (619) 595-5668, ray.major@sandag.org