TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, October 17, 2003
9:00 a.m. – 12 Noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- TRANSPORTATION PROJECT FUNDING
- TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING
- PROCUREMENT POLICIES

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

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

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, 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) 595-5300 · Fax (619) 595-5305 · www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG! Members of the public may speak to the Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip which is located in the rear of the room and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than 12:00 p.m., two working days prior to the Transportation Committee meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5300 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5300, (619) 595-5393 (TTY), or fax (619) 595-5305.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
REVISED
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ITEM #

+ 1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (pp. 6-14)

Action would approve the minutes of the Transportation Committee meeting from September 19, 2003.

PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/ MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CONSENT ITEMS (2 through 5)

The Transportation Committee will take action on the consent agenda without further discussion and with one vote unless an item is pulled by a Committee member or by a member of the public for comment.

+ 2. FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES (TEA) PROGRAM: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT (Sookyung Kim) (pp. 15-20)

This quarterly progress report covers the period July to September 2003 for the nine Federal TEA program funded projects. Two projects are complete (City of La Mesa’s El Cajon Boulevard Revitalization and City of San Diego’s Mission Beach Boardwalk), and the remaining seven projects are progressing according to their approved schedules.

+ 3. PROPOSED NEW PROCUREMENT POLICIES (Julie Wiley) (pp. 21-38)

SANDAG’s legal staff has prepared two procurement and contracting policies for review and comment by the Transportation Committee. Any changes requested by Transportation Committee members or staff over the next month will be incorporated into these proposed policies and brought back to the Transportation Committee in November. At the November meeting, the Transportation Committee will be asked to recommend approval of the policies to the SANDAG Board at its November meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE

INFORMATION

REVIEW/COMMENT
+4. WELFARE TO WORK TRANSIT STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS
(Conan Cheung) (pp. 39-54)

The Welfare To Work Transit Study, funded through a Caltrans planning grant, documents the unmet transit needs of CalWORKs participants transitioning from welfare to work, and recommends transit service improvements to address those needs. The recommendations from this report will provide a basis for future funding consideration (including Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) grant funding applications) and service improvements. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the Welfare to Work Transit Study and its Service Improvement Plan.

+5. LOS ANGELES – SAN DIEGO – SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY (LOSSAN) BOARD OF DIRECTORS WORKSHOP (Linda Culp) (pp. 55-58)

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Known as Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner corridor, it is the second busiest intercity passenger rail corridor nationwide and Amtrak’s fastest growing. This report summarizes the results of the Board’s workshop held on September 13, 2003.

REPORTS

+6. TRANSPORTATION PROJECT BUDGET DEFICITS AND POTENTIAL STRATEGIES (Jack Boda) (pp. 59-72)

The region continues to face transportation budget deficits as discussed at the September 19, 2003, Transportation Committee meeting. This updated report provides a discussion of project deficits, potential sources of funds, potential strategies and the risks associated with the strategies. It is recommended that the Transportation Committee review this update and take action on a plan to move funds to the most needed projects.

+7. TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING FOR THE CONSOLIDATED AGENCY
(Toni Bates/Conan Cheung) (pp. 73-81)

To achieve better coordination for the consolidated agency, regional policies are needed to guide future transit service planning and performance monitoring. Action would provide input and direction on the development of the SANDAG Board policy relating to transit service planning and performance evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+8.</td>
<td>MID-COAST UNIVERSITY CITY LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT (LRT) ALIGNMENTS (Toni Bates/Christine Rychel) (pp. 82-101)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report provides information on various LRT alignments in the University City area and solicits direction from the Committee on the selection of a preferred alignment to proceed into preliminary engineering and environmental document preparation. Input will also be sought from the Committee on a phasing plan for the entire Mid-Coast LRT project from Old Town to University City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.</th>
<th>UPCOMING MEETINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The next Transportation Committee meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 14, 2003, from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.</th>
<th>ADJOURNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This agenda is sent to all members of the SANDAG/RTC Board of Directors and alternates for informational purposes.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal). Other voting members in attendance were Vice Chair Dick Murphy (City of San Diego), Mickey Cafagna (North County Inland), Art Madrid (East County), Jerry Rindone (South County), Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), Bob Emery (San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board – MTDB), and Judy Ritter (North San Diego County Transit Development Board – NCTD), and Mary Sessom (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority). Also in attendance were alternates Christy Guerin (North County Coastal), Corky Smith (North County Inland), Phil Monroe (South County), Bill Horn (County of San Diego), as well as ex officio member Bill Figge (Caltrans).

1. DRAFT DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS FROM AUGUST 15, 2003, TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (APPROVE)

Upon motion by Supervisor Roberts and second by Councilmember Emery, the minutes of the August 15, 2003, meeting were unanimously approved.

2. 2002 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP) QUARTERLY AMENDMENT (APPROVE)

The 2002 RTIP, approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in June 2002, is a five-year program of major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period from FY 2003 to FY 2007. Various agencies have requested project additions and changes to the 2002 RTIP as part of this quarterly amendment. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution 2004-04 approving Amendment No. 14 to the 2002 RTIP.

3. UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS (INFORMATION)

The Subcommittee for Accessible Transportation (SCAT), as SANDAG’s Social Services Transportation Advisory Council, will hold the required unmet transit needs hearings in October.

4. INTERSTATE 15 (I-15) MANAGED LANES/Bus Rapid Transit (ML/BRT) PROJECT: QUARTERLY UPDATE (INFORMATION)

The I-15 ML/BRT project is jointly being managed by Caltrans and SANDAG. This item provides a status report on Phase 1 of the project between SR 56 and Centre City Parkway,
including progress to date on the development of BRT stations and services and Managed Lanes project development activities.

5. CONSTRUCTION POLICIES (REVIEW/COMMENT)

Staff has determined that several construction-related policies are needed to address SANDAG’s expanded responsibilities. Several new policies are proposed for the Committee’s review and comment.

Action: Upon motion made by Councilmember Emery and second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 2 through 5.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, provided comments about the recall election for Governor of California. He voted no on everything and encouraged others to do so as well.

REPORTS

10. TRANSPORTATION PROJECT BUDGET DEFICITS AND POTENTIAL STRATEGIES (INFORMATION)

Staff provided background information on this item. The intent of this report is to start discussions about where the $309 million in project shortfalls fit in the big picture. This shortfall is just for the current fiscal year; the projected funding shortfall for the next three years is $446 million. Staff’s suggestion is that the Board manages cash over the next three years. Staff reviewed various projects and their status. Staff also explained that the project deficits have resulted from the suspension of Traffic Congestion Relief Project (TCRP) allocations, the suspension of current year State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) allocations, the State’s over-commitment of the 2002 STIP which may result in no funding for new STIP projects in the 2004 STIP, and project cost increases. Staff indicated that the State may require regions to delay or reprogram projects with the 2004 STIP in order to manage the cash flow.

Staff described several potential strategies, including: apply unexpended and unobligated funds, transfer funds to ready-to-go projects (current construction and projects ready-to-go to construction in FY 2003/04), apply for TCRP and STIP reimbursements, apply for Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) bonds, and delay some projects. Any project that is delayed this year rolls into next year. Staff explained the specific strategy for the following projects: State Route (SR) 56, the Sprinter, SR 52, SR 905, and the Interstate 15 (I-15) managed lanes. The advantages of the proposed strategies would allow $1.35 billion in priority projects to proceed, would reduce the risk of losing federal funds, and would assign available cash to ready-to-go projects. The potential risks include limited GARVEE bond debt service capacity, no additional funds available in FY 04/05 and FY 05/06, TCRP and STIP reimbursements are subject to the availability of funds, lower federal apportionments to the region, and additional project cost increases. The next steps are to receive direction from the Transportation Committee, further analyze and refine the strategies, and return to the Transportation Committee and SANDAG Board for review and approval.
Chair Kellejian commented that he would take questions of staff, public speakers, then discussion of the Transportation Committee.

Mayor Murphy (City of San Diego) did not support the use of City of San Diego local street monies for SR 56. He asked if the City needs to approve this action. Staff replied that this specific action would require approval by the City of San Diego.

Mayor Murphy asked what approval was required to spend the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) money. Staff responded that the SANDAG Board allocates those funds. It was also mentioned that the money for SR 56 is a result of cost increases, not due to the State taking money from this project.

Councilmember Rindone (South County) noted some inconsistencies in the information provided and asked that the next time it comes back to the Transportation Committee that it is provided in a consistent format. Staff clarified that the information was for FY 03 only.

Supervisor Roberts (County of San Diego) asked where the TransNet money would be coming for the Sprinter project. Staff answered that there are two components, a rail one and a highway one. The highway piece has to be repaid. Using this money will not impact highway projects this year, and the projects will roll over to the next year.

Supervisor Roberts asked for a list of projects that will proceed when funding becomes available. He also commented that projects that contribute to immediate traffic congestion solutions should be given priority.

Chair Kellejian asked staff to report back on the award of construction and additional shortfalls of the projects.

Mayor Cafagna (North County Inland) asked that staff report back with information on what the risks are of losing federal funds and other funds already allocated if projects are not fully funded, and the time in which those projects will be ready for construction.

Mayor Smith (North County Inland – A) wanted a list of projects that will be rolled over so there is certainty that they will be implemented when funding becomes available.

Staff indicated that at the State level the next opportunity for funds will be in 2006; at the federal level, the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) will expire at the end of September and our best estimate is that there will be a short continuing resolution; TransNet is locked in until 2008.

Councilmember Rindone suggested that in the TransNet Extension effort staff look at increasing the public’s awareness that this is a local tax.

Chair Kellejian asked staff what assurances can we give to the entities that their delayed projects would go to the top of the list when more money becomes available and other projects would not go on top of them. Staff replied that this is a decision that policy makers control. If we don’t get more money in the system we don’t have the money to build the projects on the list.
Supervisor Horn suggested that projects such as bike trails, sound walls, and light rail be set aside in favor of moving cars.

Councilmember Emery suggested that staff report back with the consequences of not proceeding with various projects.

Public Comment

Fred Luedtke, Deputy Director of Public Works, City of Escondido, expressed concern about not proceeding with the Bear Valley/East Valley Parkway Project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document for this project will be certified and they can start purchasing right-of-way in the spring of 2004. This project is the third component of major improvements in this corridor. They want to be a partner in the decision-making process. Mr. Luedtke noted that if they can build the southern portion they may be able to get a developer to complete the northern portion.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, commented that a 1 percent sales tax to support public transit, like they have in Los Angeles, would solve all sorts of budgeting problems here in San Diego. Mayor Madrid (East County) noted that if we wanted to increase the amount of the TransNet sales tax, that would be considered a new tax and our support for the extension could go down the tubes if we asked for an increased amount.

Dan York, City of Vista, indicated the City's concern that $10 million of the funds for the Sprinter would be taken from the SR 78 corridor fund. They were under the impression that the money from SR 78 would be transferred to the South Santa Fe Avenue project. The South Santa Fe Avenue project will be ready for construction in 2006. They want some certainty that this project is on the list for implementation in 2006.

Doug Beckham, representing the Linda Vista Community Planning Committee, expressed concern about the SR 163/Friars Road interchange project not on the immediate implementation list, and that once the money is taken it won't be put back for this project.

John McAllister, Linda Vista, commented that Mission Valley has more traffic congestion that any other area in San Diego, and the SR 163/Friars Road project has been needed for a long time.

Douglas Isbell, County of San Diego, spoke in favor of the South Santa Fe widening project. This will provide an efficient roadway linking several cities and improve access to adjacent businesses and schools. Also, realigning Sycamore Avenue will reduce congestion on SR 78. This project will also solve a serious flooding problem and improve two railroad crossings for the Sprinter train. Transferring money will essentially end this project and force the County into reallocating the $10 million of TransNet funding. They need the money to acquire right-of-way.
Chair Kellejian said that you cannot purchase right-of-way until the environmental work is complete and it is not anticipated to be complete until June 2004. This project is not scheduled for construction award until 2006.

Gena Franco, Director of Engineering, City of San Marcos, commented that their portion of the South Santa Fe project is coordinated with the County’s project. The environmental work is complete and they are about 50 percent complete with right-of-way acquisition. She expressed concern about the County portion of the project being delayed. If this project does not go forward it was requested that the contribution from San Marcos be returned to the City of San Marcos.

Christine Evans, Mission Valley Community Council, read a statement from that group related to the SR 163/Friars Road project. This group would like to see this project be implemented as soon as possible.

Pete Aadland, North County Transit District (NTCD), said that basically the Sprinter is under construction as utilities have been relocated, buildings demolished, and the land has been cleared. A vehicle contract will be awarded in the next week or two. The mainline construction contract will be put out to bid next month. NCTD and the region have over $60 million invested in this project with $150 million in allocated federal money at risk if we don’t proceed.

Committee Discussion:

Mayor Murphy didn’t think the City would be in favor of using its TransNet money for local streets towards a highway. He thought it was unfair and undermines the effort to extend TransNet. He asked for more details on project funding.

In response to a question from the Committee, staff stated that in 1998 the SANDAG Board allocated federal monies for roadway maintenance. If those funds are not used, they may be lost. The City of Coronado has not used its federal road maintenance funds. (The cities of Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, and San Diego also have not yet used their share of the federal funds allocated by the Board in 1998 for local street maintenance.)

Councilmember Emery pointed out that we need to look at this issue from a regional perspective so that we know the risks of various projects. We have to do what is best for the region.

Supervisor Horn said that from the County’s perspective it doesn’t want to buy right-of-way if there is no commitment for construction. We have to have a plan for resolving traffic problems. The biggest issue in North County is traffic congestion.

Mayor Cafagna stated that right-of-way should be purchased now because it will get more expensive if you delay. He clarified to the Committee members that none of the projects are going to be deleted.

Supervisor Horn said that the SR 76 project was authorized by the voters in 1987 as part of the initial TransNet tax and is not completed nor is it projected to be completed.
Councilmember Guerin (North County Coastal – A) stated that perhaps work on the Sprinter should be delayed versus taking money from four regional arterial projects.

Councilmember Rindone said that we have to keep credence with the voters. We need to look at the funds most at risk and to act fiscally responsible. He agreed with staff’s ranking.

Councilmember Ritter, NCTD, said that the Sprinter has been planned for 20 years. If we don’t go forward now, we won’t go forward at all. The Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) indicates that this project has to be up and running by December 2005. This project was on the initial TransNet allocation. She expressed her willingness to loan the money from the South Santa Fe project with a promise that this project will go forward in the future.

Chair Kellejian summarized the direction to staff to include working with the staff members from various cities and the County to come to some sort of resolution on these projects, provide more information on the projects such as environmental work, construction award dates, additional shortfalls, and realities of when projects will be completed. He would like a commitment from SANDAG on these projects and how that manifests itself. If some projects are delayed, somehow they should flow to the top of the list. We should work on those projects that were under the TransNet measure. We also cannot lose federal funds. He supported continuing with the Sprinter project. Staff agreed to provide a risk assessment on each of the projects.

Mayor Murphy asked that staff provide a map of each of the projects as well.

Councilmember Guerin suggested that the information indicate the amount of money needed in FY 03 dollars as well as escalated dollars if delayed to future years.

**Action:** Upon motion by Councilmember Rindone and a second by Councilmember Emery, the Transportation Committee accepted this report for information and directed staff to work with staff from various entities on the projects in question, provide more detailed information about the subject projects at the next Transportation Committee, develop a mechanism that allows delayed projects to continue on the top of the list for future funding, and provide a risk assessment and a map for each project.

Chair Kellejian called a break at 11:02 a.m. and reconvened the meeting at 11:10 a.m.

7. **RECENT AMTRAK RIDERSHIP GAINS AND UPCOMING RECOGNITION EVENT (INFORMATION)**

Tyrone Bland from Amtrak provided information about the Pacific Surfliner and noted that its ridership has increased by 8.5 percent in the past year. This increase was attributed to several factors including the growth in the San Diego region and Amtrak’s infrastructure investment that improved reliability, on-time performance, and trip times. He noted that the Pacific Surfliner is the second most utilized service in the entire Amtrak service. He announced a celebration for the Surfliner’s two millionth passenger on September 30, 2003,
at 7:30 a.m., at the Santa Fe Depot. He invited the SANDAG Board to attend this celebration.

Councilmember Rindone stated that this route is restricted only due to capacity. He mentioned that one train set needs to be replaced.

8. STATE ROUTE (SR) 75/282 CONGESTION RELIEF MEASURES (APPROVE)

Staff reported that Caltrans has completed a feasibility study for the mid-term congestion relief measures and has identified a number of measures for the City of Coronado. Caltrans estimates it will cost $2.1 million to implement these measures. The schedule of construction is detailed in the report and includes traffic signals and bulbouts at three locations. The City of Coronado is proposing that SANDAG and Caltrans provide funding to address the congestion issues. Coronado is willing to front the money with payback in the future.

Chair Kellejian asked if Caltrans has identified its portion of this funding request. Staff replied negatively.

Chair Kellejian inquired if the tolls collected for the last two-year period is what Coronado is using for these traffic mitigation purposes. Councilmember Monroe responded positively.

Chair Kellejian asked what the City had planned for the remainder of that money. Jim Benson from the City of Coronado said that it depends on the results of the environmental documents for this process. Award of the contract for the mid-term measures is scheduled for December 2003. The major investment study for the tunnel has been completed.

Chair Kellejian asked why Coronado is requesting money from Caltrans. Mr. Benson replied that when the tolls were removed, the statistics for the congestion relief measures were based on 78,000 daily trips. There has been a 14 percent increase from that number.

Action: Upon motion by Councilmember Rindone and a second by Mayor Murphy, the Transportation Committee approved the request from the City of Coronado, in an amount not to exceed $700,000 in matching funds for SR 75/282 congestion relief measures. The contribution would be allocated from a future fund source administered by SANDAG. (Note: this action by the Committee must be ratified by full Board of Directors action to be effective.)

9. INTERSTATE 15 (I-15) INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP - LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIES (REVIEW/COMMENT)

Staff explained that the I-15 Interregional Partnership is a voluntary compact between SANDAG, the Southern California Council of Governments (SCAG), and western Riverside County. SANDAG Borders Committee members are participants. Six months ago this partnership adopted short-range transportation strategies that primarily deal with the existing rideshare activities in the corridor. Staff reviewed the five transportation long-range transportation strategies developed by the policy committee: T1: Support High
Speed Rail Transit Service In the I-15 Corridor, T2: Implement Transit Shuttle Services to Interregional Transit, T3: Preserve Transportation Rights-of-Way and Implement Priority Measures through the Development Process, T4: Reduce Parking Requirements in Transit Nodes and Mixed-Use Centers, and T5: Implement the I-15 High-Occupancy-Vehicle (HOV) System. Staff will be refining and setting priorities and will report back with a recommendation on the final strategies.

Public Comment

Robert Hoffman, a member of the public, indicated his astonishment at the volume of traffic between 2-3 p.m. on I-805 recently. He didn’t think this problem was going to be resolved with transit.

Board Discussion:

Councilmember Monroe suggested that ramp metering should be used so that the speed of cars on the freeway can be increased. He said that the biggest gain we can make with the current infrastructure is the better use of technology than we have today. We can quadruple the number of cars by simply using technology. Staff said the problem with that concept is that trips don’t start and end on freeways. There is a delicate balancing act between freeways and connecting streets. Ramp metering favors the longer trip and it is a tool, but not a resolution to the problem.

Councilmember Ritter did not agree with Strategy T4 reducing the parking requirements in mixed nodes. She said that we need to have parking for people to use transit.

Action: Upon motion by Councilmember Ritter and a second by Councilmember Emery, the Transportation Committee accepted this report for information.

11. AIR TRANSPORTATION ACTION PROGRAM (ATAP) UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Mayor Mary Sessom reported that the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority was formed to do two things: operate Lindbergh Field and provide for the long-term air transportation needs. On October 2, 2003, the Authority Board will hear a presentation regarding the sites that have been identified by the public working group to go into the next phase for evaluation. The Authority will be looking for a public vote in 2006 on a viable scenario.

SANDAG staff indicated that the Airport Authority is starting the Airport Site Selection Program which will evaluate each of the sites on their operational characteristics, development issues, accessibility, initial estimates of population, and environmental impacts of developing a site. The working group agreed that if certain thresholds were exceeded, the site should not proceed. The working group recommended that the following seven sites be transitioned into the next analysis: Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar, Naval Air Station (NAS) North Island, March Air Force Base (AFB), Tijuana Rodriguez International Airport, Off-Shore Floating Airport, Marine Corps Base (MCB) Camp Pendleton, and Desert Site. The working group did not have enough information on the Off-Shore scenario.
Councilmember Monroe indicated that he thought that one of the criteria was that the airport be located in San Diego County. He noticed that there are several sites outside of San Diego County. Staff stated that the overall recommendation of the working group was to maintain sites outside of San Diego County in those to be evaluated further.

Mayor Murphy asked if the East Miramar site had been deleted from further evaluation. Staff replied that it had been eliminated by the working group from the list for future consideration.

Staff commented that as the process moves forward and sites are fine-tuned, the Transportation Committee needs to pay close attention to ideas for ground access to the airport.

Public Comment

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, was pleased to see that MCAS Miramar was on the list to move forward. He thought that this is the safest and least costly site and provides the best opportunity for regional control and monetary benefit. He said that if the airport was located outside of San Diego County, the SANDAG Board will not have any control over it.

Chair Kellejian noted that the seven sites were not listed in any particular rank order

Action: Upon motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Councilmember Ritter, the Transportation Committee accepted this report for information.

Mr. Jack Limber, Interim General Manager from MTDB, distributed a letter from the San Diego Bus Drivers Union (1309) related to one of the labor negotiators. Mr. Limber announced that the individual referred to in this letter has been removed from the SDTC management negotiating team.

12. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for October 17, 2003.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.
FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES (TEA) PROGRAM:
QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

Introduction

This quarterly progress report covers the period July to September 2003 for the nine Federal TEA program funded projects. Two projects are complete (City of La Mesa's El Cajon Boulevard Revitalization and City of San Diego's Mission Beach Boardwalk) and the remaining seven projects are progressing according to their approved schedules.

Discussion

In March 2000 the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the allocation of TEA funds to nine projects and directed the Transportation Committee to receive progress reports on a quarterly basis. Listed below are the nine TEA projects. Attachment 1 contains a description of each project, progress made to date, and any pending issues.

- City of San Diego: Mid-City Gateway Project
- Cities of Coronado and Imperial Beach: Silver Strand Improvements
- Cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, and Solana Beach: Coastal Rail Trail
- San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB): San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center
- Cities of Encinitas and Escondido: Biological Core & Linkage Area Habitat Acquisition
- County of San Diego: Escondido Creek Acquisition
- MTDB: East Village Intermodal Transit Station Improvements
- City of San Diego: Mission Beach Boardwalk - Completed
- City of La Mesa: El Cajon Boulevard Revitalization - Completed

Photos of completed projects are posted on the TEA web page of the SANDAG Web site: www.sandag.org\TEA..
AB 1012: “Use-It-Or-Lose-It”

The TEA program, along with the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), is subject to the timely use of funds provision of AB 1012. Regions are required to obligate minimum amount of funds in each program or be subject to reprogramming. Based on the latest Caltrans progress report for the TEA program, the San Diego region has obligated over $18 million in TEA funds as of September 2003, which is well above the minimum obligation requirement.

The next TEA quarterly report will be presented at the January 2004 Transportation Committee meeting.

RENEE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Key Staff Contract: Sookyung Kim, (619) 595-5350; ski@sandag.org
City of San Diego: Mid-City Gateway Project ($4,255,000 TEA Funds)

The project provides for overpass and median enhancements on El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue where the two east-west major arterials intersect with the State Route 15 (SR 15) freeway corridor (formally 40th Street in Mid-City).

The project is divided into two phases. Phase 1 (El Cajon Boulevard from I-15/Central to 43rd Street Median Improvements) is complete and open for public use. Phase 2 (El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue Bridge Decks over SR 15 from 39th Street to 41st Street) is ongoing, and progress to date includes:

- Submitted requests for an encroachment permit from Caltrans and for a building permit from the City of San Diego.
- Completed the construction bid package and prepared to seek San Diego City Council authorization to advertise.
- Submitted a Request for Authorization to Proceed with Construction to Caltrans.
- Finalized project cost estimate and construction budget.

Pending Issues: None

Cities of Coronado and Imperial Beach: Silver Strand Improvements ($1,310,560 TEA Funds)

This project creates defining gateways at both the north and south entrances of the Silver Strand Scenic Highway (SR 75) as well as a restored, functional coastal ecosystem. The North Gateway corridor segment encompasses 1.5 miles of Scenic Highway 75, from the Naval Amphibious Base south, and the South Gateway corridor encompasses 2 miles from Emory Cove south to Rainbow Drive in Imperial Beach. It includes enhancement of the area surrounding the bicycle/pedestrian path, bicycle path improvements connecting Imperial Beach to the Bayshore Bikeway, median enhancements, historic landscape restoration, and gateway signage.

The project is divided into two phases. Phase 1 (SR 75 enhancement) is complete and open for public use. Phase 2 (the Bayshore Bikeway spur) is ongoing, and progress to date includes:

- San Diego Port District approved the new wetland mitigation site.
- Prepared construction bid documents and applied for an encroachment permit (to Caltrans).
- Received an additional $140,000 ($68,000 from SANDAG, $72,000 from City of Imperial Beach) to fill a budget gap.

Pending Issues: None.
Cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, and Solana Beach: Coastal Rail Trail ($4,513,500 TEA Funds)

This project includes the design and construction of a 16-foot-wide multimodal path in the San Diego Northern Railway right-of-way between the San Luis Rey River in the City of Oceanside and the southerly city limit of the City of Solana Beach (approximately 17.6 miles). The right-of-way is owned by the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD). Progress to date, by jurisdiction, includes:

City of Carlsbad (Phase 1): Tamarack Avenue to Oak Avenue
- Continue final design for Phase 1.
- Received comments from NCTD for the 70 percent Plan, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E).
- Prepared Coastal Commission permit application for submittal and prepared draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

Phase 2 (Carlsbad Village Station to Carlsbad Boulevard; Tamarack Avenue to Poinsettia Coaster Station) schedule is not known at this time.

City of Encinitas
- Prepared 30 percent PS&E and transmitted documents to NCTD for review.
- Prepared preliminary estimate for grade-separated rail crossing at various locations.

City of Oceanside (Phase 1): Vista Way to Pacific Street
- Completed final design for Phase 1.
- Circulated MND for public review.
- Received right-of-way authorization from Caltrans.
- Submitted Request for Authorization to Construct to Caltrans.

Phase 2 (Oceanside Boulevard to Oceanside Transit Center to Neptune Way) schedule is not known at this time.

City of Solana Beach
- Completed final design.
- Received Authorization to Construct from Caltrans.

Pending Issues: None.

MTDB: San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Station ($1,895,000 TEA Funds)

This project provides improvements to the existing San Ysidro/Tijuana Trolley Station. The enhancements include the creation of a pedestrian plaza to serve the Trolley station and the San Ysidro-Puerto Mexico Port of Entry as well as revisions to vehicular circulation patterns to establish designated bus, taxi, and jitney/shuttle bus passenger boarding areas.
The project is divided into two phases. Phase 1 (pedestrian bridge and new General Services Administration [GSA] parking lot) is complete and open for use. Phase 2 (pedestrian plaza, rail court modifications, track relocation, and new bus bays) is ongoing, and progress to date for Phase 2 includes:

- Intercity Bus Bay: installed lightings and railings (for ramp access).
- Northbound Track/East Station Platform: began excavation of track bed, installed drainage facilities, and started construction of the catenary and lighting foundations.
- Bus Loop Area: completed construction of four bus bays.

Pending Issues: MTDB continues to negotiate with private property owners regarding the appraised value of their properties (settled with one property owner).

Cities of Encinitas and Escondido: Biological Core & Linkage Area Habitat Acquisition ($1,800,000 TEA Funds)

This project involves the purchase of habitat along I-5. Escondido initially planned to purchase 51 acres north of Lake Hodges, but an opportunity to purchase a much larger property arose. Escondido’s share of the $1 million in TEA funds was used to help purchase a 50-acre portion (out of 232 acres) of the Bernardo Mountain property in cooperation with the San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority. The acquisition cost at $2,951,693 was completed in September 2002.

Encinitas’ plan to purchase approximately 10 acres immediately south of Batiquitos Lagoon is ongoing, and progress to date includes:

- Site A (Encinitas): appraisals and environmental assessments have been completed for three parcels. Escrow closed on the largest property on July 12, 2002. Final negotiations with the remaining two property owners are ongoing.

Pending Issues: None.

County of San Diego: Escondido Creek Acquisition ($2,000,000 TEA Funds)

The project consists of the purchase of valuable habitat land along the Escondido Creek riparian corridor, located in the Escondido Creek watershed in the unincorporated area of San Diego County.

The project is divided into two phases. Phase 1 (initial purchase of 31.53 acres) was completed in June 2002. Phase 2 (purchase of additional 64 acres) is ongoing, and progress to date includes:

- Board of Supervisors approved the purchase for one property (27.36 acres) at its June 11, 2003, meeting, and another property acquisition (18.29 acres) was approved on July 9, 2003.
- County is continuing the efforts to purchase the remaining properties. Negotiations are ongoing.

Pending Issues: None
MTDB: East Village Intermodal Transit Station Improvement ($4,584,000 TEA Funds)

This project is a part of a larger project along the 12th Avenue/Park Boulevard corridor and the new downtown baseball park station along the Bayside corridor. The enhancements include improved passenger access, widened platforms, street and curb improvements, station amenities, decorative catenary poles, and other aesthetic improvements at four station locations. Progress to date includes:

- Gaslamp station is complete and open for use.
- Began construction for Park-to-Baylink stations (12th and Market and 12th Avenue improvements).

Pending Issues: None.

City of San Diego: Mission Beach Boardwalk Project ($1,186,000 TEA Funds)

This project is complete. This project widened and improved the busy boardwalk in Mission Beach, which included among other improvements landscaping between Santa Barbara Place and Pacific Beach Drive, totaling 1.14 miles.

City of La Mesa: El Cajon Boulevard Revitalization ($1,565,194 TEA Funds)

This project is complete. This project revitalized part of downtown La Mesa via construction of a one-mile section of landscaped median along El Cajon Boulevard and the construction of a gateway sign located west of City of La Mesa limits.
PROPOSED NEW PROCUREMENT POLICIES

Introduction

SANDAG’s legal staff has continued the process of reviewing existing policies to determine whether they need to be supplemented to address SANDAG’s expanded responsibilities under consolidation. Staff has determined that some additional policies are needed to provide Board direction on SANDAG’s new construction-related responsibilities. Staff has prepared two procurement and contracting policies for review and comment by the Transportation Committee. Any changes requested by Transportation Committee members or staff over the next month will be incorporated into these proposed policies and brought back to the Transportation Committee in November. At the November 14th meeting, the Transportation Committee will be asked to recommend approval of the policies to the SANDAG Board at its November 21st meeting.

Recommendation

It is my recommendation that the Transportation Committee review and comment on the attached proposed policies.

Discussion

Procurement & Contracting – Equipment & Supplies

This policy establishes procedures for acquiring supplies, equipment, and materials. It provides direction concerning appropriate procurement methodologies for these types of items, consistent with the requirements in SB 1703.

Procurement & Contracting – Construction

This policy provides mandates for procurement methods on construction projects as well as a method for administering SANDAG construction contracts. Among other things, it discusses requirements in Senate Bill (SB) 1703 pertaining to construction procurements. It also discusses bid procedures and evaluations, protests, claims, change orders, and sole source limitations.

JULIE WILEY
Deputy General Counsel

Key Staff Contact: Julie Wiley, (619) 595-5647; jwi@sandag.org
PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTING – EQUIPMENT & SUPPLIES

Purpose

To establish procedures for acquiring supplies, equipment, and materials.

Background

When purchasing equipment, supplies, and materials, SANDAG staff is required to use a competitive procurement process. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 132352.4(5), SANDAG is required to select the lowest responsible bidder meeting specifications for awards of $50,000 or more, not including sales tax. This section also states two exceptions to this requirement. First, if an article of a specified brand or trade name is the only article that will properly meet SANDAG’s needs, competitive procurement is not required. Second, the Board may approve a purchase of equipment, supplies, or materials that exceeds $50,000 without utilizing competitive procurement methods if it is in SANDAG’s best interest to do so.

Policy

1. Supplies, equipment, and materials not otherwise provided for in a contract for construction or services, and estimated to cost more than $50,000, shall be listed separately in the budget or otherwise provided for by Board action or Executive Director approval before suppliers are asked to submit any binding offers.

2. For purchases involving no federal funds and not exceeding $25,000, a purchase order may be used. For purchases in excess of $2,500 involving federal funds, all applicable federal requirements and certifications must be attached to the purchase order or contract. For purchases that exceed $25,000, a contract must be used in order to ensure provisions are included to protect SANDAG’s interests.

3. Sole source acquisition shall only be permitted when the conditions below are met.

   3.1 When the acquisition will be paid for in whole or in part by federal funds one of the following conditions must be met:

      3.1.1 There is an urgent need for the articles due to an emergency or some other exigency that will not permit a delay resulting from competitive solicitation. Examples of such need include a danger to the public or loss of use of a transportation facility used by the public.
3.1.2 Staff solicited competitive bids and was unable to obtain a responsive bid from a responsible bidder.

3.1.3 The grantor agency providing funds for the project has approved sole source acquisition.

3.1.4 The item is only available from a single source.

3.1.5 The item is an associated capital maintenance item as defined in 49 U.S.C. § 5307 (a)(1) that is procured directly from the original manufacturer or supplier of the item to be replaced. Written certification must first be provided to the federal funding agency stating that such manufacturer or supplier is the only source for such item, and that the price of such item is no higher than the price paid for such item by like customers. A cost analysis verifying the proposed cost data, the projections of the data, and evaluation of the specific elements of costs and profit, is required.

3.2 When there are no federal funds involved the following additional factors may make sole source acquisition within SANDAG’s best interests. Therefore, a sole source for these types of procurements may be permitted when one of the conditions in this section (3.2) or section 3.1 is met:

3.2.1 There is only one vendor capable of providing the item because the item is unique or highly specialized.

3.2.2 The item should be purchased from a particular vendor in the interest of economy or efficiency as a logical follow-on to an order already issued under a competitively awarded contract.

3.2.3 The cost to prepare for a competitive procurement exceeds the cost of the item.

3.2.4 The item is an integral repair part or accessory compatible with existing equipment.

3.2.5 The item is essential in maintaining research or operational continuity.

3.2.6 The item is one with which staff members who will use the item have specialized training and/or expertise and retraining would incur substantial cost in time and/or money.

3.2.7 The procurement is of the type that may be made as a sole source procurement pursuant to the Public Contracts Code.

4. For purchases below $2,500 a micro purchase procurement method may be used. A micro purchase is a non-competitive purchase technique, however, the price of the item must still be fair and reasonable. There should be equitable distribution among qualified suppliers in
the local area and no splitting of procurements to avoid competition. A bid is only required from the vendor of choice and no contract is required.

5. For purchases between $2,500 and $50,000, a simplified competitive procurement method may be used:

5.1 Staff shall obtain written bids or document oral bids from at least three suppliers in a manner that permits prices and other terms to be compared.

5.2 Staff shall recommend the supplier that will provide the best value to SANDAG, taking into account the possible range of competing product and materials available, fitness of purpose, manufacturer’s warranty, and other similar factors in addition to price.

5.3 Staff shall obtain approval for use of the recommended supplier from a division or department director if the purchase will be under $10,000 and from the Executive Director if it is between $10,000 and $49,999.

6. For purchases of $50,000 or more, an invitation for bids (IFB) shall be issued and the award will be made to lowest responsible bidder submitting a responsive bid:

6.1 The IFB will be posted on SANDAG’s Web site. In addition, notice of the IFB will be sent to suppliers previously known to be interested in providing the needed article(s).

6.2 Notice of the IFB will be published in at least one newspaper of general circulation in San Diego County and in community newspapers and business publications as appropriate at least two weeks before the bid opening date. The notice shall state the date, location and time for receiving and opening the sealed bids. For federally funded projects, the IFB must also be published in one or more Disadvantaged Business Enterprise-certified publications.

7. For purchases of $50,000 or more that are better suited for a Request for Proposals (RFP) (negotiated purchase) or purchase on the open market, instead of an IFB (low bidder), approval may be sought from the Contracts Compliance Specialist to utilize a different procurement process. An alternate procurement process to the IFB may be in SANDAG’s best interest in the following example situations:

7.1 The purchase may be made at a lower price on the open market.

7.2 Competitive bidding is an inadequate method of procurement because it is necessary to purchase prototype equipment or modifications in order to conduct and evaluate operational testing.

7.3 The article(s) to be procured is undergoing rapid technological changes and it is in the public’s interest to issue an RFP so that the broadest possible range of competing product and materials available, fitness of purpose, manufacturer’s
warranty, and other similar factors in addition to price, can be taken into consideration.

8. If staff seeks authorization to utilize an alternate procurement process under section 7, documentation setting forth the reasons a deviation from the typical competitive bidding process is warranted, and a technical evaluation of the articles, prices, and suppliers shall be placed in the contract folder.
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 4220.1E also establish procedures which SANDAG must be follow when administering contracts using federal funds.

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 $2,500 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 $2,500 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.

1.2. 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, 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 DBE-certified newspaper or trade publication.

1.2.2 Advertisements may also be placed in other minority and community newspapers, as appropriate. Appropriate DBEs listed in the current SANDAG DBE Directory 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 Qualifications

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 in a sealed envelope 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. 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 SANDAG's 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).

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" is not defined by California law, but 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 Proposal and Cost Proposal - with bid amounts filled in.
1.5.4.2 Designation of Subcontractors - including dollar amounts.
1.5.4.2 Designation of DBE Suppliers and DBE 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" is defined by California law, but generally means that the bidder is able to demonstrate that it possess: (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 working capital that, times a factor of ten, must exceed the contract bid price;

1.5.6.1.2 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;

1.5.6.1.3 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; and
1.5.6.1.4 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. The list shall contain a name, title, 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 officers, superintendents, and engineers who will be involved in the SANDAG contract. These key personnel shall have at least three years 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 exceed the value of the SANDAG contract. A resume for each individual listed 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 a State Business and Professions Code of 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 nonresponsible bidder submits additional evidence, then that additional evidence shall be considered by the Director 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 25,000.00, the successful bidder must furnish a performance bond equal to at least one-half of the contract price and a payment bond equal to at least one hundred percent of the contract price.

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, Bid, or Award

1.8.1 SANDAG shall include in all contracts a procedure to be followed by interested parties who wish to protest a specification or procedure. 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 that the initial protest will be reviewed by a protest review committee and that protest reconsiderations will be reviewed by the Executive Director.

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
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 the functions of the awarding authority under Section 4100 et seq., including the authority to conduct a hearing in the event of a protest to the substitution. The Executive Director shall make a written recommendation to the Board, the Board may adopt the recommendation without further notice or hearing, or may set the matter for a de novo hearing before the Board.

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

1.11.1 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; and

1.11.1.10. any debarment of the contractor by another governmental agency.

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 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 or his or her designee 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 Contractors must comply with SANDAG's contractor labor compliance program, which is based on the California Labor Code and the "Labor Compliance" section of the California Department of Transportation's Construction Manual.

2.1.6 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.

2.1.7 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.

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's procurement and construction manual(s).

3.2 Construction contract change orders shall be approved by the Executive Director or his/her designees 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 or his/her designee’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 4220.1E and any successors thereof, that are applicable by law.

4. Non-Competitive Procurements

Non-competitive procurement is known as a sole source acquisition. Non-competitive 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 following conditions must be met:

4.1.1 There is an urgent need for the work due to an emergency or some other exigency that will not permit a delay resulting from competitive solicitation. Examples of such need include a danger to the public or loss of use of a transportation facility used by the public.

4.1.2 Staff solicited competitive bids and was unable to obtain a responsive bid from a responsible bidder.

4.1.3 The grantor agency providing funds for the project has approved sole source acquisition.

4.1.4 The work is only available from a single source.

4.2 When there are no federal funds involved, additional factors may be used to justify a sole source acquisition as being within SANDAG’s best interests. 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 contracts on behalf of the Board and shall report to the Board all contract 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.
WELFARE TO WORK TRANSIT STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Federal welfare reform legislation passed in 1996 (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, House Resolution [HR] 3734) shifted the responsibility of providing welfare assistance from the federal government to the state. In addition, states were required to develop an implementation plan for transitioning welfare recipients into jobs through the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) time-limited block grant program. In response, the State of California established the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program, which requires counties to develop implementation plans to assist CalWORKs participants’ transition to work.

One of the primary barriers faced by CalWORKs clients transitioning to work is the lack of viable transportation options to and from potential employment sites. In response, the federally funded Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) grant program was developed through the Transportation Enhancement Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) legislation to subsidize the capital and operation of new transportation initiatives specifically designed to improve transportation options for CalWORKs and low-income communities.

Through a competitive application process, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) was awarded JARC funding in 2000 to implement two Welfare to Work-related services, Routes 905 and 960. Route 905 provides service from the San Ysidro and Otay Mesa border crossings to the Iris Avenue Trolley Station. Route 960 is a reverse-commute route that provides service between the Euclid Avenue Trolley Station and University Town Centre via the Interstate 15 (I-15) transit plazas at University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard, and Kearny Mesa. Both routes have experienced significant ridership growth since their inception three years ago.

The Welfare to Work Transit Study, funded through a Caltrans Environmental Justice planning grant, builds on the success of Routes 905 and 960 by identifying the unmet transportation needs of CalWORKs participants, and outlining additional transit service improvements to help make public transit more usable to low income and CalWORKs communities. Since the project was conducted prior to the agency consolidation per Senate Bill (SB) 1703 (Peace), the study area was limited to the MTDB area of jurisdiction.
Recommendation

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee approve the final report on the Welfare to Work Transit Study and the recommended Service Improvement Plan (Attachment 3) as a basis for future funding consideration and service improvements.

Discussion

MTDB contracted with URS Corporation to develop the Welfare to Work Transit Study. The scope of work included an assessment of unmet transit needs and service deficiencies, and the development of service improvement proposals to address those needs. A Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), comprised of County Health and Human Services (HHS) staff, childcare and employment representation, transit agency staff, and CalWORKs participants, was established to provide input throughout the study process and to review deliverables and final recommendations. The results of this study will form the basis for future JARC funding applications.

Service Gap and Deficiency Assessment

Assessing the transportation needs of CalWORKs participants was conducted through analysis of CalWORKs origins and destinations, focus groups with CalWORKs participants, and discussions with the SAC. Based on the information collected and analyzed, the following findings were made regarding the travel demand of CalWORKs and income communities.

- The largest concentrations of CalWORKs participants reside south of Interstate 8 (I-8) in the following areas: South Bay, Mid City, Golden Hill, as well as other areas of San Diego, Lemon Grove, and the county south of State Route (SR) 94. Other high concentration areas include: Linda Vista, Oceanside, Escondido, Vista, and El Cajon.

- The largest concentrations of industries with potential CalWORKs employment (defined by the SAC as medical, manufacturing, wholesale trade, retail trade and services), are located north of I-8 in the following areas: Golden Triangle, Mira Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, the Grossmont area, El Cajon, southern Escondido, and eastern Oceanside. Other areas of high employment concentrations include downtown San Diego, Harborside, Hillcrest, and Midway/Old Town.

- CalWORKs participants have complex trip-making needs. Most CalWORKs participants are single mothers, and therefore must drop children off at childcare facilities before going to work. Also, they must travel to Health and Human Services facilities located across the county for program orientation, counseling, and training.

- Many jobs open to CalWORKs participants do not follow a regular 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday to Friday, work schedule. Jobs, particularly in the medical, manufacturing, service and retail industries, incorporate late night, early morning, and weekend shifts.

- CalWORKs participants are particularly concerned with safety in neighborhoods surrounding some transit stations, not only for their personal safety, but also because private transportation providers, such as taxis that provide a necessary link to public transit, refuse to serve these unsafe areas.
Many CalWORKs participants and low-income communities are unfamiliar with the existing transit services due to deficiencies in information dissemination, language barriers, and complex schedules and routings.

Once the transportation needs were identified, existing transit services were assessed. Based on the transportation needs and service assessment, gaps and deficiencies in transit service related to CalWORKs and low-income communities were identified. These gaps and deficiencies act as obstacles to transit usage, and can be temporal (time of day, day of week), geographic, service quality, and informational in nature. The following is a list of transit service gaps and deficiencies identified through the analysis.

**Service Between Key Origins and Destinations:** Based on the assessment of primary residential and employment concentrations (Attachment 1), and a review of transit services operating between these locations, a matrix was developed (Attachment 2) that identifies origin/destination pairs that do not have adequate transit service. These areas represent geographic gaps in service.

**Span of Service:** Due to the high percentage of shift work offered to CalWORKs and low-income communities, it is important to evaluate the viability of transit service in relation to time of day and day of week. The analysis of existing transit services revealed that fixed-route transit service is provided throughout the majority of the urbanized area within MTDB’s jurisdiction on weekdays. After 8:00 p.m., only 63 percent of the services are in operation, leaving the following areas without service: Poway Industrial Park, Sorrento Mesa, western Mira Mesa, parts of Point Loma, Paradise Hills, and Otay Mesa. After 10:00 p.m., only 51 percent of the transit routes are in operation, discontinuing service to the additional areas of Poway, Tierrasanta, Miramar Road, and parts of National City, El Cajon and Lakeside. After midnight, only 12 percent of the transit routes are in operation, primarily in the urbanized areas of Mission Valley, Midway, Pacific Beach, Mid City, Imperial Beach, National City, and western Chula Vista.

Seventy-one percent of the transit system operates on weekends and holidays, providing geographic coverage to most of the MTDB jurisdictional areas. Services that do not operate on weekends include express services in major travel corridors, commuter-specific services, and service in low-density suburban areas. Again, service is reduced into the night, and only limited service in major travel corridors is provided after midnight.

Based on this assessment, enhanced service between key origins and destinations would provide later night and weekend service.

**Express Service:** Express services are implemented to provide faster travel along major travel corridors, primarily for commute trips. There are a number of peak-hour only and all-day express services operating in the MTDB (and North County Transit District [NCTD]) areas. Peak-hour express services primarily operate along freeways with limited stops at the origins and destinations. All-day express services complement local service along the same corridor, and operate along freeways and major arterials with limited stops along the entire length of the route.

Since express services cater to the average commuter with typical eight-hour, Monday to Friday work schedule, operation is generally limited to weekdays from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Therefore, these services are unavailable to shift workers, forcing them to use much slower local services. Due to the high percentage of nontraditional work schedules, later night and weekend express services
between key origins and destinations would provide a viable transportation option for CalWORKs and low-income communities.

**Increase Awareness of Public Transit:** There is an extensive network of transit services available in the region. However, these services are only accessible if patrons know how to use them. While we currently produce transit information in Spanish there is a language barrier experienced by many non-English or Spanish speaking patrons making it difficult for them to use the system. In addition, information on the transit system is often difficult for CalWORKs and low-income communities to access and understand. An enhanced public outreach effort would help maximize the use of the existing transit system.

**Improve Service Quality and Safety:** On-time performance and overcrowding issues are apparent on many of the popular routes serving major corridors. Often, such issues are related to factors out of the control of the transit operator, including traffic congestion, construction, the number of wheelchair boardings, school bell times, etc. These issues degrade the travel experience of riders, and may result in missed transfers, and therefore longer travel times.

Safety is also an issue that may reduce the attractiveness and viability of transit services. Personal safety is a concern to most transit riders. CalWORKs participants, primarily single mothers, are especially concerned with personal safety. In addition, the lack of safety in some neighborhoods surrounding major transit stations deters taxis and other transportation connections to serve those areas. Without this connection service, transit may not be accessible to some CalWORKs and low-income communities.

**Service Improvement Plan**

Based on the assessment of transit service gaps and deficiencies, we developed a Service Improvement Plan (Attachment 3) which identifies several transit improvement proposals that would improve service for CalWORKs and low-income communities. These proposals can be categorized as service enhancements and service maximization. Transit service enhancements are proposals to increase the level of service, while service maximization attempts to maximize the use of existing services. The following is a summary of the proposed transit improvements (Tables 1 and 2). A detailed description of each proposal is presented in Attachment 3.

**Service Enhancement Proposals (Table 1):** Service enhancement proposals were developed based on the service gaps between key origins and destinations of CalWORKs and low-income communities. These proposals, geared towards improving service span and travel time, include enhancements to existing services, as well as new services.
### TABLE 1.—SERVICE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Proposal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Subsidy Requirement (Preliminary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Existing Services</td>
<td>Extended hours of operation, weekend service, realignments, etc. to Routes 30, 150, 603, 870, 877, 905, 921, 960, Coaster, and Coaster Connection.</td>
<td>Individual route subsidies range from $144,000 to $4,900,000. The total of all improvements is $10.7 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Reverse Commute Route</td>
<td>Reverse commute route between Downtown/Mid City and Poway Business Park.</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Express Service</td>
<td>I-805 Express Service between University City/Sorrento Mesa and the U.S.-Mexico Border.</td>
<td>$707,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Shuttle Service</td>
<td>Connector in Kearny Mesa between transit center and employment sites.</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with Social Service Providers for Feeder Service</td>
<td>Provide transit planner (1/4 time) to coordinate with providers and the Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA).</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** URS, August 2003.

**Service Maximization Proposals (Table 2):** Service maximization proposals were developed based on information collected from the focus groups with CalWORKs participants and discussions with the Stakeholder Advisory Committee. Improvements geared towards maximizing the use of existing services focus on improving transit service awareness and safety.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Proposal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Subsidy Requirement (Preliminary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Access to Transit Information (provided to social service agencies and targeted communities)</td>
<td>• Information pieces on sdcommute website for distribution to clients&lt;br&gt;• Link sdcommute web site to other HHSA web sites</td>
<td>$5,000&lt;br&gt;Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training sessions with caseworkers on use of website&lt;br&gt;• Information in multiple languages for distribution in areas with concentrations of speakers</td>
<td>$8,000&lt;br&gt;$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add two telephone information operators to reduce wait times and lost calls&lt;br&gt;• Include other languages in Trolley station and transit center signing&lt;br&gt;• Provide Spanish language training to operators</td>
<td>$80,000&lt;br&gt;$30,000&lt;br&gt;$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed Ride Home Program</td>
<td>Provide vouchers for cab rides home for emergencies or unexpected situations during the work day. Model on express bus program.</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Enhancements at Transit Centers</td>
<td>Provide security personnel and equipment at selected transit centers to facilitate use at off hours. Initial deployment could be at Euclid Avenue, 24th Street, and 12th &amp; Imperial.</td>
<td>Personnel - $88,000 per station&lt;br&gt;Equipment - $100,000 per station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Proposal</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Annual Subsidy Requirement (Preliminary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Attendants</td>
<td>Provide transit information and directions to transit users at 12th &amp; Imperial, America Plaza, Plaza Bonita, H Street, Iris, Old Town, Fashion Valley, Euclid, El Cajon Transit Center, Grossmont Center, and Santee. Attendants would be provided between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., 365 days per year.</td>
<td>$30,500 per station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Next Steps

A preliminary implementation phasing plan is included as Attachment 4. Implementation of any proposal would be contingent on SANDAG Transportation Committee approval, availability of funding (through grant awards or other sources), and operational feasibility. Low-cost proposals such as improvements to information dissemination can be implemented immediately. Higher-cost proposals, such as service, security, and station enhancements will serve as the basis for future JARC funding applications.

Budget Impact

The budget impact from this study is contingent on implementation of recommendations.

---

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Conan Cheung, (619) 557-4582; ccheung@mtdb.sdmts.com
The attachment to this Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Clerk of the Board at (619) 595-5602.
## TRANSIT SERVICE MATRIX

| Employment Area | Residential Location | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                 | Imperial Beach/ Nestor/San Ysidro (A) | Chula Vista (B) | National City (C) | Southern San Diego West of Euclid Ave (D) | Southern San Diego East of Euclid Ave (E) | Mid-City (F) | El Cajon (G) | Linda Vista (H) |
| Sorrento Valley (1) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| University City (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/0 | 0 | +/0 | 0 | + |
| Miramar Road/ Mira Mesa Blvd (3) | - | - | - | 0 | 0/- | 0 | 0 | + |
| Mission Valley (4) | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + |
| SDSU (5) | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Grossmont (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 |
| El Cajon Industrial (7) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - |
| Kearny Mesa (8) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| Scripps Ranch (9) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rancho Bernardo (10) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

- Direct connections generally available most of the time
- Connections available, but more than two transfers required or service hours limited after 6:00 p.m.
- Connection not available or one-way travel time exceeds 90 minutes.

**SOURCE:** URS, August 2003.
SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Service Enhancement Recommendations

Route 30

This express route connects Downtown San Diego with Pacific Beach, La Jolla, and University City. Service on this express route currently stops at 8:00 p.m. on weekdays and does not operate on weekends. This improvement would extend night service to 12:00 a.m. on weekdays and add weekend service from 7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. on a 60-minute frequency.

Advantage to CalWORKs clients: Improved travel times through the Pacific Beach and La Jolla areas, along with enhanced flexibility to travel to jobs in Pacific Beach, La Jolla, and the Miramar Road corridor. Provides a higher-speed alternative to Route 34 on weekends.

Route 150

This express service connects downtown San Diego to University City. It has a substantial reverse commute volume, indicating its use for employment trips by persons with trips originating south or east of downtown San Diego. Similar to Route 30, service ends at 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and there is no weekend service. This improvement would extend night service to 12:00 a.m. on weekdays and add weekend service from 7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. on a 60-minute frequency.

Advantage to CalWORKs clients: Improved travel times to University City and enhanced flexibility for travel to jobs on weekends.

Route 603

This local route connects Plaza Bonita in National City with the Euclid Avenue Trolley Station. It provides an important north-south link to Euclid where connections can be made with the Trolley for east and west travel, and Route 960 for travel north to Kearny Mesa and University City. The proposed improvements extend weekday service to 12:00 a.m., and Saturday and Sunday hours of operation to 10:00 p.m. (National City Transit has already proposed to increase Sunday service to 30-minute frequency in FY 2004. This improvement would compliment the proposed longer hours on Sunday.)

Advantage to CalWORKs clients: Enhanced access for National City and San Diego residents in reaching the Euclid Transit Center and expanded flexibility in reaching job locations on weekends.

Route 830

This new reverse commute route would provide 2-3 trips connecting downtown San Diego and the Poway Industrial Park by turning deadhead trips on Route 820 into revenue service. By serving the I-15 Transit Plazas, it will improve the travel time from Mid-City and downtown San Diego to the Poway Business Park.

Advantage to CalWORKs clients: This innovative use of deadhead trips for reverse commute service will improve travel times to employment sites in Poway, making jobs in that area more accessible. This service is anticipated to be implemented in February 2004. Using deadhead trips for reverse
commute service on other 800 series commuter express routes can be explored to provide express service from central and south San Diego to other employment centers along I-15.

Route 870

This limited service express route connects El Cajon and Santee with Kearny Mesa. The proposed improvements would add two more trips in each direction on weekdays, for a total of four round trips. The same level of service would be implemented on weekends, and timed connections with Route 960 would be provided.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** This route connects the client residential areas in El Cajon with employment centers in Kearny Mesa, and with connections to Route 960, to the employment areas in University City. Additional trips and weekend service would expand travel opportunities to more clients.

Route 877

This local route connects the Weld Boulevard Station on the Trolley Orange Line to the industrial area of El Cajon. It currently operates from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays only. The proposed improvements would extend service to 10:00 p.m., add weekend service from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on a 60 minute frequency, and make the connection to the Orange Line at the El Cajon Transit Center.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Longer weekday hours would enable clients to work a wider variety of shifts in the El Cajon industrial area. Weekend service would provide more flexibility in shifts. Moving the Trolley connection to the El Cajon Transit Center would enable more routes to directly connect to Route 877.

Route 905

This route connects the San Ysidro/Tijuana and Iris Ave. Stations with the Otay Mesa industrial area, and operates on weekdays until 6:30 p.m. The proposed improvements would extend the hours of operation to 10:00 p.m. and add weekend service from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on a 60 minute frequency.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Longer hours would enable use of the service for a wider range of shift times while weekend service would provide greater flexibility in accepting jobs with weekend shifts.

Route 921

This route provides service between University City and Mira Mesa via Mira Mesa Boulevard. It currently operates on weekdays only until 7:00 p.m., with no midday service. The proposed improvements would extend weekday service until 12:00 a.m., add midday and weekend service from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on a 60 minute frequency, and extend the route on the eastern end to provide better access to the new Mira Mesa MarketCenter and to dense population and employment areas just across I-15 in Scripps Ranch. Routing through the center would better connect it with communities to the west along Mira Mesa Boulevard. From the center, the route would proceed south to Maya Linda Road serving the backside of Miramar College, cross I-15 at Carroll Canyon Road, and loop back north along Scripps Ranch and Mira Mesa Boulevards. The new
terminal would be on Mira Mesa Boulevard, just west of I-15, at the current Park-and-Ride and Chargers Express bus stop. The route would also potentially serve the future Mira Mesa Transit Center, to be located at Westview Parkway and Hillery Drive.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Sorrento Mesa, Mira Mesa Boulevard, and Scripps Ranch have a sizable concentration of employment for CalWORKs clients. These improvements would provide more access and flexibility in reaching those locations.

**Route 960**

This express route connects the Euclid Station with Kearny Mesa and University City. It is currently subsidized with JARC funds and has been effective in providing an attractive link between the residential areas of south and Mid-City San Diego and the employment centers of Kearny Mesa and University City. It is a critical link in the transit travel path between several residential and employment areas. The proposed improvements would extend weekday service to 12:00 a.m., add midday and weekend service from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on a 60 minute interval, and realign the service to run along Nobel Drive to access the Nobel Drive Coaster Station when completed in 2005.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** These improvements would expand and enhance the important north-south link already provided by this route. Longer hours of service and weekend operation would expand the range of employment opportunities available in Kearny Mesa and University City to CalWORKs clients. The realignment onto Nobel Drive will allow connections with the Coaster at the new Nobel Drive station and save travel time to University Towne Centre.

**I-805 Express Route**

This new express route (identified as Route 680 in the Regional Transportation Plan) would operate between University City/Sorrento Mesa and the U.S.-Mexico Border, running primarily on I-805. Access to the route would be provided at stations in Chula Vista, National City, southern San Diego, Mid-City, and Kearny Mesa. Stations serving concentrations of CalWORKs clients include Telegraph Canyon Road, Plaza Bonita/SR 54, 47th Street Trolley Station, University Avenue Transit Plaza, and El Cajon Boulevard Transit Plaza. Employment centers in Kearny Mesa, north University City, and Sorrento Mesa would be served. The route would likely be initiated with peak-hour service on weekdays only, with longer hours added as demand warrants and funding permits.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Implementation of this route would provide high-speed travel to three of the key employment centers in the San Diego region. The decreased travel times and increased access will enhance the ability of clients to seek and secure higher paying jobs.

**Coaster**

The Coaster provides commuter rail service between Oceanside and San Diego. It is oriented primarily to southbound travel in the morning and northbound travel in the afternoon although some reverse commute trips are provided. The proposed improvements would add additional reverse commute trips and extend weekday hours of operation until 10:00 p.m.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Expanded reverse commute service on the Coaster would enhance access for clients to the employment opportunities in Sorrento Valley and Sorrento Mesa. The longer hours would expand the shifts available to clients.
Coaster Connection

The Coaster Connection service provides a timed connection between the Sorrento Valley Coaster Station and employment sites in Sorrento Valley, Sorrento Mesa, and University City. Eight routes meet the Coaster trains during peak periods to take passengers to their destinations with virtually no transfer time. The proposed improvement would provide Coaster Connection service to the additional reverse commute and later night trips.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** The link provided by the Coaster Connection service is essential in providing access to the employment sites in the vicinity of the Sorrento Valley Coaster Station. The connecting service would provide high-quality, fast service to clients seeking employment in the station’s service area.

Kearny Mesa Access Improvements

Enhanced access to the numerous employment sites in Kearny Mesa not currently served by fixed-route transit could be provided through a feeder service or modifications to fixed routes in the area. A shuttle would be timed to meet Route 960 trips at the Kearny Mesa Transit Center and take riders from all routes serving the transit center to their destinations. The service would operate between 6 am and 10 pm on weekdays, with weekend service provided from 7:00 am to 10:00 pm.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Numerous comments were received during the analysis regarding the difficulty in getting to many of the employment locations in Kearny Mesa. This shuttle would blend elements of flex routes and the Coaster Connection service to provide fast access to riders using the regional routes to get to Kearny Mesa. It would help expand the number of employment opportunities for CalWORKs clients.

Coordination with Social Service Providers for Feeder Service

Several social service providers operate transportation services that can be used by CalWORKs clients. This proposal would provide a transit planner to coordinate services of these operators with the region’s transit system and CalWORKs caseworkers to enhance travel between client residences and the transit system. A key part of the effort would be working with the region’s Coordinated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA). The CTSA works to expand the availability and economic utilization of specialized transportation services by improved use of existing resources through the coordination of services. It affords an efficient opportunity to enhance access to the regional transit system. By focusing on providing local access to the regional transit system, these specialized providers could function as feeder services.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Better access in residential neighborhood will make it easier to make trips for work and other purposes, and enable the regional transit system to focus on longer-distance trips with higher numbers of riders.

Service Maximization Recommendations

Improved Access to Transit Information

Several times during the study process it became apparent that many clients and social service staff members were not aware of the various transit services available and the sources of information regarding them. Many people were surprised to hear of the www.sdcommute.com Web site and its
trip-planning capability. Comments were also received regarding the long waits in reaching telephone information operators. As a result, several transit information improvements have been proposed, as described below.

Sdcommute Website Information

Information pieces describing the features of the Web site would be developed and distributed to clients and caseworkers. They could also be distributed more widely if desired to make people more aware of this useful source of transit information.

Link Sdcommute Web Site to Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) Web Sites

HHSA provides the empowersd.com Web site, which has a wide variety of information for CalWORKs clients. It also includes links to several other helpful websites including:

- sdcounty.ca.gov
- www.ymcacr.org
- www.sandiegochildsupport.com
- www.sandiegoatwork.com
- www.caljobs.ca.gov

This improvement would work with County HHSA staff to include links in these sites to the sdcommute Web site to make it more convenient to access transit information.

Caseworker Training

Training sessions would be developed for CalWORKs caseworkers to enhance their ability to advise caseworkers regarding availability of transit for their trip making. SANDAG transit staff could develop the training and provide it at the HHSA offices.

Transit Information in Foreign Languages

While transit materials are widely available in Spanish, several other languages are spoken by CalWORKs clients. This proposal would provide summary and detailed information pieces in Asian, Middle Eastern, and other languages for distribution through caseworkers and within communities where there are concentrations of persons speaking them.

Increase Telephone Information Capacity

Up to two additional operators would be added to the telephone information system to reduce wait times and make it easier for all transit users to reach them.

Station Signing in Foreign Languages

Similar to the transit information pieces, there is a need for signing in additional languages at Trolley stations and transit centers. New signs with summary information in languages other than Spanish would be developed and placed in the stations to enhance the availability of how to ride information to speakers of these languages.
Language Training for Operators

An ability to communicate basic information on destinations and routes would enhance the ability of non-English speakers to use the transit system. This proposal would provide training on a volunteer basis to bus and Trolley operators in Spanish and perhaps other languages.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Improved access to information on the transit system will make the system easier to use and less intimidating to clients.

Guaranteed Ride Home Program

This program enables transit users to return home for emergencies or unexpected developments when regular transit service is not running. The regional program provides an emergency ride home to commuters who carpool, vanpool, bike, use the Coaster, or Premium Express Bus service to get to work at least three times per week. To be eligible, a customer must register with RideLink by completing and signing an application form prior to needing the service. Once registered, riders receive three vouchers which are good for one year from the date of registration. The vouchers can be used for taxi service or a rental car for the ride home. There is a $3.00 co-pay for each voucher use.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Transit services will be usable with less anxiety about being able to get home if required during the day or other times when the regional service is not operating.

Security Enhancements at Transit Centers

Comments were received during the study about security concerns when traveling outside of peak hours. There was also concern about the inability to get taxis at night at certain locations. This proposal would expand and enhance security at key transit centers to provide greater safety for travel during the evening and early morning hours. The intent would be to provide a safe area within the station where riders could wait for connecting bus services or taxis to complete their travel. The enhanced security would benefit both riders and taxi drivers who would be encouraged to serve these transit centers. While these stations are not security risks in themselves, they are located in areas with relatively high incidences of crime. The Euclid Avenue, Iris Avenue, 47th Street, and City College stations are proposed as candidates for this additional security.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Enhanced safety for riders while waiting and expanded travel opportunities through the use of taxis to reach home.

Station Attendants

Questions frequently come up at trolley stations and transit centers regarding fares, service to specific destinations, and where to catch specific transit services. Station attendants have been used for special events in the past with great success. This proposal would provide attendants at key stations on a regular basis to help CalWORKs clients and all riders in using the transit system.

**Advantage to CalWORKs clients:** Use of transit will be easier and less confusing with the ability to get accurate answers to questions about using the system.
# IMPLEMENTATION PHASING PLAN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Annual Subsidy/Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 30 Extended Hours and Weekend Service</td>
<td>$973,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 150 Night and Weekend Service</td>
<td>$742,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 603 Extended Hours Weekdays and Weekend Service</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 830 Poway Reverse Commute</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 905 Night and Weekend Service</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 960 Night and Midday Weekday, and Weekend Service</td>
<td>$1,045,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-805 Express Route Peak Period Weekday Service</td>
<td>$707,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved Access to Transit Information</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination with Social Service Transportation Providers</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guaranteed Ride Home Program</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 870 Additional Weekday Trips, Weekend Service, Timed Transfer with Route 960</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 877 Extended Hours and Weekend Service. Extend to El Cajon Transit Center.</td>
<td>$122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 921 Extend Weekday Service, Midday, and Weekend Service, Extend to Scripps Ranch</td>
<td>$632,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced Kearny Mesa Connections</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security Enhancements</td>
<td>$564,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station Attendants</td>
<td>$366,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coaster Added Reverse Commute Trips</td>
<td>$4,939,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coaster Connection Added Service for New Reverse Commute Trips</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proposal implementation dependent upon SANDAG Transportation Committee approval at a future date and contingent on funding (i.e., Jobs Access Reverse Commute grants).

Source: URS, August 2003.
LOS ANGELES – SAN DIEGO – SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY (LOSSAN)
BOARD OF DIRECTORS WORKSHOP

Introduction

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

The LOSSAN Joint Powers Board of Directors meets quarterly and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meets generally every other month. SANDAG is staff to the LOSSAN Board and TAC. A summary of Board workshop held on September 13, 2003 is provided as Attachment 2.

SANDAG Actions Related to LOSSAN Board Actions

LOSSAN did not take action on any items from the workshop requiring action by the SANDAG Board of Directors. However, discussion on many topics directly relates to SANDAG’s efforts to improve the coastal rail corridor for Amtrak, Coaster, Metrolink, and freight services.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key staff contact: Linda Culp, (619) 595-5357; lcu@sandag.org
MEMBERSHIP

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

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

Staff contact: Linda Culp
(619) 595-5357; lcu@sandag.org

MEMBERS

Chair: Julianne Nygaard
North County Transit Development Board

Vice Chair: Jacki Bacharach
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Arthur Brown
Orange County Transportation Authority

Chris Norby
Orange County Transportation Authority

Beatrice Proo
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Jerry Rindone
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Joe Kellejian
San Diego Association of Governments

Bill Davis
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Joni Gray
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Peg Pinard
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Warren Weber
Caltrans, Division of Rail

Alternates

Harry Mathis
San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board

Brian Humphrey
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Susan Rose
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Fred Munroe
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Ann Kulchin
North County Transit Development Board

Ex Officio Member

Richard Dixon
Southern California Association of Governments

Additional Technical Advisory Committee Members

Amtrak

Burlington Northern Santa Fe

California Public Utilities Commission

Southern California Regional Rail Authority

Union Pacific
Introduction

The Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Agency held a board workshop on September 13, 2003. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss issues related both to the LOSSAN corridor and the future role for the LOSSAN agency. Directors and staff from each member agency attended the workshop, which was hosted by the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA). No action was taken by the Board at this meeting. However, a number of action items were developed by attendees for action by the Board in the near future.

Internal Advocacy

The LOSSAN advocacy framework and project priorities developed over the past two years have been seen in potential conflict with priorities developed by individual member agencies. The group discussed how best to work together on projects that have corridorwide importance and to gain acceptance by member agencies of LOSSAN as an agency in the corridor. Action items discussed by the group were:

- Regular coordination between LOSSAN and member agencies
- LOSSAN as a regular item on member agency board agendas
- LOSSAN road show to member agencies (include a subset of board members and possibly a slide show)
- Information sharing on projects between LOSSAN and agencies
- Potential meeting between LOSSAN board members and member agency CEOs

Develop Corridorwide Strategic Plan

In 2001, Amtrak sponsored a long-range plan for the three state-supported intercity rail corridors including the Pacific Surfliner corridor. An intense effort to involve the various agencies along each corridor was pivotal in this effort. The group discussed the possibility of updating this plan and developing a strategy for implementing it. Action items discussed by the group were:

- Update to Amtrak-sponsered plan.
- Expansion of Caltrans’ 2003 LOSSAN Strategic Plan, an implementation strategy for the Los Angeles to San Diego segment of the corridor, to entire corridor.
- Discuss the possibility of member agencies developing their priorities and bring them to LOSSAN for support.
- Concentrate on projects with corridorwide benefit.
External Advocacy
The advocacy framework adopted by the Board in 2002 called for advocacy in operations and capital funding, service levels, rail safety and security, and supportive land use policies. Related topics were how to increase the role of LOSSAN in the corridor and how best to market to the public the recent successes along the corridor. The following action issues were developed from this discussion:

- Develop implementation plan for LOSSAN priority projects, in coordination with members.
- Advocate for intercity passenger rail (i.e., Amtrak)
- Support for “growing the pot” of funds available for intercity rail.
- Larger/more visible role in corridor (e.g., Amtrak 2Millionth Event, Rail Safety Week)
- Better marketing regarding the success story of the corridor.

Formulate Future Role For LOSSAN As An Agency
A number of issues related to LOSSAN’s future role were discussed by the group. The following issues warrant future discussion both by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Board. However, several members commented that the various options for LOSSAN’s future be discussed by individual member agencies:

- Take over the operations of intercity rail services, similar to the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority
- Advocate for a particular earmark in the reauthorization legislation for LOSSAN.

Future Meetings
The TAC will discuss these and other issues from the Board Workshop at their meetings on Tuesday October 14, 2003 and Tuesday November 18, 2003. The next Board of Directors meeting is proposed for Wednesday January 7, 2004. All meetings will be held at MTA.

Note to Member Agencies:
If you would like to have a presentation or meeting with the LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency and your board, committees, or representatives, please contact Linda Culp at (619) 595-5357 or lcu@sandag.org.
TRANSPORTATION PROJECT BUDGET DEFICITS AND POTENTIAL STRATEGIES

Introduction

As discussed during the September 19, 2003 Transportation Committee meeting, there are $309.7 million in FY 2003/04 shortfalls due to cost increases and the suspension this year of the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). An additional $137 million in shortfalls are anticipated for FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06. At the September meeting, staff presented a set of potential strategies and impacts on various projects of regional significance, including highway, transit and arterials. Staff received feedback and direction from the Transportation Committee.

Due to the budget shortfalls, the Transportation Committee needs to make decisions on current year projects. The region needs to move forward with a strategy on some of the budget shortfalls. The risks involved in not making near term decisions include additional costs from interest payments on right of way court judgments, right of way and construction cost inflation, loss of federal funds and missed opportunities to begin construction on regional projects.

An update to the strategies and their potential risks are presented in this report.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to do the following:

1. Approve a series of adjustments to the programming and scheduling of various projects, that will reduce the FY 2003/04 $309.7 million shortfall to $108.9 million;
2. Make policy decisions that reduce the FY 2003/04 shortfall an additional $82.1 million to $26.8 million; and
3. Make policy decisions on delaying projects up to $26.8 million.

Discussion

Attachment 1 shows a list of the projects that make up the current year $309.7 million budget shortfall. It also shows projects that may have budget shortfalls in FY 2004/05 and 2005/06 as a result of potential extensions to the suspension of the TCRP and STIP programs. Attachment 2 shows project locations for all the projects discussed in this report. The current budget deficit can be addressed by making policy decisions in three phases.
1. Project Adjustments
2. Policy Decisions
3. Delay of Projects

These decisions are intended to keep projects under construction and “ready to go” fully funded projects moving forward. It is also intended to maintain the right of way acquisition effort of projects under way to help minimize further cost increases in this area and get the projects in a position to go to construction in future years when additional funds should be available.

1. Project Adjustments - Making the shortfall more manageable

The FY 2003/04 budget shortfall of $309.7 million is too large for the region to bridge with available sources. Therefore, a number of programming adjustments are necessary to make the shortfall more manageable. A brief summary is outlined in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project(1)</th>
<th>Description/Strategy</th>
<th>Amount ($millions)</th>
<th>Shortfall Balance ($millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003/04 Shortfall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$309.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>State will not support GARVEE, delay project to FY 2006/07</td>
<td>$101.4</td>
<td>$208.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprinter</td>
<td>Pursue innovative financing options, i.e. TIFIA bonds or similar bridge financing</td>
<td>$80.0</td>
<td>$128.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes</td>
<td>GARVEE approved, advance funds</td>
<td>$17.5</td>
<td>$110.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas Ped X-ing</td>
<td>Encinitas has agreed to advance $1.2 million and has applied for Letter of No Prejudice Reimbursement</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>$109.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Technology</td>
<td>Financed. Debt service funded with FTA 5307 funds.</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$108.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $200.8 $108.9

1. Attachment 3 discusses specific project cost and schedule impacts as well as risks resulting from the adjustments for FY 2003/04 outlined in Table 1.

- The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the $200.8 million in adjustments as shown in Table 1.
2. Policy Decisions

There are approximately $116.7 million in potential funding sources that could be applied to cover a portion of the remaining $108.9 million shortfall. Only $82.1 million, however, are recommended to be re-directed. See Table 2 for specific recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Program (1)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount ($millions)</th>
<th>Shortfall Balance ($millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Shortfall from Table 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$108.900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings from Completed Projects</td>
<td>SR 76 Right of Way and I-5/HOV</td>
<td>$4.217</td>
<td>$104.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Highway Program Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.000</td>
<td>$89.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Roadway Maintenance</td>
<td>Unexpended balance from 1998 RSTP funds allocated to Coronado, National City, Oceanside and San Diego</td>
<td>$6.666</td>
<td>$83.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Funds not needed until 2005</td>
<td>$19.000</td>
<td>$64.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet 78 Corridor Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.000(2)</td>
<td>$64.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$37.260(3)</td>
<td>$26.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.837(4)</td>
<td>$26.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Arterial System (RAS) Projects</td>
<td>SR 163/ Friars Rd, SR 78/Rancho del Oro, Plaza Blvd, South Santa Fe, East Valley/Bear Valley Pkwy</td>
<td>$19.757(5)</td>
<td>$26.757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Recommended Actions: $82.143 $26.757

1. Attachment 3 discusses specific project cost and schedule impacts as well as risks resulting from the adjustments for FY 2003/04 outlined in Table 1.
2. Not recommended; these funds are needed to cover program needs in the SR 78 corridor.
3. $31 million of these funds will be directed to Forester Creek channelization and SR 52 Right of Way.
4. Not recommended because of public commitments to bikeway project.
5. Not recommended at this time to enable projects to proceed. However, these funds are potential source of funds should the RAS projects not progress as currently scheduled. See Attachment 4.
The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the $82.1 million in policy decisions as shown in Table 2.

The Transportation committee is also asked to establish a strict Use-it-or-Lose-it policy for the five (5) Regional Arterial System projects allocated $19.757 million of RSTP funds based on the current schedule presented in Attachment 4.

3. Delay of Projects

The Transportation Committee is asked to identify the projects from the following list that should be delayed to balance project needs and available funding. The total value of the delayed projects must be at least $26.8 million (from Table 2 above).

**TABLE 3.—POTENTIAL DELAY OF PROJECTS LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project(1)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount ($millions)</th>
<th>Shortfall Balance ($millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects Underway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125 Sweetwater Noise Mitigation Cost Inc.</td>
<td>Required Mitigation</td>
<td>$0.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside Transit Center Parking Structure</td>
<td>Coaster Parking</td>
<td>$4.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Programming and Monitoring</td>
<td>SANDAG Staff</td>
<td>$0.473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56 Right of Way</td>
<td>Cost Increase</td>
<td>$24.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Ready to go in Current Fiscal Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 Construction</td>
<td>Roll over shortfall</td>
<td>$20.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 Right of Way Cost Increase</td>
<td>Roll over shortfall</td>
<td>$2.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5/Del Mar Heights Road Auxiliary Lane</td>
<td>Incorporate into I-5/ I-805 “Merge”</td>
<td>$5.485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Operational Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 Ramp Meters</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changeable Message Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Speed Monitoring Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD Buses</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$77.868</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26.757</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Attachment 3 discusses specific project cost and schedule impacts as well as risks resulting from the adjustments for FY 2003/04 outlined in Table 1.

FY 2004/05 and 2005/06 still need to be addressed

As discussed at the Transportation Committee meeting on September 19, there are approximately $137 million of anticipated budget shortfalls in the next two years. These are listed in Table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Shortfall Description</th>
<th>Shortfall ($millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fare Technology Project</td>
<td>Debt Service Payments for FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06</td>
<td>$8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Programming and Monitoring</td>
<td>No STIP allocations in FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 Right of Way</td>
<td>No STIP allocations in FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06 ($26.1 million) and cost increase ($24 million)</td>
<td>$50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Last stage providing more direct connection to CHP truck inspection station remains unfunded</td>
<td>$51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare Program</td>
<td>No STIP allocations in FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>No TCRP allocation</td>
<td>$22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$136.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on the decisions in the three phases outlined above to address the FY 2003/04 shortfall, the shortfalls for FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06 will be larger. These additional shortfalls may include rolled over deficits, additional costs from inflation on delayed right of way acquisition or construction work, and shortfalls created by taking funds away from projects to address the FY 2003/04 needs.

The state Fund Estimate for the 2004 STIP will be determined in December 2003 giving the region a better picture of what funds will be available in the 2004 STIP cycle. Staff recommends we provide strategies for FY 2004/05 and beyond towards the end of this Fiscal Year after we know the status of the 2004 STIP.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation
### Transportation Project Shortfalls for FY 2003/04 through FY 2005/06

#### Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost 2003/04 ($000's)</th>
<th>2004/05 &amp; 2005/06 ($000's)</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Funds Available ($000's)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SR 905 Construction</td>
<td>292,300</td>
<td>101,386 51,200</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Adjust by delaying to FY 2006/07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sprinter</td>
<td>351,500</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>57,300</td>
<td>[Adjust $80M TCRP shortfall with TIFIA or other sources]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes</td>
<td>324,200</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Adjust with GARVEE advance]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Encinitas Grade-Sep Ped Crossing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Encinitas to advance funds. Letter of No Prejudice]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fare Technology Debt Service</td>
<td>35,402</td>
<td>700 8,400</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Financed on-going contract]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Adjustments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,834 59,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Delays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost 2003/04 ($000's)</th>
<th>2004/05 &amp; 2005/06 ($000's)</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Funds Available ($000's)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>SR 125 Sweetwater Noise Mitigation</td>
<td>4,497</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Required Mitigation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oceanside Transit Center Parking Structure</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Risk of property lease expiration]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Planning, Programming and Monitoring</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>473 948</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>[SANDAG Operations]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Forester Creek</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Construction of channelization needed for SR 52]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SR 52 Right of Way</td>
<td>183,642</td>
<td>15,000 26,110</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Suspension of right of way acquisition in 03/04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR 52 Right of Way Cost Increase</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>2,000 24,000</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SR 52 Construction</td>
<td>138,158</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>37,260</td>
<td>[$37.26M not needed until 2006 if two segments are combined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SR 56 Right of Way Cost Increase</td>
<td>142,331</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Need up to $11M Dec '03, remainder Mar '04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I-5/ Del Mar Heights Auxiliary Lane</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>5,485</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Incorporate into I-5/I-805 Merge and save $3M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Freeway Speed Monitoring Stations</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ramp Meters on I-805</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Changeable Message Signs</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NCTD Buses</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rideshare Program</td>
<td>20,630</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4,217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>TransNet Highway Program Balance</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TransNet SR 78 Corridor Balance</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I-15 BRT, TCRP shortfall</td>
<td>50,800</td>
<td>22,600 19,000</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Not needed until 2005]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SR 163/Friars Road</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>[NEPA Enviro Doc May 2006]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SR 78/Rancho del Oro</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>[NEPA Enviro Doc Jun 2005]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Plaza Blvd</td>
<td>9,060</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>[NEPA Enviro Doc Nov 2004]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>South Santa Fe</td>
<td>43,110</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>[NEPA Enviro Doc Jun 2004]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>East Valley/Bear Valley</td>
<td>13,679</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>6,118</td>
<td>[NEPA Enviro Doc Apr 2004]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Roadway Maintenance</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>[Unexpended since 1998 allocation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>[Unexpended since 1998 allocation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>[Unexpended since 1998 allocation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5,703</td>
<td>[Unexpended since 1998 allocation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Project Delays</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>108,868 77,188</td>
<td></td>
<td>116,737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost 2003/04 ($000's)</th>
<th>2004/05 &amp; 2005/06 ($000's)</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Funds Available ($000's)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>309,702 136,788</td>
<td></td>
<td>174,037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- C: Construction contract awarded or within six months
- D: Project is in Design
- E: Project is in Environmental Document Phase
- P: Project is in Planning phase
- U: Program has unexpended or unobligated funds
Regional Roadway Maintenance:
- Coronado
- National City
- Oceanside
- San Diego

Projects of Regional Coverage:
- Fare Technology
- Planning, Programming, and Monitoring
- Rideshare
- Freeway Speed Monitoring Stations
- NCTD Buses

Oceanside Transit Center Parking Structure
New Freeway Interchange SR-78/Rancho Del Oro Dr.
Encinitas Grade Separated Pedestrian Crossing
SR 125 Noise Mitigation
SR 905
Widen South Santa Fe Ave.
Vista
San Marcos
Sprinter
Widen Bear / East Valley Pkwy.
ESCONDIDO
PACIFIC OCEAN
SAN DIEGO
Tijuana, B.C.
PROJECT SPECIFIC INFORMATION

The following presents cost and schedule impact information for all projects included in the report. A discussion on impacts to the project’s schedule from the proposed programming as well as potential risks is included, as appropriate. For easier reference, they are numbered in the same order as the list in Attachment 1.

1. State Route 905

The state has indicated that they are not considering Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) bonds to bridge the gap on the interregional component of the STIP, which totals $78.9 million. Further, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) staff has indicated that they are considering placing limits on GARVEE for the regional STIP component. Without the ability to issue GARVEE bonds on either the regional or interregional components of the STIP, the only viable option is to continue pursuing federal funds and to delay the project until other resources become available. An additional $51.2 million is needed after FY 2003/04 to finish the last stage of the project and provide a more direct service to the California Highway Patrol truck inspection station.

The project has enough federal discretionary funds to fully fund the acquisition of right of way. This effort is currently underway. This available funding cannot be re-directed to other projects. The risk of delay is that future funding is not guaranteed and delays will cause the total project cost to increase beyond the current estimate.

2. Sprinter

NCTD and SANDAG are pursuing innovative finance strategies like Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998 (TIFIA) bonds to cover the $80 million in unallocated TCRP funds. These federal loan guarantee bonds could temporarily bridge the gap of $80 million. The debt would be repaid funds. If the TCRP funds are never received, then the region will need to identify a source of funding to repay the debt. Regardless, annual debt service payments would need to be added to the list of long term regional commitments. Although debt service would add financing costs to the project, they would be offset by not delaying the project and risking the loss of the $152.1 million Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA). Due to the cash flow impact of the availability of the FFGA, the TIFIA bond proceeds are not anticipated to be needed until FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06 period. A delay to the project will escalate the construction costs by six million dollars a year.

If the innovative financing approach is not feasible and the Sprinter were to be delayed, there are $57.3 million in TransNet funds programmed for the Sprinter that could be temporarily shifted to another project. Shifting the $57.3 million, however, may also jeopardize the $152.1 million in FFGA funds. The TransNet funds would need to be paid back by 2008, or moved to another project in the North County, as currently established in the TransNet ordinance. If the funds were required for a transit project in a location other than North County, it would require an amendment to the ordinance.
3. I-15 Managed Lanes

The I-15 Managed Lanes GARVEE request to the CTC was approved after the September meeting of the Transportation Committee. GARVEE bonds are scheduled to be issued in January 2004. The issuance would allow the next three segments (of five) of the I-15 “Middle” managed lanes to proceed to construction. The $17.5 million shortfall in unallocated STIP funds would be rolled over to FY 2004/05 and is needed for the last segment of the “Middle” managed lanes project.

Staff is pursuing augmenting the GARVEE bond amount to include the $17.5 million. A risk is that if the region is not successful in securing either the $17.5 million in STIP funds in FY 2004/05 or the augmentation to GARVEE, then the region will need to use other regional funds to complete the funding of the I-15 Managed Lanes.

4. Encinitas Grade-Separated Pedestrian Crossing

The City of Encinitas has applied for a Letter of No Prejudice to be reimbursed for the $1.2 million that the city is willing to advance. SANDAG staff is assisting in the Project Management effort. This action removes the $1.2 million from the Needs list first presented at the September meeting. It is also able to proceed without experiencing delay.

5. Fare Technology or “Smart Card” Project

This project is programmed with STIP funds over a four year period. Prior to the statewide budget crisis and at the request of the CTC, an agreement with the CTC was reached that allowed the contract of the project to be awarded without a full STIP allocation. The contract has been awarded but due to the budget crisis, no STIP allocation will occur this year and no additional STIP allocations are anticipated for FY 2004/05 or 2005/06. Development costs have already been incurred. The Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) has issued bonds to cover the gap from the STIP payable over a six year period. These bonds are backed by a commitment from the state to repay the STIP funds (AB 3090 reimbursements). Debt service payments, however, need to be made this year as well as in the next two years through FY 2005/06 will be made with federal funds, but STIP funds will be needed in FY 2006/07.

6A. State Route 125 Sweetwater Noise Mitigation

We have been contacted by Caltrans with an urgent request to program an additional $600,000 of TransNet funds for an environmental mitigation contract to construct sound walls along State Route 125. Recently bids were received from two contractors for the construction of sound walls required by the environmental document for the SR 125 Sweetwater freeway. The low bid resulted in a project cost exceeding the $1.9 million programmed amount by $845,000. The project has an additional $245,000 of contingency leaving a $600,000 shortfall necessary to award the contract. The contractor is obligated to honor their bid for a period of 30 days after which they can request to be released. Since this is an environmental commitment, cancellation or delay of the project is not recommended, reduction of the project scope is not feasible and re-advertisement would most likely result in higher bids. Attachment 5 is the request from Caltrans for the additional $600,000.
6. Oceanside Transit Center Parking Structure

The design plans for the Oceanside Transit Center Parking Structure are completed and the construction contract is ready to be awarded. This project needs $4 million to bridge the gap left from the suspension of the STIP. An additional $590,000 in unallocated TCRP funds will be covered by the City of Oceanside. The urgency in having this project move forward involves the expiration in June 2004 of a leased property currently used for parking. Ideally, the parking structure would be complete and ready for use prior to expiration of the lease.

7. Planning, Programming and Monitoring

The STIP guidelines allow regions to program up to one percent of its county share for project planning, programming and monitoring activities. The $473,000 currently programmed for San Diego will not be allocated in FY 2003/04. An additional $948,000 programmed for FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06 are also unlikely to be allocated. The potential risk of not receiving these allocations are budget shortfalls in SANDAG’s operating budget and staffing levels as it attempts to continue these activities without the support from the STIP.

8. Forester Creek Channelization

Construction of the Forester Creek channel is needed to reduce the length of the SR 52 bridge that would span it and therefore be less costly. There are $6 million of unallocated STIP funds that are not available, plus a $10 million cost increase in this $29 million project. A risk of not proceeding with the channelization project at this time include delays to the SR 52 corridor completion as well as cost increases from a longer span bridge on SR 52 to cross over an un-channelized Forester Creek. Design plans are nearly complete and permits from the resource agencies have been obtained.

9. - 11. SR 52 Right of Way and Construction

Two main components of SR 52 are impacted: Right of Way and Construction. With respect to the right of way component, $15 million in right of way acquisition funds programmed for FY 2003/04 are not available. In addition, $26.1 million in FY 2004/05 and 2005/06 right of way funds may also not be allocated. Further, there are $2 million in right of way cost increases for FY 2003/04 and $24 million in FY 2004/05 and 2005/06. Two risks associated with no action for right of way in FY 2003/04 are the right of way acquisition process could be suspended in FY 2003/04 and potentially impact the overall completion schedule, and additional cost increases in right of way acquisition from real estate inflation.

With respect to the construction component, there is a $20 million budget gap from suspension of the TCRP program for the construction of the section between SR 125 and Cuyamaca Street. This section could be combined with the Cuyamaca Street to SR 125 section and be completed by 2009.

A risk is that if the region decides to move forward with the SR 125 to Cuyamaca Street section under its current schedule, approximately $37 million in TransNet funds would not be available for re-allocation to other regional projects. Another risk to the construction schedule is that the region would still need to identify $57.26 million ($20 million in unallocated TCRP funds and $37.26 million in re-allocated TransNet funds) by FY 2006/07. As has been mentioned previously, the 2004 STIP is
not expected to add any programming capacity to the region. The 2006 STIP may have additional programming capacity, but it is likely to occur in FY 2009/10 or beyond.

12. State Route 56

Court judgments stemming from the right of way condemnation process are expected in the next two to three months. Although no final estimate is available at this time, it is anticipated that the City of San Diego will need an additional $24 million to pay for this cost increase. It is further estimated that of the $24 million, between $5 and $11.3 million are needed by December 2003 and the remainder in the first quarter of calendar year 2004. The risk of delay to this project includes interest costs and other potential penalties accruing on unpaid judgments. It is not anticipated that this process will impact the schedule of the construction project, currently planned to be opened July 2004.

13. I-5/Del Mar Heights Auxiliary Lane

Caltrans can incorporate the work covered under this project in the I-5/I-805 “Merge” project. Due to economies of scale, cost efficiencies can be realized and deducted permanently from the Needs list for FY 2003/04. This project would still need $2.5 million of the original $5.5 million to be completed.

14. - 16. Caltrans Operational Improvements

Three projects, including a Ramp Metering project in the South Bay, a Changeable Message Signs project and a Freeway Speed Monitoring Stations project, totaling $13.6 million, may need to be delayed until additional funding can be identified. It is not anticipated that additional funds will become available prior to FY 2009/10.

17. NCTD Buses

The acquisition of buses by the North County Transit District could be delayed until additional resources are made available. It is not anticipated that additional funds will become available prior to FY 2009/10. Delaying this project moves $7.7 million out of the FY 2003/04 Needs list. A risk to NCTD is that it would need to continue operating an older, more expensive to maintain bus fleet.

18. Rideshare Program

The Rideshare program is funded through a variety of sources. There are no shortfalls identified in FY 2003/04. However, $3.53 million in STIP funds are programmed for FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06 and it is unlikely that an allocation will occur. This project is being included for information only on the challenges ahead and no action is being requested at this time.

19. Savings

Two projects have been completed and have unexpended funds that can be put back to work on addressing regional budget shortfalls. The projects are:
SR 76 West Right of Way Acquisition $3.169 million
I-5/ HOV Lane $1.048 million
Total $4.217 million

There are no risks associated with the use of these funds.

20. TransNet Highway Program Reserves

TransNet program reserves have been identified that could potentially be used to bridge the gap. The TransNet Highway Program balance projected through the end of the sales tax in April 2008 is estimated to have approximately $15 million of current bonding capacity. In the event the TransNet funds are programmed on a non-TransNet program project, the Highway Program would need to be reimbursed with interest within five years to insure the TransNet program remains whole.

21. TransNet SR 78 Corridor Program

The TransNet SR 78 Corridor program currently has approximately $10 million of programming capacity. It should be noted that these funds are currently eligible for other projects in the SR 78 program of projects, including the South Santa Fe Avenue (County of San Diego) widening project. Re-allocation of these corridor funds would preclude their use by SR 78 Corridor projects until such a time they are returned to the program.

22. I-15 Bus Rapid Transit

The I-15 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project has approximately $16 million available in Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds that are currently programmed for the capital construction phase of the project. These funds could be re-allocated to other projects. A re-allocation would likely cause delays to implementation of the BRT concept on the I-15 managed lanes. This project is also likely to experience a shortfall of $22.6 million from the continued suspension of the TCRP program. These funds are not needed until FY 2004/05.

An additional $3 million in CMAQ funds are available from a BRT Project Study reserve. Re-allocating CMAQ funds from this source would limit the study of additional BRT services in other congested corridors in the region.

The two CMAQ fund sources from the BRT program total $19 million.

23. - 27. Regional Arterials System Projects

Five Regional Arterial System projects were identified as potential sources of funds to help address the FY 2003/04 budget shortfall. These are listed below:

SR 163/Friars Rd Interchange (San Diego) $2.252 million
SR 78/Rancho del Oro Interchange (Oceanside) $0.895 million
Plaza Boulevard (National City) $1.292 million
South Santa Fe Avenue (County of San Diego) $9.200 million
Bear Valley/East Valley Parkway (Escondido) $6.118 million
Total $19.757 million
Attachment 4 shows a bar chart with the schedule for the completion of the environmental document, design and construction phases, as appropriate. If funds are re-allocated to other projects from this source, it will impact the project delivery schedule. Depending on the delay, environmental documents may have to be re-done and the construction cost will go up.

28. Rail Trails

Two rail trail projects in the region were identified for potential re-allocation of unobligated funds: The Inland Rail Trail and the Coastal Rail Trail. The Inland Rail Trail, however, has already obligated its remaining $870,000 in RSTP funds. The Coastal Rail Trail had obligated part of the identified $5,193,000 and currently has $4,837,000 available. The figures in this report reflect these two corrections. Re-allocation of these funds would likely lead to significant delays in the implementation of the Coastal Rail Trail.

29. through 33. RSTP Regional Roadway Maintenance Program

Unobligated Regional Roadway Maintenance Program funds remain from four jurisdictions. These funds were programmed in 1998. Staff has regularly informed jurisdictions through the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) on program balances, the latest report occurring in June 2003. Staff has encouraged the obligation of these funds as inaction on these funds may limit the region’s ability to comply with AB 1012 “Use it or Lose it” policies. The unobligated funds are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>$649,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$5,703,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$6,666,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The September 2003 report incorrectly reported $69,000 for Lemon Grove as being available for re-allocation. This report reflects the corrected amount.

A contract for the construction of sound walls to provide noise mitigation required by the environmental document for SR 125 Sweetwater Stage 3 was recently advertised. Only two bidders responded to the advertisement. The low bid exceeds the programmed amount of $1.9 million by $845,000. The contractor is obligated to their bid for a period of 30 days after which they can either request to be released or agree to perform under the current bid. Since this is an environmental commitment, elimination or delay of the project could risk litigation from the community. Reduction of the project scope is not feasible and re-advertisement would most likely result in higher bids.

The project has an additional $245,000 of contingency funds that would be used to award this contract. Caltrans therefore requests $600,000 of TransNet funds from SANDAG to fully fund the project. This project is eligible for TransNet Highway Program funding and it is recommended that this request be approved prevent the need of re-advertisement and risk an increase in the cost of this project.
### Progress Calendar for Selected Regional Arterial System Projects

#### Attachment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount ($1,000's)</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 163/Friars Rd (City of San Diego)</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA Enviro = May 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 78/Rancho del Oro IC (Oceanside)</td>
<td>$895</td>
<td>$2.252 million in RSTP for PE obligated March 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza Boulevard (National City)</td>
<td>$1,292</td>
<td>$1,292</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA Enviro = Nov 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santa Fe (Co of San Diego)</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
<td>$9.2 million for RW Jul 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Valley/Bear Valley Pkwy (Escondido)</td>
<td>$6,119</td>
<td>$3,364</td>
<td>$2,755</td>
<td>$3.364 million for RW after NEPA Enviro.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Schedule information obtained from quarterly reports submitted by project sponsors.

- **Environmental Document**: Determination of environmental impacts.
- **Design/Contract Award**: Approval of design and contract documents.
- **Construction**: Physical construction activities.
- **$XYZ**: Obligation of $XYZ funds anticipated for period of time as shown.
The attachment to this Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Clerk of the Board at (619) 595-5602.
TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING FOR THE CONSOLIDATED AGENCY

Introduction

Transit service coordination efforts have been underway in the region for a number of years. Agency consolidation will facilitate our ability to coordinate service planning and implementation between the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) and North County Transit District (NCTD) services, consistent with the intent of the consolidation legislation. To achieve better coordination, regional policies are needed to guide future transit service planning and performance monitoring. An initial draft framework for a transit service planning and performance evaluation policy is shown in Attachment 1. The Joint Committee on Regional Transit (JCRT) discussed the initial draft policy at its September 11, 2003, meeting. The following report reflects the JCRT input. Specific JCRT comments are included in Attachment 2.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the SANDAG Transportation Committee provide input and direction on development of Board policies related to transit service planning and performance evaluation.

Discussion

The MTDB and NCTD transit agencies have planned and implemented new services and service adjustments in their respective service areas fairly independently of one another based on agency-specific policies. With consolidation, SANDAG is now responsible for developing a regionwide policy and process for service planning, performance monitoring, and programming of funds. The consolidation legislation defines the transit agency planning and programming functions transferred to the consolidated agency as follows:

- **Planning** shall include, but not be limited to, conceptual development of transit projects and services and integration and coordination of all modes of transportation.

- **Programming** shall mean the acquisition, prioritization, and allocation of funding of transit projects and services.

To establish a framework for this shift in responsibilities, a Transit Service Planning and Performance Evaluation Policy will establish a framework for:

- Enhancing regional network connectivity and access
- Balancing service to better serve various travel markets
• Improving transit service and system performance
• Adjusting service to be in line with funding availability

A service evaluation process, incorporated into the Transit Service Planning and Performance Evaluation Policy, will guide the transit operators in the following areas:

• Changes to existing service
• New service implementation priorities
• Service reductions resulting from financial constraints

In accordance with the Initial Transition Plan adopted by the SANDAG Board on February 28, 2003, the Transit Service Planning and Performance Evaluation Policy will need to “recognize the need for the consolidated agency to initially maintain the existing service concepts upon which the service is based and the existing levels of service (revenue hours/miles) for each operator.” Attachment 3 provides the Transit Service Planning agency responsibilities approved in the Initial Transition Plan.

Attachment 1 outlines an initial draft framework for service planning, evaluation, programming of funds, and implementation. In summary, SANDAG will evaluate service proposals submitted by the transit agencies and those developed by SANDAG and make recommendations for services to be funded through the annual SANDAG budget process. Transit agency service proposals that do not have an impact on the annual operating budget (minor adjustments throughout the course of the year) would not be part of the budget process and would either be approved by the Transportation Committee or implemented at the operator’s discretion, depending upon the magnitude of the service adjustment. The framework outlined in Attachment 1 will be refined and brought back to the JCRT and Transportation Committee as work progresses on developing these policies.

Issues

There are several policy and process issues to resolve before a comprehensive Transit Service Planning and Performance Evaluation Policy can be presented to and adopted by the Board. These issues include:

1. Service Performance Evaluation. Regional criteria and a process for evaluating new service proposals and existing service performance (Step 3 in the framework, Attachment 1) needs to be developed for inclusion in this policy. In developing the criteria and process, there are trade-offs among service performance, access to transit, and funding allocations. How should evaluations balance factors such as service type, service area, regional goals, ridership productivity, and geographic equity?

2. Operator Service Adjustment Authority. Some service adjustments are relatively minor and do not affect the operating budget or merit a public hearing at SANDAG. The Initial Transition Plan states, “Minor service changes to a transit operator’s defined service (less than 25 percent of revenue miles/hours of a route within the operator’s existing approved budget) will be at the discretion of the transit operator.” Key issues are:
   a) How should cumulative regional impacts of multiple minor changes be addressed?
b) How should inconsistencies of minor changes with regional policies be addressed?

c) Do certain minor changes require a public hearing, and, if so, should the consolidated agency hold it?

We are scheduled to return to the JCRT on October 30, 2003, and the Transportation Committee on November 14, 2003, with a more fully defined Transit Service Planning and Performance Evaluation Policy that builds on the framework discussed in this report and includes proposals for addressing the remaining issues.
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Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning
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The process needs to ensure that minor service changes can be accomplished in a timely manner and aren't held up at the regional level.

If service changes can be made within the transit agency’s budget, discretion for those changes should stay with the transit agency.

Evaluation of service proposals should be based on comparisons with like kinds of services.

The policy should establish criteria that consider regional effects of minor service changes.
The attachment to this Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG's Clerk of the Board at (619) 595-5602.
MID-COAST UNIVERSITY CITY LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT (LRT) ALIGNMENTS

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee

- Provide input and direction that will lead to selection of an LRT alignment(s) in the University City area for preliminary engineering and environmental document preparation; and,
- Provide input on a phasing plan for the entire Mid-Coast LRT project from Old Town to University City.

Introduction

Mid-Coast Corridor Background

In 1987, with the passage of the Proposition A half-cent transportation sales tax measure (TransNet), San Diego voters approved the Mid-Coast Corridor as a TransNet priority transit project. In 1991, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) began planning studies for the Mid-Coast Corridor in accordance with state and federal environmental processes. The corridor is generally defined from Interstate 8 (I-8) to the south, State Route (SR) 163 to the east, and SR 56 to the north. This is an area of high density development with a variety of major activity centers such as the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and University Towne Centre (UTC).

In 1995, the MTD Board of Directors selected a locally-preferred alternative (Attachment 1) to extend light rail transit (LRT) from Old Town to University City generally along I-5. The 1995 adopted alignment stays entirely along the west side of I-5 with a station adjacent to the freeway at Gilman Drive, and does not directly serve the UCSD campus. At that time, in response to funding constraints, the MTD Board also approved splitting the project into phases. The first phase, Balboa LRT Segment, extends from the Old Town Transit Center to Balboa Avenue and the following phase, the University City LRT Segment, extends from Balboa Avenue to University City. In 2001, the Final Environmental Impact Statement was completed on the Balboa LRT segment. We are working on project readiness documents for submittal to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Upon FTA approval of the Balboa LRT Segment project readiness, FTA would issue permission to enter final design.

Since 1995, a number of land use developments in the vicinity of the University City area have rendered that portion of the alignment problematic and there is a renewed desire to better serve the UCSD campus and UTC. Numerous alignment options have been considered for the UCSD
campus to better serve its growing travel demand. Expansion proposals for the UTC shopping center have provided an opportunity to reconsider an alignment that would serve it directly. The additional alignment analysis included both engineering and environmental considerations.

In February 2003, after extensive consideration of nonrail alternatives, the MTD Board reaffirmed its strategy to pursue the Mid-Coast LRT project. The Mid-Coast LRT is included in MOBILITY 2030, under both the Revenue Constrained Plan and Reasonably Expected Revenue scenarios, and recently received relatively strong support in a TransNet public opinion survey.

Since past discussion and actions on the Mid-Coast LRT project have occurred at MTDB, we are presenting this report on the recent University City Segment alignment alternative analysis and project implementation phasing to the Transportation Committee for information and discussion. We plan to return to the Transportation Committee on November 14, 2003, recommending action to select a new preferred alignment alternative in the UCSD/University City area and an alternate phasing plan for the entire Mid-Coast LRT project.

Discussion

In early 2000, MTDB conducted an evaluation of LRT alignments that would better serve the UCSD campus/University City area and better integrate into the UTC shopping center than the 1995 adopted alignment. In November 2000, the MTD Board of Directors selected the most promising of the alignment options to carry into more detailed evaluation (Attachment 2). One option stays entirely on the east side of I-5 with a single station near Thornton Hospital. The other traverses the UCSD campus to a station north of Pepper Canyon and just east of the Price Center. From there, the alignment follows Voigt Drive eastward to cross back to the east side of I-5 to its terminal at the UTC shopping center. Two alignment variations were identified from Voigt Drive to UTC, one along Regents Road and Executive Drive, and another along Genesee Avenue. In addition, variations related to side and center-street running along Voigt Drive, below, above, and at-grade options near Pepper Canyon and along Genesee Avenue and some design geometrics have been considered but remain unresolved.

Since November 2000, additional analysis has focused on some of the alignment variations, design issues, environmental issues, cost estimates, and public input. The following report describes the results of that analysis, which is intended to set the stage for possible Transportation Committee action on November 14, 2003, to formally adopt a new LRT alignment in the UCSD/University City area.

Alignment Descriptions (Attachment 2)

East Side I-5 Alignment - From the Nobel Drive Station, the alignment continues along the east side of I-5 over La Jolla Village Drive and the canyon south of Medical Center Drive turning east to a station to the south of Thornton Hospital. The alignment then continues easterly crossing to the south side of the canyon, south of the UCSD Science Research Park and north of Miramar Street. It crosses Regents Road and enters the median of Executive Drive, where it transitions to an aerial section along Genesee Avenue on its way to the terminus at UTC.
UCSD West Alignment - Each alignment variation begins at the common station with the East Side I-5 Alignment north of Nobel Drive, between I-5 and University Center Lane.

- Variation 1 - LRT Side Running in Voigt Drive to Executive Drive - This alignment starts at the Nobel Drive Station and crosses over I-5 south of La Jolla Village Drive. It continues along the west side of I-5 over La Jolla Village Drive to the northeast corner of the Veterans Administration Medical Center property. The alignment then crosses under Gilman Drive just west of UCSD’s planned Gilman Drive bridge over I-5. It emerges from the tunnel and continues along the west side of Pepper Canyon to a below grade station south of Voigt Drive.

The alignment then continues north, still below grade, and turns east along the south side of Voigt Drive. The alignment continues easterly emerging from the tunnel section, running at-grade on the south side of Voigt Drive, crossing over I-5 parallel to the Voigt Drive bridge, and continuing to a potential station site south of Scripps Hospital campus. The alignment then runs easterly, crossing Campus Point Drive at-grade, and proceeding to an alternative station site and on to Regents Road. It turns south on Regents Road to Executive Drive where it enters an aerial section along Genesee Avenue on its way to the terminus at UTC.

- Variation 2 - LRT Side Running in Voigt Drive to Genesee Avenue - This alignment follows the LRT Side Running variation to the Scripps Hospital Station, where it enters an aerial section crossing over Campus Point Drive. The alignment stays aerial, veering to the north across Regents Road to the median of Genesee Avenue, proceeding aerial to UTC.

- Variation 3 - LRT Median Running in Voigt Drive to Executive Drive - This alignment is similar to the LRT Side Running variation described above, except that the LRT would be located in the median of Voigt Drive. The crossing of Campus Point Drive would be at-grade, with at-grade running along the west side of Regents Road and in the median of Executive Drive, transitioning into an aerial structure as it approaches Genesee Avenue.

Alignment Analysis

Capital Cost Estimates

The table below summarizes the construction cost estimates for the alignments and variations from north of the Nobel Drive Station to UTC. They are conceptual level capital cost estimates in 2003 dollars.
LRT Construction Cost Estimates*
(between Nobel Drive Station and UTC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 East Side</td>
<td>$57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Side-Running Voigt – Executive (Variation 1)</td>
<td>$87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Side Running Voigt - Genesee (Variation 2)</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Median Voigt – Executive (Variation 3)</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are construction costs only for the segment between Nobel Drive Station and UTC. The project cost estimate for the entire University City between Balboa Avenue and UTC including planning, environmental, design, construction, and vehicles, is approximately $450 million. The total project cost estimate for the Balboa segment is $134 million.

Although the I-5 East Side alignment is the least costly of the alternatives, it does not serve both the east and west campuses of UCSD. Of the UCSD West alignment variations, the at-grade, side running to Executive Drive is the least costly. More cost is incurred on the median running for tunnel and depressed sections and utility conflicts in Voigt Drive. The UCSD West alignment on Genesee Avenue has a longer aerial structure, and therefore, is more costly. All of the alignments assume an aerial station located on the east side of Genesee Avenue at the entrance to UTC. The existing UTC transit center is anticipated to be relocated in advance of the LRT project and would be integrated into the redevelopment of the shopping center. It is possible that the LRT station and transit center would be constructed by Westfield Corporation, owners of the shopping center.

Ridership Analysis

The analysis of ridership potential focused on two areas: the differences between the two basic alignments (UCSD West vs. East Side I-5), and the differences between the two East Campus station sites (Scripps and Campus Point). Order-of-magnitude estimates of daily ridership were developed for each of the stations based on the employment, housing, and special generators in the vicinity of each location. An estimate of the transfers from shuttles on the UCSD campus was included. The estimate of daily boardings for the UCSD stations is reported below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Station Ridership Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side I-5: Thornton Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West: Price Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West: Scripps Hospital (Station Alt. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West: Campus Pointe (Station Alt. 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preliminary ridership projections for the UCSD West alignment variations would be approximately 3,200 a day, while the preliminary ridership projections for the East Side I-5
alignment would be approximately 2,000 a day. The combined total for the UCSD West alignment stations reflects the proximity of stations that serve the University directly, while the I-5 East Side alignment ridership is less due primarily to its distance from many of UCSD’s trip generators. Also, there would be only one station on the East Side I-5 alignment, while the UCSD West alignment would have stations that serve both East and West Campus.

Environmental Studies

- Biological - An analysis of the habitats in Pepper Canyon and the presence of sensitive species was conducted. Pepper Canyon was found to have a minor amount (0.05 acres) of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub that would need to be mitigated.

The East Side I-5 alignment would traverse an undeveloped portion of East Campus that was found to have a higher habitat and wildlife value, a more established and mature wetlands, Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub that is more extensive and of higher quality than in the Pepper Canyon area. It is also a site of past wetlands restoration. Because of the conditions described above, Pepper Canyon is less biologically sensitive than the undeveloped area east of I-5 and is the preferred biological alternative for LRT project development. However, Pepper Canyon provides open space of value to the campus community.

- Traffic and Circulation - A focused traffic study looking at the impacts of the UCSD West alignment at key intersections and driveways along the alignment was performed. A Level of Service (LOS) comparison was made for the morning and evening peak periods for future traffic conditions.

The analysis found that only the intersections along Regents Road are projected to have a reduction to a Level of Service (LOS) D. These three intersections would be minimally affected by the LRT line in both the AM and PM peak periods. The minimal traffic impacts are generally due to the LRT crossing only one leg of the intersections (i.e., side running) and not interfering with the major traffic movements. LRT operation would be phased and coordinated with the major movement of the intersections, and therefore would not significantly impact the overall intersection operation. The LOS D is within acceptable LOS standards for the City of San Diego. No major improvements are anticipated at these intersections with the implementation of the LRT.

- Noise & Vibration - A noise and vibration study was conducted to address the proposed project’s potential noise and vibration impacts on nearby existing and future planned student housing and research buildings at UCSD. On the UCSD West variations, there are three sites that would exceed noise criteria and one site on the East Side I-5 alignment that would require mitigation. For vibration, there are two sites on the UCSD West alignment (one near Pepper Canyon and one on Genesea Avenue) that would require mitigation measures such as ballast mats or sound walls.

- At-Grade Crossings - An analysis of the potential noise impact of an at-grade alignment along Voigt Drive from the trolley horn and the noise of the crossing gates was performed. Gates would be required to protect the driveways and street crossings between the UCSD West/Price Center Station and Regents Road. In addition, the LRT would sound its horn as it enters and/or leaves the East Campus Station at Scripps Hospital or Campus Point Drive. Using field measurements and reference noise levels for the San Diego Trolley, the analysis
indicated that horn and gate bell noise would be below the guidelines for maximum airborne noise from train operations. SANDAG staff met with UCSD representatives and determined that 12 at-grade crossings would be required between Gilman Drive and Executive Drive. In reviewing the alignment, it appears that 4 of the 12 at-grade crossings may be eliminated by reconfiguring access to the parking lots. SANDAG staff also met with the California Public Utilities Commission to discuss the alignments and at-grade crossing since the CPUC grants permission for the installation of at-grade crossings. For safety reasons, the CPUC desires to minimize the number of at-grade crossings, so from its perspective, the elevated alignment in Genesee Avenue is preferable. However, the at-grade alignment in Voigt Drive and Regents Road is not fatally flawed.

- Electromagnetic and Pulse - A wide selection of electronic and electrical equipment is sensitive to and may malfunction in environments of elevated fields from Direct Current (DC) used by LRT. The most common example of adverse effects is interference with computer systems and displays. Other than very specialized instrumentation of the electronic or medical devices in common use, the device most susceptible to magnetic field interference is the cathode ray tube (CRT) found in televisions and computer displays. There are five locations where the UCSD West alignment is close enough that an adverse impact may occur but the impact should be mitigable to less than significant with proper design. Mitigation measures to reduce the electromagnetic fields (EMF) effects, if needed, would be developed cooperatively with UCSD. An agreement with UCSD could be developed to clarify roles and responsibility for addressing this issue.

- Land Use - The interaction with nearby land uses is an important element of the analysis. A summary of the land use consideration for each station along the UCSD West alignment, and the alignment itself is provided below.

**UCSD West/Price Center Station** - This station would provide access to West Campus and would be the busier of the two UCSD stations. It would be located just east of the center of campus and Price Center, with convenient shuttle and pedestrian connections to all of the West Campus facilities and the VA Medical Center. It would serve students, faculty, and campus visitors, enhance access to both existing and planned developments, and would become a focal point for transportation on the campus. Close attention will be needed in design to ensure efficient circulation and facilities for the campus shuttles serving the station, and coordination with the future Structural and Engineering Materials building planned adjacent to the station site. A sensitive approach will be needed to ensure the station fits in with the look and feel of the campus and nearby Pepper Canyon, while making sure the station functions well.

**Scripps Hospital Station** - This station would provide convenient access to several activity centers in the vicinity including Scripps Hospital and attendant medical offices, the Preuss School, and the planned arena. The planned extended studies building, East Campus medical and research facilities, and employment centers on Campus Point Drive could also be served, but the greater distance from the station would require longer walks. Shuttle service would connect the campus destinations with the station. The station would enhance access to the area and would be compatible with most of UCSD’s plans for the area.
Campus Point Drive Station - As an alternative to the Scripps Hospital Station, this station would provide convenient access to the future extended studies facility to be located adjacent to it. It would also provide access to the housing on the east side of Genesee Avenue, although a crossing of Genesee Avenue would be required. The station would also provide access to several major employers on Campus Point Drive. Walking access to the Preuss School would be adequate, while the longer distance to Scripps Hospital and medical offices would provide a lesser level of access. Room would be needed for both campus shuttle vehicles and off-campus shuttles to employment centers, especially along Campus Point Drive. The station could be elevated if the crossing of Campus Point Drive is grade separated. This design would tie well into the future extended studies building, while requiring vertical circulation to reach Voigt Drive to reach other destinations. This site would be supportive of UCSD plans for the area, although access to the Scripps facilities, the new arena, and the Health Sciences facilities would be less convenient than the Scripps Hospital Station.

Executive Square Station - This station would be located in a fully developed portion of the office buildings north of UTC. As an elevated station, it could have direct pedestrian walkways to the offices on both sides of Genesee Avenue. Outstanding access to these employment centers would be provided, with convenient access to others via the pedestrian walkway system. Access to points north of the station would require returning to street level for walking to nearby offices, the Jewish Community Center, and the high-density residential development to the west on Executive Drive. Shuttle connections and the “Super Loop” (Attachment 3) would provide access to the rest of the employment sites along and north of Executive Drive. The station would enhance access to a large number of sites, and would be compatible with the area’s community plan.

University Towne Centre Station - The elevated station at UTC would provide access to an intensely developed area, including direct connections to UTC as well as Costa Verde on the west side of Genesee Avenue. We have been working closely with the Westfield Corporation (UTC management) to incorporate the station, transit center, and parking into the UTC expansion plans currently being considered. The station is compatible with the scale and intensity of the area, and the transit service and connections it would provide would be an asset for the community. Access to the surrounding area will be enhanced with the planned Super Loop transit project and the other local bus services.

LRT Alignment - The alignment through Pepper Canyon on West Campus would change the nature of this vegetated canyon. After construction, the impact would be minimized with much of the alignment being in a cut-and-cover tunnel. Along Voigt Drive, plans for developments on both sides of the street constrain the right-of-way available for the LRT. Buildings and a new swimming pool are planned north of Voigt Drive, west of I-5. The location and treatments of the alignment will be further refined in preliminary engineering and final design. The alignment option along Regents Road would affect future developments in that area of East Campus, with access to the planned parking structure a key issue.

Along Genesee Avenue, the alignment would be grade separated, with limited impact to land uses. Along Executive Drive, parking would likely need to be removed and some encroachment into the curb and sidewalk may be required.
Public/Community Involvement

Project Review Committee (PRC/Technical Working Group) – We presented the UCSD West alignment and variations to the PRC on July 21, 2003. The PRC, comprised of area stakeholders, discussed improving the pedestrian bridge connections to UTC and ensuring that the LRT in the University City area is feasible. In addition, funding and schedule of the project were discussed. While issues remain, the PRC supports enhanced transit in the Mid-Coast corridor as soon as feasible.

Veteran’s Administration (VA) Medical Center – The concerns of the VA staff were related to vibration effects of the UCSD West alignment on the nearby underground fuel tanks as well as the physical proximity of the LRT between the tanks and the foundation of the future Gilman Drive bridge. We would further the vibration analysis in the environmental documentation phase to address the underground tanks and continue to coordinate with the bridge designers for updates on the future Gilman bridge.

UCSD – We presented the UCSD West alignment analysis to the Campus Community Planning Committee on September 25, 2003. There was general support for the alignment and strong sentiment toward selecting the Campus Point station (see minutes in Attachment 4). The Campus Point station seems better from the standpoint of UCSD shuttle operations and accommodating the public shuttles for maneuverability. We would continue to work with UCSD on the UCSD West/Price Center station design, pedestrian connections to the station, shuttle bus area at the station, minimizing impacts to UCSD facilities, at-grade crossings, and access to parking lots. Additionally, we would continue to coordinate on maintaining emergency access to Thornton Hospital. We have initiated discussions on developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with UCSD and will bring further information to the Transportation Committee for direction on such an agreement.

University Community Planning Group (UCPG) – We will present the UCSD West alignment and station alternatives at the October 14, 2003, meeting of the UCPG. We will bring a verbal report on its comments to the Transportation Committee meeting.

Jewish Community Center (JCC) – We are scheduled to meet with the JCC on October 9, 2003, and will bring a verbal report on its comments to the Transportation Committee meeting.

Conclusions

The information in the previous section was used to compare the two alignments and variations. The matrix below summarizes the results:
## Alignment Comparison Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Shuttle Connections</th>
<th>Overall Environ.</th>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 East Side</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West/ Side Voigt to Regents/Executive (Variation 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West/ Side Voigt to Genesee (Variation 2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West/ Median Voigt to Executive (Variation 3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
+ Highest positive rating or lowest impact
0 Mid-range rating or some impact
- Lowest positive rating or highest impact

The UCSD West side running on Voigt Drive and to Regents Road/Executive Drive (Variation 1), has the highest overall rating. It has the highest rating for ridership, shuttle connections, environmental impacts, and land use potential, with mid-range scores for construction cost and traffic impacts. Although the UCSD West median running on Voigt Drive (Variation 3) has many of the positive attributes of the side-running variation, the median below-grade section conflicts with major utilities servicing UCSD, which results in a much higher construction cost and left-turn traffic conflicts. The UCSD West with an elevated section in Genesee Avenue (Variation 2) results in the highest construction cost and a lower rating for environmental impacts. The East Side I-5 alternative has the lowest rating for ridership and land use due to the location of stations at the edge of campus activity centers.

Based on this analysis, the most promising alignment and variation appears to be the UCSD West alignment side running at-grade along Voigt Drive to either Regents Road or Genesee Avenue (Variation 1 - Attachment 5). The alignment variations along either Regents/Executive or Genesee require further analysis to lead to the selection of a single route. The additional analysis in this next phase would also determine the station location on East Campus, and other design details.

### Next Steps

We will return to the Transportation Committee on November 14, 2003, to seek selection of one or both LRT alignment(s) in the UCSD/University City area to move into preliminary engineering and environmental document preparation. In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and FTA requirements, the environmental document would include the selected alignment(s) (and any variations) as the Build alternative, a
Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative (a low capital cost option), and a No Build (i.e., do nothing) alternative. The preliminary engineering/draft environmental document preparation phase would be completed by late 2005. Upon completion of the preliminary engineering and draft environmental document, the Transportation Committee would adopt a Locally Preferred Alternative and complete the NEPA process (Final Environmental Impact Statement). The project would be ready to enter final design, pending FTA approval and availability of funding. Options for how to proceed with final design and ultimate construction are outlined below.

LRT Implementation Strategy

The implementation strategy adopted for the Mid-Coast LRT in 1995 split the project into two segments (Balboa and University City) to address overall project funding issues and take advantage of potential federal funding for the Balboa segment. At that time, it appeared likely that the Balboa Segment could be constructed relatively quickly since it would be built on existing railroad right-of-way, fairly inexpensively since it is a relatively simple design, and that federal dollars for the project would be forthcoming particularly since the FTA recognized the positive attributes of the project and the requested federal funding share was small compared to other rail projects in the federal pipeline.

Since 1995, we have held the Balboa LRT Segment’s place in the federal New Starts funding process while we focused staff and funding resources on the Mission Valley East LRT project. The New Starts program is an annual rating process by FTA that evaluates rail projects nationwide for federal funding allocations. It takes into account ridership, transportation network user benefits, cost-effectiveness, and the long-term capital and operating financial plan of the applying agency. For several years, the Balboa LRT Segment received FTA’s highest New Starts rating, putting it in a prime position for up to 50 percent federal funding. In FY 04, FTA did not rate the Balboa LRT project pending updates of user benefit and cost-effectiveness data in response to new federal New Starts formulas.

We have submitted the FY 05 New Starts application to FTA for project rating next year. Given the financial constraints we have experienced in the past several years, FTA will be paying particular attention to our ability to construct and operate the Balboa LRT, particularly prior to any voter approval of an extension of TransNet funding for the region. As a result, our ability to move the Balboa LRT forward at the federal level this year may be slowed.

Meanwhile, we have been evaluating opportunities for advancing the entire Mid-Coast LRT project (Balboa and University City Segments) in the event TransNet passes in November 2004. The full Mid-Coast LRT project received relatively strong public support in the recent TransNet public opinion survey. One such opportunity for implementing the entire project a year or more earlier than the current schedule for completion through University City could be through the use of a design-build approach. We are currently evaluating the feasibility, benefits and risks of using design-build to
implement the entire project, including seeking input from the federal project management oversight team. We will return to the Transportation Committee with an implementation strategy recommendation for the Mid-Coast LRT project.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning
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Approval of Minutes
The minutes for the August 28th meeting were approved as submitted.
**Action Item: Archery Range – Site Evaluation**

Robert Clossin presented the site evaluation for the relocation of the existing archery range. The relocation of the archery range is necessary due to the expansion of parking lot P759 and the future I-5/Gilman Bridge project. Clossin described that the proposed site is an undeveloped parcel of land located on the East Campus, southeast of the baseball field, west of Parking Lot 702 and north of Campus Point Drive. This facility would be primarily used by a UCSD club, called the Society for Creative Anachronism (SCA).

The Range is approximately 60 yards long (180 feet) with 6-8 targets located 12-feet on center, for a width of approximately 80-feet. There is a safety zone of 30-feet along each side of the Range. Clossin described that access to the site would be from the north via an enhanced path from parking lot P702.

The committee agreed to listen to the site evaluation for the Ropes Course to obtain a better comprehensive perspective of future development in the area. The committee discussion for both items is described within the Ropes Course section of the meeting minutes.

After discussion, a motion was made and seconded to approve the location of the Archery Range as presented and shown in the site evaluation. The motion passed unanimously.

**Action Item: Ropes Course - Site Evaluation**

Christy Robinson explained that based on C/CPC comments from the April 2003 meeting, a space within a designated recreation area in east campus has been identified for a future ropes course. The location is northeast of the proposed archery range is positioned behind existing eucalyptus trees adjacent to the northwest of the Medical Center Drive North/Campus Point Drive intersection. An existing tree belt along these roads will provide a screened buffer between the site and potential viewers. Robinson added that the proposed height and material of the ropes course would be compatible with the surrounding landscape.

Robinson described that approximately 24,000 square feet (SF) would be needed for the structures and the safety zones. The Alpine Tower component will be 50 feet high with one main structure and one support pole. The low course will be a series of challenges ranging from 2 to 12 feet high. The facility could be used by groups of 5 to 30 people, including recreation staff, at a time. This would be an ADA accessible facility that would be accessed by a provided path from parking lot P702.

Suzette Tsiknas commented that she was pleased that the Recreation Department was able to find a superior ropes course location based on the committee’s previous comments. Phel Steinmetz expressed concern about the safety of those on the ropes course and asked if visitor to campus would also utilize the range with modern equipment. Robert Clossin responded that UCSD clubs and recreation groups would use the archery range. The archery and ropes course events could be programmed so they don’t take place during the same timeframe. Ed Spriggs inquired about the safety record at the existing archery range. Larry Andrews, with the Society for Creative Anachronism, responded that there has never been an issue since the installation of the fence over the berm.
The committee discussed the possibility of reorienting the site; however, due to environmental constraints it would be impossible. Robinson added that the LRDP EIR will address the environmental issues and will allow for the reconfiguration of the area in the future. Jeremy Cogan asked how the ropes course has been scaled down since it was last presented. Robinson responded that a second 50’ tall tower was removed. Spriggs noted that the proposed site was in close proximity of the Preuss School and asked about the safety of each facility. Sue Peerson responded that the appurtenances for the ropes course are raised to prevent the unsupervised use and the lower course consists of mainly low (1’-2”) obstacles. Andrews added that the archery range equipment is kept under lock and key within a metal storage container.

With no further discussion, a motion was made and seconded to approve the location of the Ropes Course as shown in the site evaluation. The motion passed unanimously.

**Information Item: SANDAG Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alignment Update**

Milt Phegley described to the committee that in July 2003, the transportation planning and engineering functions of the MTDB were transferred to the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). Previous MTDB staff (now as SANDAG staff) and consultants are still involved in the process. Phegley indicated that the MTDB Board has voted to endorse Light Rail Transit (LRT) as the primary north-south transportation mode within the Mid-Coast Corridor allowing preliminary planning and engineering to proceed. The project is scheduled to be presented to the SANDAG Transportation Committee in mid-October for review and potential endorsement to continue the planning and engineering work.

Christine Rychel, SANDAG staff, provided an overview of the LRT alignment from its origination point at the Old Town Transit Center through the possible station options on campus. From the 12 alignments that were previously discussed, and the four that were previously endorsed by C/CPC, the scope has been narrowed down to 2 alignment options. The “Pepper Canyon” alignment option would provide a campus station on the west side of Interstate 5 (I-5) and a second station east of I-5; whereas the “Eastern” alignment would only provide one station east of I-5 to the south of Thornton Hospital. Rychel advised the committee that the “Pepper Canyon” is the preferred alignment and is the option that will be recommended to the SANDAG Transportation Committee in October. She stated that “Pepper Canyon” alignment is preferred because it serves the campus directly, allows for centralized shuttle access, serves both east and west campus, and will provide an effective pedestrian link to the center of campus.

Rychel described the “Pepper Canyon” alignment as traveling northward through Pepper Canyon, to a station just southeast of existing parking lot P403 in Sixth College. From the station the route would curve to the east and follow Voigt Drive over I-5 until it reaches Regents Road, at which time the LRT would travel south to the UTC area. An optional alignment along Genesee Avenue will also be considered. Rychel indicated that there are two options for the eastern station location. One station option is along Voigt Dr. between the Baseball Field and parking lot P702 and the alternative is along Voigt Dr. just east of Campus Point Drive and north of parking lot P703.

Sue Peerson presented University staff evaluation pertaining to the “Pepper Canyon” alignment. She described, in detail, impacts that the LRT would have on the campus. The major issues are the impact to the Park, the station locations, shuttle access and connections, and impacts to existing and future buildings. As the project progresses, she identified 16 critical areas which
Jeremy Cogan inquiry about when the LRT segment through UCSD would be completed. Rychel responded that it’s anticipated to be operational in 2012. Phegley added that this project would highly rely upon a local funding match. The TransNet sales tax that would help support this project will expire in 2008. A measure to extend the tax will be put on the ballot in March or November of 2004. If it passes, then it could be possible for SANDAG to bond against the future tax dollars. This could help expedite the Mid-Coast LRT extension.

Boone Hellmann asked about the width of the necessary right of way and physical improvements. Rychel responded that it would generally be approximately 55 feet that includes 35 feet for physical construction and 10 feet on either side for service areas.

Susan Taylor noted concerns from Health Sciences relating to vibration and noise that could impact sensitive scientific testing equipment. Rychel answered that the chair of the structural engineering program was contacted and he didn’t have any concerns. Peerson added that staff would work with Casey Sandack to determine and study concerns from staff within the Health Sciences. Taylor voiced that a shuttle stop shouldn’t be placed near Scripps Hospital and prefers the Campus Point station located closer to Thornton Hospital. Rychel responded that forecasted ridership plays a significant role in the siting of the stations; however, the model has reflected similar user numbers for either location. That is the reason why both locations are being reflected on the proposed alignment. Bob Bitmead added that SANDAG should be advised of UCSD’s preference of the easternmost station location near lot P703 since East Campus Health Sciences will continue grow and create a high demand for mass transit.

Ed Spriggs asked if the noise impacts in Pepper Canyon have been studied. Rychel responded that an initial study was performed and that the alignment through the canyon didn’t have a fatal flaw, meaning that all impacts could be adequately mitigated. She added that this subject would be studied in greater detail in the future as the planning and engineer work progresses. Doug Magde asked if SANDAG has settled on LRT over BRT. Phegley responded that this would be a LRT route to link with the LRT network. Additionally, there would be connecting BRT routes.

Dennis Goodrich expressed concern about the accessibility to the hospitals coming southbound on Campus Point Drive past Voigt Drive if the LRT is traveling at grade. Peerson indicated that this issue would be studied further to allow emergency vehicles to travel unencumbered. Bitmead asked if a single track could be used along Voigt Dr. to reduce the width of the LRT. Rychel indicated that during a recent conversation, the operations manager stated that a single track would make scheduling very difficult. Phegley added that utilizing a single track wouldn’t free up a significant area since the same size service areas on either side would need to be maintained.

The committee discussed the proposed Pepper Canyon pedestrian bridge and configuration. Peerson responded that the Pepper Canyon station design is at an early conceptual phase and University staff will work with SANDAG staff to integrate appropriate planning principles with the project. Spriggs commented a station at the Pepper Canyon location would surely add to the ambiance of the University Center neighborhood.

Martha Lampland voiced her appreciation of the “Pepper Canyon” alignment that includes the western station. Rychel added that the western station is forecasted to have three times the ridership of the eastern station. Phegley stated that regardless of the selection of the east campus
station, the distance would necessitate both Scripps and Thornton Hospitals to dedicate shuttle routes from their respective facilities to the station. After discussing the shuttle accessibility of the two east campus station options, the committee requested SANDAG staff to advance the Campus Point Drive station as the university preferred option.

This item concluded the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brad Werdiscount
Recording Secretary
The attachment to this Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Clerk of the Board at (619) 595-5602.