TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, November 14, 2003
9 a.m. – 12 Noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY - HOW CAN TRANSIT BETTER MEET REGIONAL TRAVEL NEEDS?
• ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES FOR MID-COAST LIGHT RAIL
• EFFORTS TO RE-OPEN THE SAN DIEGO & ARIZONA EASTERN RAILWAY

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.
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.
## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

**Friday, November 14, 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td><strong>APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 17, 2003 MEETING MINUTES (pp. 6-15)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (3 through 6)

+3. **PROPOSED NEW CONSTRUCTION-RELATED POLICIES (Julie Wiley) (pp. 16-44)**

Last month staff provided two new procurement policies for review and comment by the Transportation Committee. Additionally, in September staff provided four draft construction-related policies for review and comment. No changes were requested by Transportation Committee members, staff, or the general public to any of the policies during the comment period. If the Transportation Committee recommends approval of the policies, the policies will be brought to the Board for final approval next week.

+4. **TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) CLAIM AMENDMENTS (Resolution #2004-07) (Stephan Vance) (pp. 45-47)**

Amendments to Transportation Development Act allocations for two pedestrian bridges in the City of Solana Beach are recommended for approval. This action would increase the allocation for the Rosa Street pedestrian bridge by $211,126, and decrease the allocation for the Cliff Street bridge by $177,573.

+5. **DOWNTOWN BALLPARK DEFICIENCY PLAN STATUS REPORT (Mike Hix) (pp. 48-50)**

SANDAG, Caltrans, National City, and the City of San Diego have prepared a Freeway Deficiency Plan for the Central Interstate 5 Corridor that identifies improvements and an implementation plan to alleviate freeway congestion. The Plan will go first to the two city councils before coming to the SANDAG Board in November or December. The environmental impact report for the new Padres ballpark requires that the Plan be accepted by the SANDAG Board before the Certificate of Occupancy for the ballpark facility is issued by the City of San Diego.
+6. ROUTE 11 BUS STOP CONSOLIDATION DEMONSTRATION (Mike Daney) (pp. 51-54)

Route 11 is one of the most productive routes in the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) but has poor on-time performance and slow travel times due to the large number of bus stops along the route. SANDAG and San Diego Transit Corporation are planning to implement a Bus Stop Consolidation Demonstration on Route 11 to improve its reliability, speed up service and attract new riders without increasing operating costs for the route. This report describes the demonstration project and schedule.

REPORTS

+7. MID-COAST LRT ALIGNMENT SELECTION AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY (Christine Rychel) (pp. 55-70)

Updated alignment analyses in the UCSD/University City area for the Mid-Coast light rail transit project have been conducted to address changing land uses and travel patterns in the area and to respond to renewed interest in directly serving UCSD and University Town Center shopping center. This report updates a status report given at the October 17, 2003 Transportation Committee meeting, recommends a new alignment for the area and lays out next steps for moving the project through the federal funding process and toward implementation.

+8. 2003 REGIONAL TRANSIT PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY (Jeff Martin) (pp. 71-74)

In July 2003 SANDAG conducted a telephone survey of 1,300 residents of the San Diego region to better understand what is most important to them when they travel and to evaluate their opinions of transit service, their use of the region’s transit system, and how potential changes in the system would affect their use of transit. An important objective of this survey was to identify how best to change the transit system to meet the travel needs of residents, rather than identifying the best ways to market the existing system. This report summarizes the key findings from the survey.

+9. SAN DIEGO & ARIZONA EASTERN RAILWAY RE-OPENING ACTIVITIES (Mike Hix) (pp. 75-77)

Representatives from the Carrizo Gorge Railway will provide an update on their efforts and funding needs to complete repairs and re-open the rail link between San Diego and Imperial Valley. To assist in the re-opening and to prepare a business plan for the railway, the Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the SANDAG Board that it authorize the Executive Director to accept up to $1.6 million of TEA-21 demonstration funds, amend the FY04 Overall Work Program and Budget, and contract for consultant services related to the SD&AE Railway.

4
SAN DIEGO/LOS ANGELES MAGLEV PROJECT CONCEPT REPORT (Linda Culp) (pp. 78-79)

Sandor W. Shapery of Shapery Enterprises will be joined by Lockheed Martin, Transrapid International, and the IBI Group to present a status report on their San Diego/Los Angeles Maglev Project.

SAN DIEGO SERVICE AUTHORITY FOR FREEWAY EMERGENCIES (SD SAFE) UPDATE (Eddie Castoria/SAFE; Derek Toups) (pp. 80-82)

At the July 11, 2003, Executive Committee meeting, staff provided an update on Senate Bill (SB) 795. In that meeting, staff was asked to arrange for a presentation to the Transportation Committee by the San Diego Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SD SAFE). SD SAFE operates as the region’s service authority for freeway emergencies and manages an extensive freeway call box program. SD SAFE was created by legislation in 1986, and is a separate governmental entity operated under a Board of Directors made up of local elected officials. SD SAFE operations are contracted to a private firm responsible for managing the region’s emergency call box program. SB 795 opens the opportunity to expand the motorist aid services offered by the SD SAFE program.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, December 12, 2003.

ADJOURNMENT
APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 17, 2003 MEETING MINUTES

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal). See attached Attendance SANDAG Transportation Committee Meeting, October 17, 2003.

1. APPROVAL OF DRAFT DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

On a motion by Mayor Terry Johnson (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority) and a second by Councilmember Judy Ritter (North County Transit District [NCTD]) the minutes of the September 19, 2003, Transportation Committee meeting were unanimously approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

Councilmember Jack Feller (NCTD) invited Committee members to attend a parade in Oceanside on October 25, 2003, honoring our military. Chair Kellejian said that to arrange seating and parking arrangements, interested members should contact Greta in the Oceanside City Manager’s office.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) stated that all of the right-of-way for the Mission Valley East Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project has not been secured. He asked that the SANDAG Chair and Vice Chair work with the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) to ensure that it is in place.

CONSENT ITEMS (2 through 5)

2. FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES (TEA) PROGRAM: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT (INFORMATION)

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 (REVIEW/COMMENT)

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.

4. WELFARE TO WORK TRANSIT STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS (APPROVE)

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 (INFORMATION)

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.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Mickey Cafagna (North County Inland) and a second by Mayor Johnson, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 2 through 5.

REPORTS

6. TRANSPORTATION PROJECT BUDGET DEFICITS AND POTENTIAL STRATEGIES (APPROVE)

Chair Kellejian noted that the action on this item has been changed from review/comment to approval.

Staff requested that due to the budget shortfalls, the Committee is being asked to approve a series of policy decision on projects. At the September meeting staff was asked for status of projects and funds available and a risk assessment for each project. That information was provided to the Committee in Attachments 1 and 2 to the agenda report. The current fiscal year budget deficit is $309.7 million. SANDAG staff will make recommendations in three categories to reduce this amount: project adjustments with recommendations of $200.8 million, policy decisions at $82.1 million, and project delays of $26.8 million.
Staff reviewed project adjustments on the following projects: State Route (SR) 905, the Sprinter, Interstate 15 (I-15) Managed Lanes, Encinitas pedestrian crossing, and fare technology. The total shortfall after adjustments is $108.9 million.

The policy decisions involve those projects to pursue this fiscal year and those that will not be pursued. The projects that are being recommended not to pursue include: TransNet highway projects, maintenance efforts, I-15 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), and SR 52 construction. Those projects being recommended to delay at this time: TransNet SR 78 corridor, the Coastal Rail Trail, and the regional arterial projects. The shortfall after these policy decisions is $26.8 million.

The projects that are being recommended for delay include: Caltrans Operational Projects, NCTD Buses, and SR 52 Construction. These projects total $41.3 million.

These actions will provide flexibility to meet this year’s needs and give the region flexibility into the next year. Staff reviewed the three-step approval to cover the FY 2003/04 budget shortfall of $309.7 million: (1) approve budget adjustments of $200.8 million, (2) approve policy decisions totaling $82.1 million, and (3) delay projects in an amount of $41.3 million.

The Executive Director suggested that the Committee enforce a strict “use it or lose it” funding policy for the regional arterial projects. Having this policy will be healthy for us to keep critical projects on schedule and help us solve problems in the future. We also recommend the delay of more projects to provide additional funding flexibility.

Chair Kellejian commended SANDAG and area agency staffs for working cooperatively on this difficult process. He expressed support for the recommended actions.

Board Discussion:

Mayor Pro Tem Phil Monroe (South County – Alternate) expressed concern about strict adherence to the “use it or lose it” policy. He said that we have to also be flexible when unexpected circumstances arise.

Chair Kellejian suggested that staff mail a copy of this funding policy to each Board member.

Mayor Art Madrid (East County – Alternate) reminded the Committee that there are no guarantees or assurances that the funding situation will improve in the short term. He suggested that a project status review be conducted on a quarterly basis if not sooner. He also suggested that SANDAG issue a press release indicating this funding policy has been discussed with all regional representatives.

Public Comment

Fred Luedtke, representing the City of Escondido, thanked SANDAG for including them in this process.
Nathan Johnson, representing the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 1309 (Bus Drivers Union), asked if the 40 percent of the TransNet formula will still be used for operations. He wondered if operations money is being used to subsidize any of these projects. Chair Kellejian told Mr. Johnson that his concerns did not relate to this issue. He asked staff to meet with Mr. Johnson about his concerns.

Councilmember Ritter, on behalf of NCTD, requested SANDAG’s support in the pursuit of funding for the Sprinter project.

The Executive Director reminded the Committee that there is some funding flexibility due to the TransNet program.

Mayor Corky Smith cautioned the Committee about moving money around when there is a possibility that the new governor might cut programs of the former governor.

**Action**: Upon motion by Vice Chair Dick Murphy and second by Councilmember Rindone, the Transportation Committee unanimously approved: (1) a series of adjustments to the programming and scheduling of various projects that will reduce the FY 2003/04 totaling $200.8 million; (2) policy decisions that total $82.1 million; and (3) policy decisions on delaying projects totaling $41.3 million. The Transportation Committee also expressed its support for the Sprinter project.

7. TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING FOR THE CONSOLIDATED AGENCY (DISCUSSION)

Staff reported that with consolidation SANDAG is now responsible for regional transit service planning, monitoring the performance of those services, and programming funding for those service changes. SANDAG needs to adopt a policy for this process. The two primary components of such a policy are to develop a framework for service planning, service priorities, and funding within SANDAG’s budget, as well as a service evaluation and implementation process. Staff described the proposed process. The remaining issues relate to the service performance evaluation process and the service adjustment authority. The schedule has this item returning to the Joint Committee on Regional Transit (JCRT) on October 30 for further discussion. It will then come back to the Transportation Committee in November/December and to the Board for budget input early next year.

Chair Kellejian asked if major service changes would come to the Transportation Committee for action. Staff replied that only those major service changes that might have implication on regional policies would come back to the Transportation Committee.

**Board Comment**

Chair Kellejian indicated his preference for public hearings where necessary and in locations where the change would take place.

Councilmember Rindone agreed that public hearings on major service changes should be held. He commented that the first two years of a new service is to build up ridership and it should not be subject to elimination during that time period.
Councilmember Ritter wanted assurance that the consolidated agency agreed to maintain initial service concepts and initial levels of service for each operator. Staff indicated that they are aware of this commitment.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe questioned SANDAG’s involvement in major service changes. He didn’t feel it was necessary so long as the changes were within the adopted budget levels of the districts. He thought that the transit agencies could notify SANDAG of the changes on a periodic basis. Staff agreed that only changes that resulted in major capital investments would be brought to SANDAG.

The SANDAG Executive Director clarified that the transition documents agreed that only major changes would have oversight from the policy board.

Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, suggested that the transit agencies report on service changes to the Transportation Committee on a quarterly basis.

Councilmember Christy Guerin (North County Coastal – Alternate) requested a policy that included flexibility for service change public hearings to be held at times and locations that would be convenient to the public.

Chair Kellejian clarified that SANDAG would only be holding public hearings on major services changes that would have a regionwide impact.

Councilmember Rindone indicated the consensus that minor service changes should stay with the operating boards. He asked staff to report back with a clear definition of what constitutes minor and major issues.

Mayor Cafagna suggested that the Transportation Committee review this policy on an annual basis.

Councilmember Rindone noted that as of October 16, 2003, MTDB no longer exists and it is now the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS).

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe stated that at the recent American Public Transportation Association (APTA) Annual Meeting there was discussion about selling the experience of transit. He thought that we should pursue this concept.

**Action:** On a motion by Councilmember Rindone and a second by Mayor Cafagna, the Transportation Committee unanimously accepted this report and directed staff to incorporate Committee member comments.

Chair Kellejian called a five-minute break at 10:15 a.m. and reconvened the meeting at 10:20 a.m.

8. MID-COAST UNIVERSITY CITY LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT (LRT) ALIGNMENTS (DISCUSSION)

Staff provided an introduction to this item. The Mid-Coast LRT Project was included in the original TransNet measure in 1987. The alignments were described. Staff indicated that
MTDB elected to break this project into two segments: one from Old Town to Balboa Avenue, and then a second segment from Balboa Avenue north to the University City area. MTDB has been advancing the Balboa Segment project through the design and environmental phases. This project has been forwarded to the federal government for potential federal funding. Staff has since reviewed the alignment north of Balboa Avenue and will present a proposal for a new alignment in the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and University City areas.

Staff reported that alignments have been narrowed down to two: UC West and I-5 East. Each of these alignments was described as well as variations for side running or median running and some elevated sections. Staff also provided preliminary information related to ridership, environmental impacts, and capital costs. Further analysis is needed to determine the best alignment on the east side. A comparison matrix on the alignments (with variations) showed that the UCSD West Side (Voigt-Regents-Executive) received the highest score. A number of public and community involvement activities were noted and next steps were reviewed.

Board Comments:

Mayor Corky Smith (North County Inland – Alternate) asked about the sound barrier study. Staff replied that some noise impacts can be mitigated through the use of sound walls and ballast mats.

Chair Kellejian commented that this item is for information only, and that this item will come back to the committee for a final decision on November 14.

Mayor Cafagna wondered if the costs are worth the ridership gain on some of the more expensive alignment options. Staff responded that we have not yet conducted the cost per rider analysis.

Mayor Cafagna suggested that a potential shuttle service from the west side to the east side might be a less expensive alternative. Staff stated that it is a question of regional policies and goals. In the Regional Transit Vision, part of the policy is to provide convenient access.

Vice Chair Murphy suggested that staff keep the alignments at grade as much as possible to reduce costs. Staff commented that in the next phase we will review that issue related to topography and environment.

Mayor Art Madrid (East County) expressed his support for providing direct service to the UCSD campus. He added his opinion that the long-term public transit benefit was more important than aesthetics and we should not cater to pressures from people who don’t want a transit system adjacent to them.

Mayor Cafagna expressed a concern about at-grade crossings increasing traffic congestion.
Public Comment

Milton Phegley, UCSD, Campus Community Planner, said that they have been involved with this project since 1989. He thanked SANDAG staff for presenting this as an information item to give the Committee more opportunity to be prepared for a decision in November. He stated that the selection of a preferred alignment presents a great opportunity to integrate current land use planning and transportation activities. UCSD wants to be a supportive and cooperative partner, and they hope to have a preliminary Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to guide the design and construction process in the future.

Robert Hoffman, a member of the public, provided comments that suggested transit should use new technologies to solve the problems of today.

9. UP COMING MEETINGS

Chair Kellejian reminded Committee members of the joint Transportation Committee/Regional Planning Committee meeting on Friday, October 24, 2003, to be held 30 minutes following the end of the Board of Directors meeting.

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for November 14, 2003, at 9:00 a.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m.
# ATTENDANCE
## SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
### OCTOBER 17, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Joe Kellejian (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Christy Guerin</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Mickey Cafagna</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Corky Smith</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Jerry Rindone</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Dick Murphy (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit Development Board</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>Leon Williams</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit Development Board</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Terry Johnson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIONAL ARTERIAL SYSTEM PROGRAM
Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy
Transportation Committee Approved: July 11, 2002

1. Member agencies sponsoring Regional Arterial System projects agree to submit quarterly progress reports. The progress reports will include information on accomplishments this quarter, anticipated progress next quarter, pending issues and recommended resolutions, schedule and reasons for schedule delay (if any), budget, and an updated project cost estimate.

2. Member agencies sponsoring Regional Arterial System projects agree to adhere to the project schedule for three milestones including (1) the award of a consultant contract for preliminary engineering, (2) environmental clearance, and (3) the award of a contract for project construction as submitted in the member agency’s original proposal, with adjustments made as defined in 2.c below.

   a. A reported delay of more than six months and less than twelve months for a project milestone results in a mandatory review by the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC). A reported delay of one-year or greater for a project milestone results in a mandatory recommendation from CTAC to the SANDAG Transportation Committee to either (1) reallocate any unobligated funds to the next highest project(s) on the most current Regional Arterial System project priority list approved by SANDAG on May 24, 2002 or (2) for projects funded in 2001 for preliminary engineering (i.e., “Preliminary Engineering Only” projects) determine the project ineligible to compete for regional funding during the next funding cycle or to (3) grant a schedule extension subject to the conditions outlined in 2.b below. A reported delay for projects funded during the 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) cycle (i.e., “Ready to Go” projects) of greater than six months requires a mandatory recommendation by CTAC for (1) or (3) as stated above.

   b. Schedule extensions may be recommended by CTAC if diligent progress towards meeting project milestones can be demonstrated by the project sponsor. Schedule extensions shall not be recommended by CTAC if the funding can not be obligated in the funding cycle in which the funds were initially programmed. Projects receiving a schedule extension from the Transportation Committee will be reviewed by CTAC on a quarterly basis. Projects with a reported delay beyond the extension date may receive one additional recommended schedule extension by CTAC if (1) federal or state policy changes occur that can be shown to directly affect the project schedule, (2) a lawsuit is filed against the project, (3) unwarranted and lengthy state/federal agency review times are documented, or (4) there are unusual circumstances that can be shown to be completely outside of the control of the project sponsor.

   c. Schedule adjustments will be made for “Preliminary Engineering Only” projects to account for the delay time between the date the local agency’s original proposal was submitted and the time funds were available for expenditure. (e.g., the current “Preliminary Engineering Only” project proposals were submitted in October 2000, but funds were made available for expenditure in August 2001.) Therefore, a ten month extension will be
assigned. Schedule adjustments also will be made for any project if schedule delays are directly related to delay in availability of regional funding for the current project phase.

3. SANDAG will employ the following procedures if there is imminent danger of losing funding due to state or federal use-it-or-lose-it policies. SANDAG staff will present a recommendation to CTAC for discussion and recommendation and then to the Transportation Committee. The staff recommendation will include funding reductions/additions to the Regional Arterial System, Highway, Roadway Maintenance, Traffic Demand Management, and other eligible transportation programs. The recommendation will be project specific and based upon a comparison of the project/program priority and delivery records. The recommendation will be made in an effort to ensure that no funds will ultimately be taken away from the region.
PROPOSED NEW CONSTRUCTION-RELATED POLICIES

Introduction

On September 19, 2003, staff brought four policies that are needed for SANDAG’s new construction-related responsibilities to the Transportation Committee for review and comment. Additionally, on October 17, 2003, staff provided two procurement and contracting policies for review and comment by the Transportation Committee. No changes to any of these policies have been requested by Transportation Committee members, staff, or the general public since they were introduced. If recommended for approval by the Transportation Committee, the policies will be brought to the SANDAG Board of Directors for final approval at its November 21, 2003 meeting.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee recommend approval of the attached proposed policies.

Discussion

A summary description of the proposed policies follows:

Project Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (Board Policy No. 019)

This policy provides the Board’s direction concerning the design of major transit projects, including preparing and approving contract plans, specifications, and cost estimates.

Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) For Capital Improvement Projects (Board Policy No. 020)

This policy is intended to provide clear, concise quality assurance and control recommendations that will ensure that capital improvement projects constructed by SANDAG meet or exceed requirements and expectations, and to provide for a Quality Plan as mandated by the Federal Transit Administration.

Acquisition of Real Property Interests and Relocation Assistance (Board Policy No. 021)

This policy provides Board guidance on the acquisition of real property by agreements with owners. It also covers relocation assistance provided by SANDAG to individuals, families, businesses, farm
operations, and nonprofit organizations that are required to relocate as a result of projects
constructed by SANDAG for the benefit of the public.

Utility Agreements and Relocation (Board Policy No. 022)

This policy concerns relocations or adjustments and placement of public and privately owned
utilities, for which SANDAG is legally obligated, and that may be made necessary by proposed
construction of a SANDAG project either within SANDAG right-of-way or in other public agencies'
rights-of-way.

Procurement & Contracting – Equipment & Supplies (Board Policy No. 023)

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 (Board Policy No. 024)

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 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
PROJECT PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS AND ESTIMATES

This policy provides direction concerning the design of major transit projects and for preparing and approving contract plans, specifications, and cost estimates.

Section 14085 et seq. of the State Government Code states that whenever any public entity is to receive state or federal funds for the purposes of project planning, design, rights-of-way, construction, acquisition, or improvement of exclusive public mass transit guideways (and their related fixed facilities, power systems, passenger facilities, vehicles, and equipment), it shall prepare plans for the complete project that are applicable to the type of project, and transmit them to the Department of Transportation for its review and approval of policies, procedures, and performance standards, prior to the implementation of the project or the project phases affected. This policy is intended to cover the following components of Section 14085: preliminary engineering investigations; plans, specifications, and cost estimates.

Procedures

1. Plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&Es) for SANDAG projects shall be prepared in the most functional and timely manner possible, by competent engineers in any combination of public agency staff, consultants, or SANDAG staff as appropriate.

2. PS&Es shall generally be prepared in accordance with SANDAG’s practices and standards and/or accepted practices as defined by major project administrators, such as Caltrans.

3. Design criteria shall be as adopted by the Board of Directors and in compliance with other accepted engineering standards and practices used for transportation systems. In the case of projects to be constructed on the NCTD/MTDB-owned railroad right-of-way, such design standards shall include but not be limited to:

   3.1 NCTD’s/MTDB’s adopted System Safety Program Plan

   3.2 49 CFR Part 213: Track Safety Standards

   3.3 49 CFR Part 236: Installation, Inspection, Maintenance and Repair of Signal and Train Control Systems, Devices, and Appliances

   3.4 Amtrak MW 1000 Limits and Specifications for the Safety, Maintenance, and Construction of Track
3.5 SDNR Bridge Inspection and SDNR Signal Maintenance, Inspection, and Testing Manuals

3.6 American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) standards

3.7 California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) general orders and standards as applicable

4. As a guideline, PS&E packages should generally contain the following:

4.1 Plans -- The official project plans and Standard Plans and Profiles, typical cross sections, general cross sections, working drawings and supplemental drawings, or reproductions thereof, approved by the responsible Engineer licensed in California, which show the location, character, dimensions and details of the work to be performed.

4.2 Specifications -- Special provisions shall contain specific clauses setting forth conditions or requirements peculiar to the work and supplementary to the standard specifications. Standard Specifications shall provide the directions, provisions and requirements contained in published documents setting forth conditions and requirements that are reoccurring in like work.

4.3 Estimate -- The engineer's estimate shall list the estimated quantities of work to be performed and estimated costs of each item and for the total project construction.
QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL (QA/QC) FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

This policy provides clear, concise quality assurance and control recommendations that will ensure that capital improvement projects constructed by SANDAG meet or exceed requirements and expectations, and to provide for a Quality Plan as mandated by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). In order to protect the public interest and safety, public works projects have historically implemented quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) management. QA/QC utilizes specific techniques that ensure conformance to specifications and requirements with respect to design, procurement, construction, and functional performance. The FTA requires that grantees undertaking major capital improvement projects (over $5 million) prepare, submit, and administer an approved Quality Plan. An approved Quality Plan defines a series of planned, systematic activities to ensure that the design, procurement, and construction meet the specified requirements at each stage of the project.

Procedures

1. SANDAG shall establish a Quality Plan for the design, procurement, and construction of major capital improvement projects. The Quality Plan shall be prepared in accordance with FTA and Caltrans guidelines. In addition, project-specific Quality Plans may be developed for other very large or complex projects, or if required by a funding agency.

2. The Quality Plan should be utilized by SANDAG staff, consultants, agency contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers to assure adequate quality verification of the project design, procurement, and construction activities.

3. The Quality Plan should describe the quality oversight activities that will be utilized by the project oversight team.

4. The Quality Plan should provide adequate project quality guidance for design, procurement, and construction. It should include details of the quality system requirements to be applied during the design and construction processes, including requirements placed on subconsultants or subcontractors.
ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY INTERESTS AND RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

The purpose of this policy is to encourage and expedite the acquisition of real property by agreements with owners, to avoid litigation and relieve congestion in the courts, to assure consistent treatment for owners in the public programs, and to promote public confidence in public land acquisition programs carried out by SANDAG. This policy also covers relocation assistance provided by SANDAG to individuals, families, businesses, farm operations, and nonprofit organizations that are required to relocate as a result of projects constructed by SANDAG for the benefit of the public.

Section 14085 et seq. of the California Government Code states that whenever any public entity is to receive state or federal funds for the purposes of project planning, design, rights-of-way, construction, acquisition, or improvement of exclusive public mass transit guideways (and their related fixed facilities, power systems, passenger facilities, vehicles, and equipment), it shall prepare plans for the complete project that are applicable to the type of project, and transmit them to the Department of Transportation for its review and approval of policies, procedures, and performance standards, prior to the implementation of the project or the project phases affected. This policy is intended to cover the following components of Section 14085: acquisition of rights-of-way and other related real properties, and relocation assistance.

Additionally, Government Code sections 7260-7276, require public entities such as SANDAG to provide relocation assistance to displaced persons and to implement a relocation assistance program.

Procedures

1. Acquisition of rights-of-way and other related real properties will be prosecuted within the following policy parameters:

   1.1 All property owners will be dealt with fairly and equitably in the acquisition of lands or interests therein required by SANDAG.

   1.2 Settlements will be based on estimates of fair market value as supported by current appraisal practices.

   1.3 SANDAG shall pay for expenses which the owner(s) must incur for title and escrow fees incidental to conveying real property to SANDAG.
1.4 SANDAG shall make reasonable efforts to acquire expeditiously by negotiation the required property interests.

1.5 Condemnation will be utilized where negotiations have reached an impasse or there is a requirement to meet time restraints imposed by funding sources or construction schedules.

1.6 The Relocation Assistance Program will be fairly administered to ensure that all owners receive any and all benefits to which they are legally entitled.

2. The following guidelines shall be utilized by SANDAG or its agents to ensure fair and equitable treatment of all property owners affected by SANDAG acquisitions as set out in Government Code Section 7267 et seq., as it may be amended from time to time:

2.1 The real property interests to be acquired shall be appraised and the fair market value established before the initiation of negotiations and the property owner shall be given the opportunity to accompany the appraiser during his inspection on the property. (Government Code Section 7267.1 and 7267.2)

2.2 SANDAG or its agents shall make a prompt offer to the property owner for the full estimate of market value established by the Board. SANDAG or its agents shall also provide the property owner with a written statement of, and summary of the basis for, the amount established as just compensation. The summary shall contain the following elements:

2.2.1 The owner's name and address.

2.2.2 Zoning and present use of the property.

2.2.3 Highest and best use of the property.

2.2.4 Consideration to be paid by SANDAG.

2.2.5 Total property area and amount to be acquired.

2.2.6 Market value of the property to be acquired and a statement as to how the value was established, i.e., market data approach, income approach, or cost approach.

2.2.7 Amount of damages or a statement indicating that there are no compensable damages. (Government Code Section 7267.2)

2.3 SANDAG shall make reasonable efforts to acquire by negotiation the real property interests required so as to reduce the need for litigation. SANDAG shall strive at all times to assure consistent treatment of property owners involved in public improvement projects and to promote public confidence in SANDAG's acquisition practices. (Government Code Sections 7267 and 7267.1a)
2.4 SANDAG shall schedule the construction or development of a public improvement, insofar as it is practicable, so that no person lawfully occupying real property shall be required to move from a dwelling or business, assuming a replacement dwelling is available, without at least 90 days written notice from the SANDAG. (Government Code Section 7267.3)

2.5 Should rental property become vacant, SANDAG may rent the vacated premises prior to acquisition.

2.6 The threat of condemnation shall not be used to coerce a property owner into agreement. (Government Code Section 7267.5 and 7267.6)

2.7 SANDAG will offer to acquire the entire property if the owner so desires where the acquisition of a portion of the property would leave the remaining portion in such shape or condition as to constitute an uneconomic remnant. (Government Code Section 7267.7)

3. Relocation assistance is a program that has been established by federal and state law to provide help to individuals, families, businesses, farm operations, and nonprofit organizations required to relocate as a result of a public improvement project. Its primary objective is to assist all project displacees to the end that they do not suffer disproportionate injury as a result of projects constructed for the benefit of the public as a whole.

3.1 Relocation assistance shall be in accordance with Section 7260-7276 of the State Government Code, as it may be amended from time to time.

3.2 No person will be required to relocate due to a proposed construction project until a replacement facility has been made available which meets the following standards:

3.2.1 Decent, safe, and sanitary.

3.2.2 Fair housing.

3.2.3 In areas not generally less desirable than the property to be acquired in regard to public utilities or public and commercial facilities.

3.2.4 Within the financial means of the displacee.

3.2.5 Reasonably accessible to the displacee's place of employment, public services, and commercial facilities.

3.2.6 Adequate to accommodate the displacee.

3.2.7 In an equal or better neighborhood.

3.2.8 Available on the market to the displacee.
3.3 In lieu of a replacement facility, the eligible owner or occupant may agree to accept a cash settlement as provided by state law.

3.4 Moving and related payments will be paid as provided by state law.

3.4.1 Individuals, businesses, and nonprofit organizations occupying the property to be acquired at the time of the first written offer to purchase and move as a result of SANDAG’s acquisition, will be eligible for reimbursement of moving expenses.

3.4.2 Residential occupants will receive either the actual reasonable costs involved in moving family and personal property up to a maximum of 50 miles, or a payment based on a schedule relating to the size of their present dwelling, not to exceed $500.

3.4.3 Businesses, farms, and nonprofit organizations will be entitled to reimbursement for (1) actual reasonable costs involved in moving the operation and personal property up to a maximum of 50 miles, (2) actual reasonable expenses incurred in searching for a replacement property, and (3) actual direct losses of tangible property.

3.5 Instead of accepting an actual moving expense payment, a business owner may be paid an amount equal to the average annual net earnings of the farm or business for the last two years prior to relocation. The payment may not be less than $2,500 or more than $10,000. A business may qualify for an In Lieu Payment if the agency determines that the business cannot be relocated without a substantial loss of the existing dollar volume of business and it is not a part of a business having an additional establishment. A part-time individual or family occupation in the home that does not contribute materially to the income of the displaced owner is ineligible for an In Lieu Payment.

3.6 The Board hereby adopts the Department of Housing and Community Development relocation assistance regulations set forth in Title 25, Division 1, Chapter 6, Subchapter 1 of the California Administrative Code, except as supplemented herein, as SANDAG’s Relocation Assistance Program for all projects that must have such regulations apply pursuant to Government Code section 7267.8.

3.7 Pursuant to section 6152 of Title 25 of the California Administrative Code, the provisions for review commencing with section 6150 shall be supplemented as follows:

3.7.1 In the case of complaints dismissed for untimeliness or for any other reason not based on the merits of the claim, SANDAG shall furnish a written statement to the complainant stating the reason for the dismissal of the claim as soon as possible but no later than two (2) weeks from receipt of the last material submitted by the complainant or the date of the hearing, whichever is later.
3.7.2 Except to the extent the confidentiality of material is protected by law or its disclosure is prohibited by law, the Board shall permit the complainant to inspect all files and records bearing upon his claim or the prosecution of the complainant's grievance. If a complainant is improperly denied access to any relevant material bearing on the claim, such material may not be relied upon in reviewing the initial determination.

3.7.3 The principles established in all determinations by SANDAG shall be considered as precedent for all eligible persons in similar situations regardless of whether or not a person has filed a written request for review. All written determinations shall be kept on file and available for public review.

3.7.4 Any aggrieved party has a right to representation by legal or other counsel at his expense at any and all stages of the proceedings set forth in these sections.

3.7.5 If a complainant, other than the owner of a displaced advertising sign, seeks to prevent displacement, SANDAG shall not require the complainant to move until at least twenty (20) days after it has made a determination and the complainant has had an opportunity to seek judicial review. In all cases, SANDAG shall notify the complainant in writing twenty (20) days prior to the proposed new date of displacement.

3.7.6 Where more than one person is aggrieved by the failure of SANDAG to refer them to comparable permanent or adequate temporary replacement housing, the complainants may join in filing a single written request for review. A determination shall be made by SANDAG for each of the complainants.

3.8 Before any project may be undertaken which involves the displacement of people, SANDAG or its agents shall complete a Replacement Housing Study to determine the needs of the relocatees and the availability of replacement housing. The SANDAG studies shall serve to assure that orderly relocation can be accomplished and that realistic and adequate plans are developed for relocating all displaced persons.

3.9 Comparable replacement dwellings will be available or provided for each displaced person within a reasonable amount of time. Such assurance is a part of the SANDAG Relocation Assistance Program study process and must be specifically given on every project requiring displacement.

3.10 Relocation advisory services will be provided to assist persons in relocating into safe, decent, and sanitary housing that meets their needs and is within their financial means. The same will be provided for displaced business and farm operators to aid them in finding suitable replacement locations to continue operations. Assistance is required throughout the acquisition phase of the project and starts at the time SANDAG begins acquiring properties on a project.
3.11 No person lawfully occupying real property shall be required to move from a dwelling, assuming a decent, safe, and sanitary replacement dwelling is available, or to move a business or farm operation, without at least 90 days written notice from SANDAG, prior to the date the move is required.

3.12 SANDAG shall follow generally the procedures outlined in the following Caltrans guides: Right-of-Way; Relocation Assistance Handbook; and How to Make Relocation Studies and Plans.

3.13 All cash payments to owners or occupants for any purpose shall be formally reported to the Board as to amount, rationale, and applicable code or statute.
UTILITY AGREEMENTS AND RELOCATION

The purpose of this policy is to define and clarify matters relating to utility agreements and utility relocations. Relocations or adjustments and placement of public and privately owned utilities, for which SANDAG is legally obligated, may be made necessary by proposed construction of a SANDAG project. These utility placements and relocations may take place within SANDAG right-of-way or in other public agencies' rights-of-way.

Procedures

1. For the purpose of this policy, the term “utility” shall include water systems, gas lines, electrical systems, and other public facilities, as well as those normally used to deliver, or dispose of, products utilized by the general public.

2. Utility agreements will be negotiated with each major utility owner affected, or likely to be affected, by a SANDAG project. These agreements shall establish the general basis for determining costs, salvage and betterment credits, liabilities, methods of payment, encroachments and easements, and procedures for effecting specific and discrete elements of work. Utilities that must be replaced or rearranged shall be replaced or rearranged in-kind to the current code or standard. Board approval is required to improve utilities beyond the code or standard of the utilities being replaced.

3. Design and construction relative to SANDAG-required utility relocations shall generally be performed by, or under contract to, the utility owner. Where the utility agrees to have such work performed by a SANDAG contractor, however, the utility should be assigned final responsibility for accepting that portion of the contractor's work.

4. SANDAG shall exercise reasonable discretion in acting on applications of utilities for permits to occupy SANDAG's right-of-way. SANDAG may, however, refuse to grant any applications for any crossings which would be inconsistent with public safety or the continued unobstructed use of the right-of-way for freight or transit purposes.

5. With the necessary modifications for the type of right-of-way and ownership thereof, SANDAG shall be guided by the California Streets and Highway Code, Section 680 and on any applicable case law, in carrying out this policy.

6. Nothing in this policy is intended to apply to relocations or adjustments and placement of public and privately owned utilities within NCTD or MTDB owned right-of-way. Any such relocations or adjustments and placements shall be governed by the policies of NCTD or MTDB, or governed by separate agreements established on a case-by-case basis.
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;

1.5.6.2 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 exceeds 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 Code section 4100 et seq., as it may be amended from time to time. Notwithstanding the foregoing, nothing in this policy is intended to
require SANDAG to strictly comply with the Subcontracting Fair Practices Act. The Executive Director is hereby designated to carry out 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 designee 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 Director 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.
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Introduction

Revisions to two Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocations to the City of Solana Beach are recommended for approval. The City of Solana Beach has requested an increase of $211,126 to the allocation for a pedestrian bridge over the Coaster/Amtrak railroad tracks at Rosa Street. In addition, a reduction of $177,573 to an allocation for another pedestrian bridge in Solana Beach at Cliff Street is necessary because the project has not progressed according to schedule.

Recommendation

Based on the recommendations of the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, the TDA claim amendments described above and included in Resolution 2004-07 are recommended for approval.

Discussion

SANDAG has allocated a total of $695,655 to the City of Solana Beach under three separate claims to support design and construction of a pedestrian bridge over the railroad tracks at Rosa Street. The project will connect the Coastal Rail Trail, which is currently out to bid, to the Cedros Design District. After the project went through a public input process and the design was refined, the estimated total cost (including design) has increased to $906,781. Funding for the additional allocation will come from TDA bicycle and pedestrian reserve funds that were set aside to cover unanticipated cost increases like this.

SANDAG also allocated $200,000 to Solana Beach for another pedestrian bridge at Cliff Street. This project has fallen behind schedule and, under the administrative rules governing TDA bicycle and pedestrian funds, the allocation should be rescinded. Some preliminary design work was completed at a cost of $22,427, leaving $177,573 subject to return. Unallocated funds go to the bicycle and pedestrian reserve. The recommendation to increase funding for the bridge at Rosa Street assumes that the funds from the Cliff Street bridge will be available for reallocation.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 595-5324; sva@sandag.org
RESOLUTION NO. 2004-07

APPROVING REVISIONS TO TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CLAIMS
FOR THE CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

WHEREAS, the City of Solana Beach has requested an increased Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocation of $211,126 under FY 2001 Claim 334 for the Rosa Street Pedestrian Bridge; and

WHEREAS, the allocation to the City of Solana Beach under FY 2003 Claim 356 for the Cliff Street Pedestrian Bridge is subject to rescission under the administrative guidelines for TDA Article 3 claims adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group has recommended approval of the actions listed below; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors delegated the authority for Transportation Development Act amendments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has analyzed the allocations and has found that the revisions are warranted pursuant to Section 6659(d) of Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR); NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Transportation Committee as follows:

1. That the Transportation Committee, pursuant to CCR Section 6659(d) does hereby approve revisions to the claims as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Original Allocation</th>
<th>Adjustment (+/-)</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Rosa Street Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$211,126</td>
<td>$361,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Cliff Street Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>($177,573)</td>
<td>$22,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. That the Transportation Committee does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit allocation instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for adjustment of these claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 14th day of November 2003.

________________________________________           ATTEST: ________________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

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

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit Development Board, North San Diego County Transit Development Board, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, S.D. Unified Port District, S.D. County Water Authority, and Baja California/Mexico.
DOWNTOWN BALLPARK DEFICIENCY PLAN STATUS REPORT

Introduction

A Freeway Deficiency Plan (the Plan) has been prepared by SANDAG in cooperation with Caltrans and the Cities of National City and San Diego. The Plan addresses congestion on portions of Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route (SR) 163, as analyzed in the Central I-5 Corridor Study. As required by state law, the Plan identifies what improvements would be necessary to provide acceptable levels of service on the freeways. But, given the potential environmental and community impacts of some projects, the Plan only recommends those projects included in the MOBILITY 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.

Under state law, the Plan must first be adopted by the local jurisdictions affected by the congestion and thereafter must be accepted or rejected by SANDAG, acting as the Congestion Management Agency. The Plan will come to the Transportation Committee and the Board in November or December. The Plan is also a requirement of the environmental impact report for Petco Park in Centre City San Diego. SANDAG must accept the Plan before the Certificate of Occupancy for the ballpark facility is issued by the City of San Diego (currently expected to occur in mid-February 2004).

Discussion

In October of 1999, the San Diego City Council certified the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FSEIR) for the Ballpark and Ancillary Development project in downtown San Diego. In addition to the arterial impacts addressed in the FSEIR, impacts to the freeway system were identified as arising from the build-out of downtown in the longer term. Analysis of the freeway system was combined with other ongoing studies into a comprehensive study of the Central I-5 Corridor, extending from I-8 to SR 54.

The Central I-5 Corridor Study was completed and approved by the Transportation Committee in December 2002, with many of the projects incorporated into MOBILITY 2030. The analysis conducted for the Central I-5 Corridor Study was the basis for an additional report, called the Freeway Deficiency Plan. This report satisfies a mitigation requirement of the Ballpark FSEIR and identifies near-term and long-term capacity improvements and programs for the segments of I-5 and SR 163 serving Centre City.

The Plan was prepared by SANDAG in cooperation with Caltrans and the cities involved in the corridor study. SANDAG took the lead on this Plan since it is a by-product of the Central I-5 Corridor Study. The Plan must first be adopted by the city councils of San Diego and National City, and once submitted to SANDAG, the Board has 60 days to accept or reject the Plan. The Ballpark FSEIR,
approved by the San Diego City Council, states that SANDAG must accept the Plan before the Certificate of Occupancy for the facility is issued by the City of San Diego.

In general, a local jurisdiction is required by state law to prepare and adopt a deficiency plan when a freeway segment on the regional Congestion Management Program (CMP) system fails to meet the applicable Level of Service (LOS) standard. A deficiency plan is required to include, among other things, a list of improvements necessary to correct the deficiency and relieve congestion, alternate options to reduce trips on the network, and an action plan for implementing identified improvements.

The Plan draws from several sources to identify improvements necessary to relieve congestion and meet CMP standards. This includes the MOBILITY 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Central I-5 Corridor Study. Identified Improvements in the Plan include:

**Adopted in the RTP**

- Two HOV lanes on all of I-5
- Auxiliary lanes south of SR-75
- Two general purpose lanes south of I-15
- Missing freeway connectors at I-8 and I-5

**Not Adopted in the RTP**

- Widening SR 163
- Centre City Collector Distributor Ramp System
- Missing freeway connectors at SR 94 and I-5

While SANDAG’s technical studies have identified that these improvements would relieve congestion on the freeway, not all of the projects have universal approval of the agencies and affected communities. In cases like this when proposed projects are too expensive or include large potential impacts, all Freeway Deficiency Plans include alternative ways to improve system performance, whether it’s Transportation Demand Management measures or improved transit facilities. In any event, eliminating any of the projects from discussion in the Plan could result in an incomplete and legally deficient Freeway Deficiency Plan under state law.

An example of the above situation is the identification of widening SR 163 to achieve acceptable CMP levels of service. Although this measure would relieve congestion on SR 163, the Plan acknowledges that “due to environmental and community concerns” the San Diego City Council already removed any consideration of such improvements to SR 163 from the final FSEIR. A proposal for a new downtown ramp system, called the Collector-Distributor System or C/D, is treated in a similar fashion. The Plan acknowledges that the Collector-Distributor System cannot be implemented, if ever, unless the lead agency has completed the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process that includes alternative analysis and has been publicly reviewed by the community. **However, it is important to note that any additional lanes on I-15 through Centre City must be accompanied by some type of ramp improvements in order to avoid physically widening the freeway.**

The "action plan" in the Plan incorporates the existing timeframes from MOBILITY 2030 but acknowledges that both RTP and especially non-RTP projects must still undergo environmental
review, identification of available funding, and further input from the community. Even without a firm commitment to the specific projects, the Plan still serves its intended purposes because it identifies a broad range of technically feasible measures that local jurisdictions can consider as they address congestion issues in the future.

In summary, preparation of this particular Freeway Deficiency Plan will comply with the requirements of: (1) the FSEIR for the Ballpark, and (2) state law governing congestion management programs. For other freeway corridors in the region, SANDAG will be preparing and compiling deficiency plans in order to develop a more comprehensive approach to congestion management and relief.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Michael Hix, (619) 595-5377; mhi@sandag.org
ROUTE 11 BUS STOP CONSOLIDATION DEMONSTRATION

Introduction

Successful bus service requires a balance between access and speed. Bus stops should be located to provide convenient and easy access to bus service, particularly at junctions with other routes to provide transfer opportunities. Although placing more bus stops along a route may improve pedestrian access, too many bus stops can negatively impact the quality of service, travel time, productivity, and efficiency of the service. Therefore, bus stops should be strategically placed to maximize access, while the number of stops along a route should reflect goals to achieve faster operating speeds, maintain reliability, and improve transit service to our riders.

Route 11 (shown in Attachment 1), which serves some of the most densely populated communities in San Diego, is one of the most productive routes in the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), carrying just under 3 million passengers a year. However, its ability to operate efficiently is hindered by frequent stop spacing and by stops that are placed in inappropriate locations. As a result, the route continually experiences bunching and is often late. Unreliable service, combined with the length of the route and slow travel speeds results in longer trip travel times for riders.

San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC) has had little success in correcting these problems with extra trips and frequency increases. As a result of the constant challenge to maintain reliable service and reduce travel times on Route 11, we have partnered with SDTC to review the existing stop spacing and locations along the route, and have identified a number of stops for possible consolidation or removal to help improve on-time performance and speed up the service. These recommended bus stop changes are expected to improve service quality for existing riders and attract new rider markets by providing a faster, more reliable transit service (consistent with Transit First objectives).

Discussion

Based on review of Route 11, 29 out of 233 existing stops have been identified as excessively frequent, and justify either consolidation or removal (See Attachment 2). We have shared this proposal with the community groups and neighborhood associations along Route 11 to obtain input and gain support for this project. By consolidating or removing these stops, we anticipate that we will be able to save between five and eight minutes in one-way travel time, or up to 10 percent of the travel time over the length of the route. Because of the current transit operations funding shortfalls, removing and consolidating these stops is a low-cost method for improving the route’s reliability, travel time, and attractiveness, which will improve transit service for our riders and attract new rider markets.

SDTC is scheduled to begin this project in early January 2004. SANDAG will conduct the “before and after” evaluation to assess the success of this demonstration project. The overall scope of the demonstration project will include the following:
- **Public Notification (Early January)**
  - Post “Take One” information bulletins regarding the project on Route 11 at least one week prior to project implementation. The bulletins will identify stops for removal and a contact number for patrons seeking more information or with concerns about particular stops.
  
  - Post information signs at stops one week prior to project implementation. The signs will notify the public of the pending removal of identified stops, explain the benefits to riders of the program (faster travel times and better service reliability), and identify where the closest remaining bus stop is located.

- **Project Implementation (Mid-January)**
  - Open comment/concerns hotline (telephone line).
  
  - Temporarily remove stops from service. (Maintain the information signs at removed stops that provide the nearest alternate bus stop location, information on the project, a number to call with questions, concerns or compliments.)

- **Monitoring and Evaluation Period (three months from the time of implementation)**
  - Continued monitoring of bus stop issues (reinstate stops with major passenger concerns immediately).
  
  - Continued monitoring of Route 11’s performance (ridership trends, on-time performance, and customer satisfaction).

- **Post-Demonstration Project Analysis (one month after demonstration period ends)**
  - Complete a comprehensive evaluation of the project after the three-month demonstration period to evaluate project success and identify stops for permanent removal. Evaluation factors will provide before and after comparisons, including changes in ridership, changes in on-time performance, changes in travel times, and driver and passenger perceptions. Demonstration project results will be presented to the SANDAG Transportation Committee and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Board.

- **Final Implementation**
  - Permanently consolidate identified stops if the demonstration is successful.
  
  - Consider other applications for bus stop consolidation.

**BOB LEITER**
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Mike Daney, (619) 557-4541; mike.daney@sdmts.com
## Route 11 Stop Consolidation Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Council Districts</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Ons</th>
<th>Offs</th>
<th>Stops</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (South) IB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skyline &amp; Address 7787</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (South) OB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Skyline &amp; Address 7787</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (South) IB</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Skyline &amp; 58th</td>
<td>Eliminate (No Corresponding Stop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (South) OB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Logan &amp; Jarrett</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (South) IB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Logan &amp; Jarrett</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (South) OB</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Logan &amp; Euclid (Logan Piazza)</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (South) IB</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Logan &amp; Euclid (at WYCA)</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (South) IB</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Logan &amp; Dominion</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (South) OB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Logan &amp; 44th</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent) (By Park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (South) OB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>National &amp; 42nd</td>
<td>Eliminate (No Corresponding Stop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (South) IB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>National &amp; 37th</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent) Consolidate @ 38th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (South) IB</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>National &amp; 37th</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent) Consolidate @ 38th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (South) IB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>National &amp; 33rd</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent) Consolidate @ 32nd St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (South) OB</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>National &amp; 31st</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent) Consolidate @ 32nd St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (South) IB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Logan &amp; Evans</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (South) OB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Logan &amp; Evans</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (North) OB</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1st &amp; Juniper</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (North) IB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1st &amp; Palm</td>
<td>Eliminate (No Corresponding Stop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (North) OB</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1st &amp; Walnut</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (North) OB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1st &amp; Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 (North) IB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1st &amp; Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Avenue Transit First Now!</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>University &amp; 3rd</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>University &amp; 3rd</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent) (East Edge of Park) Remove too close to IB stop at Adams and Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adams &amp; Panorama</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent) Consolidate @ Louisiana St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adams &amp; Mississippi</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Adams &amp; Hamilton</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Adams &amp; Oregon</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adams &amp; W. M. View</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Adams &amp; W. M. View</td>
<td>Eliminate (Bus Stop Spacing too Frequent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Adams &amp; Wilson</td>
<td>Eliminate (No Corresponding Stop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OB = Outbound (traveling away from Downtown San Diego)
IB = Inbound (traveling towards Downtown San Diego)
INTRODUCTION

At the October 17, 2003, Transportation Committee meeting we described the status and recent work on the narrowed-down alignment alternatives for the University City light rail transit (LRT) segment through the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) campus. The most promising alignment would serve both the west and east sides of campus and would integrate the LRT with other transit at University Towne Centre (UTC) Shopping Center where a major transit center exists today. It takes advantage of a renewed desire to directly serve the UCSD west campus and the heart of north University City (UTC). There is also the opportunity to incorporate the LRT design with potential UTC expansion plans, supporting MOBILITY 2030 goals for land use and transit integration. The analysis presented on October 17, 2003, focused on alignment variations, design issues, environmental issues, cost estimates, and public input.

RECOMMENDATION

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the UCSD West LRT alignment (with both the Regents Road/Executive Drive and Genesee Avenue variations) in the University City area (Attachment 1) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for federal consideration and begin preliminary engineering and environmental document preparation, and

The Committee is also asked to provide input on a phasing plan for the entire Mid-Coast LRT project from Old Town to University City.

DISCUSSION

The following is a brief summary of the LRT alignments and analysis performed and presented on October 17, 2003 (more detail is in Attachment 2).

INTERSTATE 5 (I-5) EAST SIDE ALIGNMENT

The I-5 East Side LRT alignment option (Attachment 3) stays entirely on the east side of I-5 with a single station near 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

The UCSD West alignment (Attachment 1) traverses the UCSD campus to a station north of Pepper Canyon and just east of the Price Center, which serves the heart of the campus. From there, the alignment follows Voigt Drive eastward to cross back to the east side of I-5 to a station at either Scripps or Campus Point, serving the east side of campus. The alignment then extends to its terminus at the UTC shopping center. There are variations on the UCSD West alignment related to side (Variation 1) and center-street (Variation 2) running along Voigt Drive. In addition, two alignment variations were identified from Voigt Drive to UTC, one along Regents Road and Executive Drive (Variation A), and another along Genesee Avenue (Variation B).

Alignment Analysis

Capital Cost Estimates – Conceptual level construction cost estimates (2003 dollars) were made for the segment between Nobel Drive and UTC for comparison of alternatives. Although the I-5 East Side ($57 million) 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 (Variation 1A; $87 million) is the least costly. More cost is incurred on the median running (Variation 2A; $95 million) due to a longer tunnel and the depressed sections required, and utility conflicts in Voigt Drive. The UCSD West alignment on Genesee Avenue (Variation 1B; $104 million for the side running Voigt to Genesee) has a longer aerial structure, and therefore, is more costly. The most costly variation is the UCSD West median running along Voigt Drive to Genesee (Variation 2B; $112 million). All of the alignments assume an aerial station located on the east side of Genesee Avenue at the west entrance to UTC.

Ridership Analysis – The UCSD West alignment is projected to carry 1,600 more riders per day than the I-5 East Side alignment. This difference favoring the west campus alignments reflects the proximity of stations that serve the University directly on the UCSD West alignment. 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 the East and West Campuses.

Environmental Studies – The biological assessment concluded that the UCSD West alignment would traverse less biologically sensitive areas than the I-5 East Side alignment. A focused traffic study evaluated the impacts of the UCSD West alignment at key intersections and driveways along the alignment. The analysis found that only the intersections along Regents Road are projected to have a reduction to a Level of Service (LOS) D, which is an acceptable LOS in the City of San Diego. The at-grade alignment along Voigt Drive would require crossing gates to protect the driveways and street crossings between the UCSD West/Price Center Station and Regents Road, although it may be feasible to eliminate some at-grade crossings by reconfiguring access to the parking lots. A noise and vibration study was conducted to address the proposed project’s potential noise and vibration impacts and sites were identified that could require implementation of mitigation measures. If needed, mitigation measures to reduce the electromagnetic fields (EMF) effects would be developed cooperatively with UCSD. The land use integration with the LRT addressed access, activity centers, circulation, shuttle service, and existing and planned facilities.
Cost Effectiveness – On October 17, 2003, the Transportation Committee requested some measure of cost-effectiveness for the alignment alternatives and variations. While there are several simplified approaches for assessing cost-effectiveness at this phase in the project planning, a consideration of the projected ridership benefits over the life of the project relative to the estimated construction costs provides a general cost-effectiveness comparison.

**PRELIMINARY PLANNING PHASE LRT CONSTRUCTION COST EFFECTIVENESS**
(BETWEEN NOBEL DRIVE STATION AND UTC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT</th>
<th>INITIAL CONSTRUCTION COST</th>
<th>COST / RIDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 East Side</td>
<td>$57 million</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West – Side Running Voigt – Executive (Variation 1A)</td>
<td>$87 million</td>
<td>$0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Side Running Voigt - Genesee (Variation 1B)</td>
<td>$104 million</td>
<td>$0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Median Voigt – Executive (Variation 2A)</td>
<td>$95 million</td>
<td>$0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Median Voigt – Genesee (Variation 2B)</td>
<td>$112 million</td>
<td>$0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cost Effectiveness = Capital Cost/(Ridership** x 320 days/year*** x 100 years [project life])
** Ridership based on 2015 projections, not escalated past 2015.
*** Annualization factor for LRT ridership that takes into account weekends and holidays.

We did not include operating revenue or cost into the analysis. However, the higher ridership projected for the UCSD West alignments would tip the scale in favor of those alignments for the following reasons:

- The 1,600 additional boardings in the segment north of Nobel Drive would generate approximately 3,200 boardings on the LRT system (i.e., each boarding has a corresponding return trip). These 3,200 additional trips would generate an estimated $800,000 in annual fare revenue (2003 dollars assuming an average LRT fare of $0.79/trip) with a modest increase in operating costs due to the additional 0.94 miles of service.

- The East Side alignment would be heavily dependent upon UCSD shuttle services for transit riders headed to the West campus. This shuttle service presents an additional operating cost burden, albeit on UCSD, and not the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS).

Conclusion - Based on the analysis, the most promising alignment and variation from a ridership, access, land use integration, and biological assessment appears to be the UCSD West alignment side running at-grade along Voigt Drive to either Regents Road/Executive Drive or Genesee Avenue (Attachment 1). The early capital cost-effectiveness analysis for this segment indicates a range from $0.72 to $0.86 for the Regents/Executive and Genesee variations, respectively. We believe that the
total cost-effectiveness (i.e., considering operating revenue and cost in addition to capital costs) would favor having the West side alignment and station. The alignment variations along either Regents/Executive or Genesee require further analysis during the preliminary engineering and environmental phase 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.

Public/Community Involvement

Over the past several years, we have held or participated in over 30 public meetings to receive input on numerous LRT alignment options in the University City area. In addition, we established a Project Review Committee comprised of community stakeholders to assist in the technical analysis, including an assessment of the appropriate transit mode for the corridor (LRT or Bus Rapid Transit). These public meetings and corresponding policy board actions have led to the narrowing down of LRT alignment alternatives and variations to those presented in this report. The following discussion describes recent meetings with the community stakeholders specific to the alignments and variations discussed in this report.

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. 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 expect a letter of support for the UCSD West alignment recommendation from the Acting Chancellor to be presented at the Transportation Committee meeting.

University Community Planning Group (UCPG) - We presented the LRT alignment alternatives at the October 14, 2003, meeting of the UCPG. The UCPG requested a community public meeting prior to taking an action to support moving the UCSD West alignment and variations into the environmental and preliminary engineering phase. This public meeting was held on Monday, November 3, 2003. The meeting was advertised both locally and regionally. We will return to the UCPG on November 11, 2003, to hear discussion and answer any questions. We will provide an oral report on these public meetings at today’s Transportation Committee meeting.

Jewish Community Center (JCC) - We presented the LRT alignment alternatives to JCC representatives on October 9, 2003. As stated at the October 14, 2003, Transportation Committee meeting, they are concerned about noise and vibration, circulation, and visual impacts to their facility from a potential elevated alignment on Executive Drive. We need to conduct further analysis on the Regents/Executive alignment variation to assess how these concerns might be addressed. We also need to conduct further analysis on the elevated Genesee variation. Therefore, we believe it is prudent to move both variations into the preliminary engineering and environmental phase.
Next Steps

To ensure that this project remains eligible for future federal funding, we need to follow Federal Transit Administration (FTA) processes and obtain FTA concurrences as we move forward. FTA has indicated that it may approve use of our previous (mid-1990s) work on the Alternatives Analysis as the basis of our federally required Alternatives Analysis and that our current approach should be to update the previously adopted Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). To proceed with this approach, SANDAG would need to approve an updated LRT alignment (with variations) as the Locally Preferred Alternative for further study and provide historical project data to FTA, including the change in conditions in the corridor since the 1995 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that led to the updated LPA (i.e., travel demand, population, employment, land use changes, public involvement, etc.). This would lead to preparation of a Locally Preferred Alternative report for federal approval early next year.

Following confirmation of our approach with FTA, the next step is to obtain permission to enter Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Impact Statement (PE/EIS) preparation. We would need to prepare a Project Management Plan (PMP), which demonstrates our technical capability and capacity to implement the project. The PMP describes how subsequent phases of the project development (preliminary engineering, final design, construction, start-up) will be managed by the lead local agency. FTA would approve the PMP prior to issuing permission to enter preliminary engineering.

We would then begin preliminary engineering and preparation of the environmental documents on the LRT project between Balboa Avenue and UTC along the selected alignment in the UCSD/University City area. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), and FTA requirements, the environmental document would include the selected alignment (and variations) as the “Build” alternative, a “Transportation Systems Management” (TSM) alternative (a low capital cost option that best meets the project purpose and need), and a “No Build” (i.e., do nothing) alternative. The environmental process would document the project purpose and alternatives studied, characterize the affected environment, and identify mitigation for impacts. The environmental document would include analysis on topics such as land use, transportation, socio-economics/demographics, visual, air quality, noise and vibration, natural resources, geotechnical, water resources, cultural resources, parklands, and hazardous materials.

The preliminary engineering/draft environmental document would include more detailed analysis to narrow down the alignments and station variations as well as more investigation into the following:

- UCSD West station
- Shuttle access
- Facilities interface and impacts
- At-grade crossings and re-configuration of UCSD parking lots
- Emergency access to Thornton Hospital
- Elevated design along Genesee Avenue
- Alignment design along Executive Drive
- UTC Transit Center
Upon completion and approval of the preliminary engineering and draft environmental document, 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, would be fairly inexpensive 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 of 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 Segment, 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 Segment 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 the TransNet extension 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

Key Staff Contact:  Christine Rychel, (619) 557-4540; christine.rychel@sdmts.com
DESCRIPTION OF UNIVERSITY CITY LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT ALIGNMENT
ALTERNATIVES AND VARIATIONS

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 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.

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. 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 describes the results of that analysis.

Alignment Descriptions

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 1A - 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 1B - 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 2A - 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.

- Variation 2B - LRT Median Running in Voigt Drive to Genesee Avenue - This alignment is similar to the LRT Median Running in Voigt to Executive Drive (2A) variation described above, except that 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.

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.

<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 1A)</td>
<td>$87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Side Running Voigt - Genesee (Variation 1B)</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Median Voigt – Executive (Variation 2A)</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Median Voigt – Genesee (Variation 2B)</td>
<td>$112</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 $500 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>STATION</th>
<th>DAILY BOARDINGS (2015) (WITH SHUTTLE AND WALK ACCESS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Side I-5: Thornton Hospital</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West: Price Center</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West: Scripps Hospital or Campus Points</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preliminary ridership projections for the UCSD West alignment variations would be approximately 4,100 a day, while the preliminary ridership projections for the East Side I-5 alignment would be approximately 2,500 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 the single station and its distance from many of UCSD’s trip generators.

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 Genesee 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, CPUC indicated that the at-grade alignment in Voigt Drive and Regents Road is not a fatal flaw.

- **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. 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” 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.

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 ACCESS</th>
<th>OVERALL ENVIRON.</th>
<th>TRAFFIC</th>
<th>SMART GROWTH &amp; 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/Exec (Variation 1A)</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 1B)</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 2A)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West/ Median Voigt to Genesee (Variation 2B)</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 1A), 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 2A) 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 variations with an elevated section in Genesee Avenue (Variation 1B and 2B) result 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. 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.
2003 REGIONAL TRANSIT PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY

Introduction

Through the Assistance to Transit Operations and Planning (ATOP) Program SANDAG provides technical assistance to area transit decision makers by producing relevant information related to service areas, ridership, and system performance. ATOP staff periodically collaborate with transit planning and marketing staff to design and conduct a telephone survey of residents that provides information to help guide future planning and marketing efforts. The most recent telephone survey was conducted in 1998. This year’s survey builds upon the market segmentation research conducted in 2000 by the North County Transit District (NCTD) and the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) for the Transit First Strategy, which led to the Regional Transit Vision.

Discussion

Conducted in July 2003, this survey of 1,300 residents within the San Diego region, marks a departure from previous surveys by focusing more on traveler needs and how transit service can be changed to best meet those needs rather than focusing on how to market the existing transit system to area residents. This approach more closely follows the direction set out in developing the Transit First Strategy.

Travelers have differing needs, preferences, and perceptions that shape their mode choice decisions. One objective of this study was to provide a connection between traveler needs and potential service improvement strategies. Survey respondents were asked to rate modes of transportation by how well they meet their travel needs and identify how particular types of service changes would affect their use of transit. Respondents were also grouped into market segments based on their responses to questions related to their travel needs and opinions.

Key Findings

Broad Exposure to Transit

One of the more striking findings from this study is that the vast majority of the region’s residents have ridden transit in the region. Approximately 9 percent of adult residents are considered frequent riders of transit, meaning they ride at least once per week. More than half (51 percent) have ridden transit at least once during the past 12 months. An additional 34 percent have ridden transit in the region at some point, although not in the past 12 months. Thus, just 15 percent of adult residents have never ridden transit in the region.
Making Transit More Competitive

Respondents were asked to rate four modes – personal vehicle, bus, trolley, and Coaster in terms of their ability to meet a list of ten travel needs. The left side of the figure below presents each of the travel needs in order from most important (‘You will feel safe’) to least important based on survey results. Note that the travel need shown at the bottom of the graph “You can get where you need to go” was not rated for importance since it is a prerequisite for making any trip.

The right side of the figure shows the degree to which respondents agreed with the travel need statement as it pertains to using each mode. The relative position of a logo indicates how well the mode competes in terms of satisfying respondents’ needs. The farther to the right the better the mode meets respondents’ needs. For all but two travel needs, avoiding traffic and being inexpensive, the personal auto is viewed as best meeting respondents’ needs. However, for many needs such as safety at least one form of transit (Coaster) closely competes with the auto.

This recent survey confirmed the research conducted in 2000 that efforts to increase transit ridership should focus on making improvements to the transit system that will enable transit to better compete with the personal vehicle in meeting the needs that travelers identify as being most important. Survey results suggest that improving transit’s performance with respect to travel time, on-time arrivals, and avoiding traffic will have the greatest positive impact on transit ridership, everything else being equal. This conclusion is also supported by the results of other questions in the survey that asked respondents about the likely effects of service changes on their frequency or
likelihood of riding transit in the future. Having the most positive impact on decisions of whether or not to use transit or use transit more frequently are service changes that improve the speed and convenience of using transit, including locating pick-up and drop-off points closer to their home and destinations, faster travel times, more frequent service, and adopting a transit pass card that would eliminate the need for cash and exact change.

Market Segmentation

This survey also updates and confirms findings on a regional level from the market segmentation work performed in 2000 when developing the Transit First Strategy. Updated market segment information also will be used in the next phase of SANDAG’s transit market research, which will focus on market segment analysis at the community and corridor level of geography.

The market segmentation process divides respondents into one of six groups or “market segments” (listed below) based on their need for flexibility and speed, their sensitivity to their personal travel experience, and their sensitivity to personal safety. Because each market segment is an aggregation of respondents with similar needs and perceptions, they also have some degree of uniformity and predictability in how they would respond to different types of transit service. This information was extremely valuable when developing the Transit First Strategy, which is essentially a plan for implementing a network of transit services that addresses traveler needs and presents the best possible option for public transit to compete with the private vehicle.

Road Runners are travelers with both a high need for flexibility and speed, and a high sensitivity towards their personal travel experience.

Cautious Runabouts are characterized by their high need for flexibility and speed as well as a medium level of sensitivity to their personal travel experience. They also tend to be more concerned about their personal safety than other segments.

Intrepid Trekkers exhibit a need for flexibility and speed, have a medium level of sensitivity to their personal travel experience, and are generally less concerned with their personal safety.

Flexible Flyers have a high need for flexibility and speed, but are less sensitive to their personal travel experience than most segments.

Conventional Cruisers do not have a particular need for flexibility and speed, but they are highly sensitive to their personal travel experience.

Easy Goers exhibit a lower than average need for flexibility and speed, and a lower than average sensitivity to their personal travel experience.
Next Step

The next step in this research program is to extend the utility of the survey data to be able to focus on smaller levels of geography. This will guide long-range transit service planning and marketing at the local level. Work will soon be underway to develop a process that will provide planners with the ability to determine the market segment composition of neighborhoods and travel corridors, thus allowing them to be able to design services tailored to the specific needs of communities.

JEFF TAYMAN
Director of Technical Services

Key Staff Contact: Jeff Martin, (619) 595-5358; jma@sandag.org
SAN DIEGO & ARIZONA EASTERN RAILWAY RE-OPENING ACTIVITIES

Introduction

The San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railway (SD&AE) is a railroad corridor that could provide new east-west freight connections for the San Diego region and northern Baja California. In the last decade, SANDAG has prepared cost estimates to reopen the line and studied the potential freight market. As private efforts to physically reopen the line are almost complete, there is growing interest in the economic opportunities the SD&AE can offer the region. Representatives from the Carrizo Gorge Railway will provide an update presentation at the Transportation Committee meeting.

Additional funding is needed to prepare a business plan and finish the repairs to the railroad. Through the efforts of Congressman Bob Filner, $10 million was authorized and appropriated for the SD&AE Railway as part of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) in 1997. In response to an inquiry from Caltrans, MTDB estimated that about $1.6 million of the $10 million would be used for engineering activities. No further action was taken to obligate these funds.”

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the SANDAG Board of Directors that the Board approve a resolution authorizing the Executive Director to accept the TEA-21 demonstration funds, amend the FY 2004 OWP and budget, and contract for consultant services to develop a business plan for reopening the SD&AE Railway.

Discussion

The SD&AE Railway connects San Diego to Tijuana, Tecate, and the Imperial Valley (Attachment 1). The Metropolitan Transit System (successor to MTDB) owns the portion of the line in the United States, while the State of Baja California owns the 44-mile portion in Mexico. While the line has been closed east of Tecate since 1983, freight service is available between San Diego and Tecate. In 2002, freight movements included agriculture and food products, steel and aluminum, liquefied petroleum gas, lumber, paper, and building materials. In 2003, heavy machinery and transformers/generators also were transported along the line.

Freight service between San Diego and San Ysidro is provided by the San Diego and Imperial Valley (SDIV) Railroad. In 2001, the State of Baja California awarded Carrizo Gorge Railway, in partnership with the Mexican company, Ferrocarriles Peninsulares del Noroeste, a 25-year concession to operate freight on the Mexican section of the line. In May 2002, MTDB granted a contract to Carrizo Gorge
Railway (CZRY) to repair, operate, and maintain the 70-mile Desert Line. The Desert Line is the segment of the SD&AE in the U.S. east of Tecate, connecting to the Union Pacific Railroad in the Imperial Valley.

Of the 16 tunnels in Carrizo Gorge, two remained blocked (Tunnels 8 and 16) after attempts to reopen the Desert Line in the early 1990s ran out of funding. However, since 2002 the Carrizo Gorge Railway has been actively working on the Desert Line and has cleared Tunnel #8 and is close to clearing Tunnel #16 for service. CZRY estimates just over $500,000 to finish the tunnel work and initially reopen the line. Additional reliability measures include more than $3 million to rehabilitate tracks and structures, and another $7 million overall for initial capital improvements.

SANDAG studies in the late 1990s estimated that reopening the SD&AE Railway for basic service would cost $43 million. This included repairs, reliability measures, and staging and intermodal yards. Under basic service, the Desert Line would be rehabilitated to handle single-stack intermodal traffic and “conventional” rail carload traffic such as bulk commodities. An intermodal transfer facility to gather and distribute potential diversions of truck traffic passing through the SD&AE’s service territory also would be built in the San Diego area. Potential funding for some improvements could come from the $10 million authorized for the SD&AE Railway by Congress in TEA-21.

A meeting was held on October 23, 2003, with Congressman Filner and representatives of the Carrizo Gorge Railway and the Port of San Diego. As the principal involved with the demonstration funding, Congressman Filner agreed with the group to explore use of a portion of the demonstration funds to complete efforts to reopen the Desert Line and to prepare a business plan.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Michael Hix (619) 595-5377; mhi@sandag.org
The attachment to this Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG's Clerk of the Board at (619) 595-5602.
SAN DIEGO/LOS ANGELES MAGLEV PROJECT CONCEPT REPORT

Introduction

The San Diego/Los Angeles Maglev Project is a proposal by a nonprofit corporation based in San Diego interested in developing a very high-speed (270+ miles per hour) magnetic levitation (maglev) passenger train system between downtown San Diego/ Lindbergh Field and the Los Angeles International Airport. Intermediate stops would include north San Diego County, John Wayne Airport in Orange County, and Long Beach Airport in Los Angeles County. This system would connect to a similar effort underway by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to design a maglev system in the Los Angeles region.

Representatives will provide an overview of the project at the meeting.

Discussion

Maglev trains move at very high speeds on elevated structures. One maglev project is currently in revenue service; a 19-mile route in Shanghai, China, began limited passenger service in December 2002. SCAG has developed a business plan for a maglev system with connections from Los Angeles to Orange County and to Riverside County. The California Maglev Alliance, in conjunction with SCAG, is currently developing this project.

Since 1996, the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) has been tasked with developing and implementing a statewide high-speed passenger rail system. Plans call for a 700-mile network of high-speed service connecting five corridors statewide. San Diego would be connected to the rest of this network via the coastal rail corridor and the inland Interstate 15 (I-15) corridor. SANDAG established the San Diego Regional High-Speed Rail Task Force in 1999, a working group of board members and agency representatives, to monitor this work. The Task Force meets as needed.

In November 2001, the SANDAG Board of Directors, through actions by the Executive Committee recommended by the Task Force, supported the CHSRA recommendation to not pursue further study of maglev and other technology that cannot share tracks with existing rail services. SANDAG is on record supporting: (1) incremental improvements to the coastal rail corridor, which will benefit high-speed rail, Coaster and Metrolink commuter rail operations, Amtrak intercity passenger service, and freight; and (2) further study of an electrified, grade-separated, high-speed train service along the I-15 corridor.
Currently the CHSRA is completing a draft programmatic environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (PEIR/EIS) for the statewide network. The Task Force is scheduled to review this document at its December 4, 2003, meeting in preparation for a report to the Transportation Committee on December 12, 2003.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key staff contact: Linda Culp, (619) 595-5357;lcu@sandag.org
SAN DIEGO SERVICE AUTHORITY FOR FREeway EMERGENCIES (SD SAFE) UPDATE

Introduction

At the July 11, 2003, Executive Committee meeting, staff provided an update on Senate Bill (SB) 795. In that meeting, staff was directed to arrange for a presentation to the Transportation Committee by the San Diego Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SD SAFE). SD SAFE operates as the region’s service authority for freeway emergencies and manages an extensive freeway call box program. SD SAFE was created by legislation in 1986, and is a separate governmental entity operated under a Board of Directors made up of local elected officials. SD SAFE operations are contracted to a private firm responsible for managing the region’s emergency call box program. SB 795 opens the opportunity to expand the motorist aid services offered by the SD SAFE program.

Discussion

SAFE Background

The SD SAFE Board of Directors is made up of seven local elected officials: two County Supervisors, two Council members from the City of San Diego, and three Council members from the remaining 17 cities within the region. In other regions, the SAFE Board of Directors is the local Council of Governments (COG), Transportation Commission, or Transportation Authority.

SAFE Organization

Since SAFEs are separate legal entities from the County and its cities, SAFEs have no direct staff. Instead, in most SAFEs, the staff for the agency that serves as the SAFE Board also serves as the SAFE staff. In San Diego, the SAFE Board contracts with TeleTran Tek (T3) Services, a private company, to provide management and staff services to the SAFE Board; the County Treasurer acts as the SD SAFE investment manager, and the County Counsel serves as the SD SAFE legal counsel.

SAFE Core Operation: The Freeway Call Box Program

California Streets and Highways Code Section 2550 authorized counties across the state to create a SAFE call box program. The SAFE Board in each region collects a one dollar ($1.00) vehicle registration fee for every vehicle registered in the County; for San Diego this equates to just over two million dollars ($2,000,000) per year. The vehicle license fees are used to fund SAFE operations. The use of SAFE funds is restricted by statute and can only be used within the County for “motorist
aid” purposes. Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol (CHP) act as oversight agencies for the freeway call box program, and have approval authority over SAFE Implementation Plans.

What is a Call Box?

A freeway emergency call box is a solar-powered, analog cellular telephone housed in a weather-resistant box that is installed on an aluminum pole. In San Diego County, SAFE maintains 1,760 call boxes. Statewide there are over 16,500 call boxes. Each callbox has a unique identifying number that correlates to the location on the freeway or highway (e.g., call box 5-667 is on Interstate 5, at Post Mile 66.7).

Call boxes are generally installed in pairs, on opposite sides along freeways and state routes, and are generally placed at one-half mile spacing. On rural two-lane routes, single call boxes are usually placed on alternating sides. Locating and spacing of call boxes is dependent upon cellular signal strength, sufficient sunlight, a minimum shoulder width of eight feet, and sufficient sight distance for safety purposes.

Call Box Call Answering

Freeway call box call volumes for SD SAFE have decreased from a high of 170,000 in the mid 1990’s to approximately 60,000 in FY 2003. This decrease is attributed largely to the increase in use of portable cellular phones.

The SD SAFE Board contracts with CDSNet, Inc., which answers call box calls in the San Diego region. CDS Net, Inc., answers calls on average within ten seconds, and usually on the first ring. CDS Net, Inc., routes 30 percent of the calls directly to the CHP. Calls routed to the CHP include calls reporting crimes and requests for assistance such as medical emergencies, fires, FSP dispatch, and rotational tow dispatch. Freeway call box calls are the third priority for CHP, behind cellular 911 and allied agency calls. CHP often takes from two to ten minutes to answer call box calls.

Call Box Maintenance

SD SAFE freeway call boxes are maintained by Comarco Wireless Technologies, under a ten-year agreement.

Cellular Services

AT&T Wireless provides analog cellular service to SD SAFE. Cellular service for the SD SAFE program costs $7.50 per month per call box, with a 50-minute per box allowance, per month. Because of the dwindling availability of analog cellular service, the SD SAFE is working with other SAFE agencies to prepare for a conversion to digital cellular service sometime in the next few years.

SB 795

SB 795, signed into law on September 11, 2003, is clean-up legislation for the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) and Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE). SB 795 includes a provision that allows a local SAFE to implement other motorist aid services in addition to a freeway emergency call box program.
Under SB 795, it is possible for a local SAFE to use excess funds to pay for expanded FSP service. A SAFE can directly contract for FSP services, however, to do so the SAFE operator must first obtain approval from any agency that is already operating FSP services within the county. SANDAG has managed the region’s only FSP program since March 1993. SANDAG staff has since met with the Executive Director of San Diego SAFE to discuss future coordination of motorist aid services as a result of the passage of SB 795.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility & Implementation Services
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