TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Friday, March 5, 2004
9 a.m. – 12 Noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• IMPROVING SENIOR TRANSPORTATION SERVICES
• COMMENTS ON STATE’S HIGH-SPEED RAIL PROPOSAL
• TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT AT GROSSMONT TROLLEY STATION

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 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) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
+1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES | APPROVE
A. FEBRUARY 6, 2004 MEETING MINUTES
B. FEBRUARY 20, 2004 MEETING MINUTES
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 5)

3. I-15 EXPRESS LANES WEEKEND OPERATIONS (Jack Boda) | INFORMATION

Since late August 2003, the Interstate 15 (I-15) Express Lanes between State Routes (SR) 56 and 163 have been open for weekend operations. Based on an analysis of Express Lanes traffic over the past six months, weekend usage of the lanes in the northbound direction is nearly double the usage in the southbound direction. Caltrans proposes to operate the I-15 Express Lanes in the northbound direction beginning in mid-March 2004.

+4. NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORTATION FACILITY STUDY DEFERRAL (Mike Hix) | APPROVE

In December 2003, the Transportation Committee approved moving forward with a study to improve north-south mobility in north San Diego County. The evaluation was to include potential enhancements to the existing and planned transportation network as well as new long-range transportation corridors. However, funding for new projects would be difficult without a TransNet Extension, and the identification of post-2030 corridors should wait until land use assumptions are available and the RTP extends beyond 2030. As a result, the North-South Transportation Study Working Group is recommending that the Study be deferred at least until the outcome of the TransNet Extension ballot measure is known. In addition, the Working Group is recommending that the suggested analysis of previously deleted circulation-element links is not appropriate at this time because of relatively recent decisions that were made to delete certain links, based on technical analyses and local policy board actions.

+5. TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) CLAIM AMENDMENTS (Heidi Calabrese) | APPROVE

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve two claim amendments: (1) FY 2003 Fiscal Audit Claim Adjustment for the North County Transit District (NCTD), and (2) allocation to the City of Chula Vista for prior year unallocated TDA funds. These funds will be used as the local match to purchase mid-size, low-floor buses.
REPORTS

+6. DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (PEIR/EIS) FOR THE PROPOSED CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM (Dan Leavitt, California High-Speed Rail Authority; Linda Culp, SANDAG)

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) is the state agency charged with planning, designing, and constructing a 700-mile, high-speed passenger rail system for California that would connect our major metropolitan areas. San Diego would be connected by a high-speed inland Interstate 15 (I-15) corridor and an improved conventional coastal rail corridor. In January 2004, the Authority released the draft PEIR/EIS for this statewide system. SANDAG’s High-Speed Rail Task Force is meeting on March 4, 2004, to review and comment on this document. Pending a recommendation by the Task Force, the Transportation Committee is asked to approve the comments and forward them to the Authority.

+7. SENIORS ACCESS TASK FORCE REPORT (Nan Valerio)

The Senior Access Task Force has met four times to develop recommendations for providing and enhancing senior transportation services in the region. The Task Force will present its recommendations related to immediate, small-scale actions as well as for a broader regional program. The Task Force also will present a recommendation for funding these senior transportation services as part of the draft TransNet Expenditure Plan.

+8. GROSSMONT TROLLEY STATION JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL (Rachel Hurst, La Mesa Housing and Redevelopment Director; Miriam Kirshner, SANDAG)

The City of La Mesa, SANDAG, and Fairfield Realty LLC, are working jointly on a proposed mixed-use, transit-oriented development project at the Grossmont Trolley Station site owned by Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). Fairfield Realty LLC is operating under an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement with the City of La Mesa and MTS.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next two Transportation Committee meetings are scheduled for Friday, March 19, 2004 and Friday, April 2, 2004.

10. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of February 6, 2004

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order at 9:29 a.m. by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal). See attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the January 16, 2004, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, reminded the Committee members about sponsorship opportunities for the Multiple Sclerosis (MS) Walk. On the matter of public transportation, he asked how the cities of San Diego County can only spend one-sixth of a cent of the TransNet tax to support transit in a vast county area. He noted that Los Angeles has a full cent of sales tax dedicated for transportation purposes. He said that having high transit fares does not encourage people to use transit.

Clive Richards, a member of the public, stated that a newspaper article about the recent SANDAG Board retreat referred to a discussion of less money for transit and more money for local streets and roads. He said that it seems to him the best way to deal with transportation projects is to find some blend between highway and transit dollars.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 5)

3. TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW REPORT (INFORMATION)

The report is an annual summary of the results of SANDAG’s efforts to coordinate transit and land use through the project development review process. SANDAG staff works closely with local jurisdictions to ensure the integration of transit facilities into development projects and to improve the pedestrian environment wherever possible. These efforts resulted in the inclusion of privately funded transit and pedestrian facilities into 177 development projects worth over $1.6 million during 2003.
4. TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL MONIES TO REPLACE TRACK SWITCHES ON C STREET (RECOMMEND)

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board a transfer of $157,000 from the Beyer Station/Dairymart Road Rail Replacement Project to the State and Columbia Streets Switch Replacement Project. This additional funding is needed to complete the replacement of the San Diego Trolley, Inc., trackwork switches on C Street near Columbia and State Streets.

5. FY 2004-2008 REGIONAL SHORT-RANGE TRANSIT PLAN (SRTP) (APPROVE)

The FY 2004-08 SRTP supports the vision of MOBILITY 2030 by providing a short-term plan for transit system adjustments and enhancements regionwide. On January 16, 2004, the Transportation Committee conducted a public hearing on the SRTP. Comments received from the review period and public hearing have been incorporated into the final SRTP, as appropriate. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the final FY 2004-08 SRTP.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 3 through 5.

REPORTS

Chair Kellejian noted that Item 8 would be taken out of order at this time.

8. 2004 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) ALTERNATIVES (INFORMATION)

The Executive Director reported that this item will come back for action at the February 20 Transportation Committee meeting. The three programming options have been refined since the last time they were presented to the Committee. He reviewed each of the three options noting available STIP funding, the STIP funding commitments already in place, and the Interstate 15 (I-15) Managed Lanes GARVEE (Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle) bond debt service. He stated that in 2014 we would have the funding capacity in the STIP for new projects for the options with the least amount of GARVEE being proposed. He added that the STIP is not the only funding source for projects. He noted that there are challenges to obtain GARVEE bonding for the Sprinter project. We are working with our financial advisor and a plan has been developed to sell bonds to fund this project. The Executive Director said that Option C will allow us to possibly cover $59 million in ongoing construction and procurement projects.

Staff highlighted the changes on this item from the last discussion including: additional Transit Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) projects at risk, added construction/right-of-way acquisition inflation costs, and the North County Transit District (NCTD) bond financing proposal for the Sprinter. The difference between the 2002 STIP as it is currently programmed and the 2004 STIP proposed program is that the $203.8 million available is now spread over five years and most of the money is located on the tail end of the STIP cycle. In the 2002 STIP, we were promised $113 million for 2004-05, and that has been decreased to $4 million. This will result in project delays.
With Option A, No Additional GARVEE, the current GARVEE bond debt service would be $17.1 million. It would complete all 2002 STIP projects, but with some delays to the following projects: State Route (SR) 52 right-of-way, SR 905 construction, Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit (LRT) right-of-way, and freeway operations projects. Projects already under construction are: the East Village Transit Stations, SR 56 Middle Freeway, I-5/I-805 “Merge,” and the MTS Buses. The state has previously approved money for these construction projects. With this option, there is a $243.4 million funding gap for the following projects: SR 52 construction, SR 905 construction, I-15 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), the Sprinter, and SR 56 landscaping.

Option B would increase the level of debt service from $17 million to $29 million. This option would complete all 2002 STIP projects, but with some delays. Staff proposes to minimize delays with GARVEE bonds for the SR 52 right-of-way acquisition and the SR 905 construction. The funding gap with Option B would decrease from $243.4 million to $196.7 million on the same projects contained in Option A.

Option C would increase the debt service from $17 million to $51 million. This option would complete all of the 2002 STIP projects and there would be no remaining shortfall. There is the option of having NCTD issue bonds for the Sprinter to cover the $80 million shortfall from TCRP. It would be a 20-year bond with interest only in the first ten years with the anticipation that other funds would be identified to cover the principle. The following ten years would be used to pay back the principle if other funds were not found.

Staff clarified that final approval authority for the GARVEE bonds rests with the California Transportation Commission (CTC). We will probably be notified of the CTC’s final recommendation in June.

Staff noted that there is $196 million of unanticipated unprogrammed Regional Surface Transportation Program/ Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (RSTP/CMQA) monies, but these funds have been used in the past for other programs.

The next steps include presentation of this item to the Transportation Committee on February 20, 2004, for a recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors; a presentation on February 27, 2004, to the Board of Directors for information; action scheduled at the March Board of Directors meeting; submittal of the STIP to the CTC by the April 12, 2004, deadline; and adoption of the STIP by the CTC on August 5, 2004.

Chair Kellejian asked about the cost of the debt service for each option. Staff referred to page 21 of the handout of revised information.

Supervisor Roberts noted that we get more for our money in terms of project benefits with Option C. The Executive Director explained that the reason we don’t get as much benefit from Option B is that we don’t have the funds in that scenario to complete all of the projects.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if any of the options assume the passage of the TransNet Extension. The Executive Director responded that none of the three options assumes that passage. This item is solely dealing with the STIP projects that SANDAG has already
accepted. There are several projects that are included in the draft TransNet expenditure plan that are not in the STIP.

Councilmember Madaffer commented his feeling that Ms. Sunni McPeak, State Secretary of Business, Transportation, and Housing, was impressed with SANDAG and its aggressive stance in trying to solve the region’s transportation needs. He said that traffic congestion is the primary issue in San Diego County and the public expects action now. He stated that Option C makes the most sense.

The Executive Director stated that we have a good case to make to the Governor and Legislature not to take away money we have already spent. It doesn’t make sense to delay some projects because right-of-way costs are significant as time goes on.

Chair Kellejian expressed his support for Option C in order to accelerate completion of the projects.

Councilmember Emery also supported Option C.

The Executive Director reminded the Committee that this is an information item only. The challenge with this program is that other regions are doing exactly what we are doing and when the CTC puts it all together, there will be more requests than capacity at the state level. We have to persuade the CTC and the Administration that we have good projects. We feel that our projects will meet the requirements of the CTC/Administration.

The Executive Director clarified that Option C includes projects that are not in the STIP, such as the Sprinter. In the narrow definition, STIP funding in this cycle is only for projects that are already in the STIP. Therefore, by a strict definition, the Sprinter would not be eligible for STIP funding. However, staff will continue to work on this with the CTC.

Mayor Corky Smith (San Marcos) asked if there are any other projects like SR 56 that will be completed. The Executive Director highlighted several projects that are already underway such as the MTS bus order that has been issued, and construction of the East Village Transit Stations. The I-5/I-805 merge project is a different scenario because it is not as close to completion.

Mayor Smith stated that it seems the more projects we have underway, the better our case will be. He asked what other financing options are available if we can’t GARVEE bond for the Sprinter. Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, stated that last week the President signed the appropriations bill which included $48 million in federal New Starts funding for the Sprinter, which is the full amount requested. On Monday, February 2, the President’s budget included $55 million for the Sprinter project, which is also the full amount requested for FY 2005. She felt confident that this shows that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Congress strongly support this project. The question comes down to the $80 million the state has pledged to the project. She said that the state needs to honor its funding commitment to this project. NCTD’s Board has formed a task force to study funding options. NCTD is currently in the process of issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for banking services and will try to secure variable rate bonds to bridge the $80 million funding gap. NCTD has awarded a contract to purchase the vehicles. NCTD is also in the bid process to award a contract for the main line project and stations.
The Executive Director noted that the Mid-Coast LRT project has also been recommended for federal funding. It looks like we are in a good position for funding for Mid-Coast. We have an opportunity to leverage some discretionary money from the federal government.

Ms. King stated that the FTA is striving to deliver on its promises to grow the program. For us to deliver these projects at this point in time will be critical to how we are viewed in the future. We need to be able to demonstrate our ability to meet commitments already made.

Supervisor Roberts asked about the interest rate on the GARVEE bonds. Staff replied that it will probably be about 4 percent, but in the analysis the interest has been assumed at 5 percent.

Supervisor Roberts asked what the impact will be on our projects with the passage of the TransNet Extension. The Executive Director replied that we will finish projects we have started and complete more projects in a shorter period of time. He suggested that we add language in the TransNet Extension ordinance that includes those projects that were in the original measure and are not yet completed including SR 56, SR 52, and the Mid-Coast LRT Line.

Councilmember Feller (Oceanside) asked if there is any advantage to submitting our STIP projects early. The Executive Director responded affirmatively, though he noted that the CTC won’t make its final decision until it receives all of the information.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee directed staff to recommend that the SANDAG Board approve STIP programming Option C, Maximize Use of GARVEE Bonds, as the 2004 STIP alternative.

6. GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF FY 2005 TRANSIT OPERATING BUDGETS (APPROVE)

Staff reported that SANDAG is to assume a new responsibility for the transit operator budgets. The transition plan approved by the SANDAG Board identified this new responsibility as a result of consolidation. Staff explained that NCTD directly operates various services including the Coaster, fixed-route bus services, FAST Demand Response, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) services. MTS is organized differently and has six separate operators. The new SANDAG responsibilities include preparation and approval of the SRTP, development of a public input process for service changes and holding of public hearings, development of the regional fare policy, development of fund estimates, examination of the budget process and obtaining efficiencies, and approval of the transit operator budgets for funding.

Staff provided an overview of the budget development process, noting that the transit boards will develop their budgets within the revenue estimates provided by SANDAG. The guiding principles and objectives are as follows: (1) having sustainable levels of service with recurring revenues covering expenses; (2) a policy addressing productivity and service coverage standards; (3) flexibility to adjust service to changing circumstances, (4) SANDAG provides the revenue estimates; (5) the operators prepare their budgets; (6) there is a zero-based approach for each operator with five-year projections including low and high ranges; (7) preservation of current service levels and the evaluation of possible cost efficiencies;
(8) recurring revenue that includes federal, Transportation Development Act (TDA), State Transit Assistance (STA), TransNet, passenger fares; and (9) consistent presentation of budget information meeting TDA requirements.

Staff noted that additional considerations include working with the Joint Committee on Regional Transit (JCRT) to develop policies related to service planning and regional fares, and staff proposes working with the JCRT on an incentive plan for the operators.

The budget schedule was reviewed concluding with the approval of the transit agencies budgets for funding, contingent upon transit agency board approvals.

Chair Kellejian commented that this is a major step in consolidation and fulfilling our obligations in Senate Bill (SB) 1703.

Councilmember Emery asked if there has been sufficient transit operator input on the schedule and the consistency of budget preparation. Staff replied affirmatively in both cases.

Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer of MTS, stated that they will need to rely on former MTS (and now SANDAG) employees for this year’s budget process. They will have a more formalized process next year.

Councilmember Feller clarified that the transit agencies will approve their budgets before they come to the Transportation Committee. Staff replied that the budget public hearings will appear before June 18 but the budgets will be approved by the transit boards after that date.

Councilmember Rindone asked if the budget public hearings will be at MTS and NCTD. Staff responded affirmatively.

In response to a question from Chair Kellejian about the budget process, staff clarified that after the transit boards approve their budgets, the only time the budgets would come back to the Transportation Committee would be if there are any changes.

Mr. Jablonski asked how the zero-based budget approach and current service levels would work with the Mission Valley East (MVE) project or the Sprinter. Staff agreed that language should be added to the zero-based budget approach to reflect the inclusion of MVE and the Sprinter.

Councilmember Rindone suggested language similar to “what the agency is obligated to operate.”

Ms. King added that this was an issue discussed in the development of the transition plan and it does reference both of these projects. She suggested that appropriate language could be pulled from the transition plan.

In response to a question from MTS Chair Leon Williams, staff clarified that the Transportation Committee needs to approve the budgets of the operators for funding purposes.
Public Comment:

Clive Richard, a member of the public, commented that he has found over the years that the MTDB budget discussion process to be tolerable. He expressed concern about how the budgets will be handled at the operator level. He was under the impression that SANDAG would be responsible for setting the parameters.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe ( Coronado) suggested that principles 1 and 8 be combined. He said that the second principle is really interesting and wondered if there is a timeline for its achievement. He agreed with dearly defining lifeline services. He suggested that there may be services we could provide that would make money and he volunteered to work on that. Staff stated that they have been working with the JCRT on profitable services for a number of meetings and discussions are continuing. The JCRT has set up a task force to deal with a service planning policy. Staff will present a draft policy to the JCRT in May and to the Transportation Committee for policy discussion and action in the June-July time frame.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Councilmember Judy Ritter (Vista), the Transportation Committee approved the proposed guiding principles and objectives for use in preparing the FY 2005 transit agency operating budgets, with language that addresses the future operations of MVE and the Sprinter.

7. INTERSTATE 15 (I-15) BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) STATION DESIGN (INFORMATION)

Staff reported that the I-15 Corridor Managed Lanes (ML)/BRT Project is a 20-mile corridor from SR 163 in downtown San Diego to Centre City Parkway in Escondido. It includes four-lane, bi-directional managed lanes and a moveable barrier. The BRT stations will be built as part of the middle segment (Phase 1) Managed Lanes Project between SR 56 and Centre City Parkway. Future phases would extend the I-15 managed lanes south to SR 163 and north to SR 78. There are two types of BRT options: a 100 percent exclusive use guideway with online stations, and a BRT/ML facility with shared lanes and direct ramps to the stations. The I-15 project is the latter type.

Staff reviewed the facility design concept which incorporated features such as access for buses, parking, and allowances for future parking structures. Bus access time getting into the station will be about 2-3 minutes. The only way to minimize this time would be to put the station in the middle of the freeway; however, this would put passengers in a hostile environment in the center of the freeway, add walking time for pedestrians and those who park-and-ride, and limited joint development opportunities. In addition, it would not tie in with the community. Staff noted that there are two types of service operating plans: a trunk-line service and point-to-point service. A trunk-line service would operate along the I-15 freeway corridor between Escondido and downtown San Diego stopping at every station to provide access to I-15 communities. It would be designed as an all-day service ultimately with 10-15 minute frequencies. Point-to-point service is designed to facilitate home-to-work trips during the peak-period commute times by providing direct connections from the north I-15 corridor residential neighborhoods to major employment centers. Point-to-point services would skip stations.
Staff reported that the operating strategy includes park-and-ride at stations and station designs that allow future parking structures, as well as opportunities for remote park-and-ride lots in communities along the routes after they leave the managed lanes.

The next steps include completing the design work on the BRT stations, identifying remote park-and-ride locations and pursuing shared-use agreements, developing a detailed BRT operating plan, and defining Smart Growth opportunity areas around stations as part of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) work.

Chair Kellejian asked about the other transit modes that would use the BRT stations. Staff responded that carpools, vanpools, and Fastrak program participants would also use these stations.

Councilmember Emery cautioned staff to evaluate the holding capacity of the metered freeway on-ramps so that congestion on these ramps does not block access for the ML/BRT station facilities. Staff replied that that was considered in the traffic studies.

Mayor Smith asked about the managed lanes. Councilmember Emery stated that all of the lanes may not be heading in the same direction at the same time; two may be going south and three going north in the morning, and then it could change in the afternoon. Chair Kellejian added that a machine moves the lanes.

Mayor Smith asked how long it takes to move the lanes. Bill Figge, Caltrans, said that it depends upon traffic, but it will be flexible enough to respond to traffic conditions. Staff added that we are looking at new technology and multiple machines, so it should take less time than the existing system on the Coronado Bridge. The Executive Director stated that the managed lane in Coronado operates at 3-5 miles an hour. With new technology, that is now up to 10-12 miles an hour. We could move all of the proposed managed lanes in a maximum of an hour.

Chair Kellejian asked staff to arrange a tour of the existing managed lanes for Transportation Committee members.

Councilmember Feller asked if this is the only access for carpools. Staff replied that there will be other access lanes along the freeway. The Executive Director stated that the new system will allow access points at major cross streets.

Councilmember Ritter commented that in order to get people out of their cars you have to decrease transit travel time. A problem with the Coaster is that its parking lots are full all of the time, and she expressed concern about the parking situation. She noted that it’s hard to acquire more space for future parking needs. The Executive Director said that we are going to have to build parking structures, and get more aggressive in how we plan and provide for parking for transit users.

Councilmember Ritter commented that when you are a senior citizen you have to be close to transit because you are not always able to drive.

Councilmember Rindone suggested that staff obtain a video of the median stations on the 110 freeway in Los Angeles to show to the Transportation Committee.
Mr. Jablonski said that we need to keep in mind the competitiveness of transit versus autos. If you stop at all of the BRT stations, that could add 20 minutes to the trip. Another concern was the mixing of cars, buses, and vans, and the congestion at the access and egress points over time. The Executive Director stated that the key to this concept is to manage it to achieve the established goals.

**Action:** The Transportation Committee accepted this report.

9. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

   The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for February 20, 2004.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

   Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 11:31 a.m.
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TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of February 20, 2004

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:05 a.m. See attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Kellejian indicated that Mr. Walt Brewer, who has moved to Oregon, has sent a letter to the Transportation Committee. Those members who are interested in receiving this letter can request a copy of it.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, indicated that Rincon Casino would double any donation made to the MS Society from Wednesday, February 18, 2004, until the MS Walk on March 13-14, 2004. He said that every donation is appreciated.

Mr. Lungerhausen also commented on a recent newspaper article that stated that the San Diego Trolley is of little benefit to this region. He said that this conclusion came from someone who does not use public transit. Mr. Lungerhausen wondered how much worse would our congestion be today without the trolley and accompanying bus services.

Clive Richard, a member of the public, said that he read an article entitled, “The Great Rail Disaster,” that was about alternatives to rail transit. It actually provided information on exactly what the San Diego region is doing. It stated that the alternative to rail transit is commuter rail and possibly other rail improvements. This brings us back to where we started. He said that the solution is to mix transportation modes because one mode will not solve all of the transportation challenges.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 5)

Chair Kellejian indicated that Item 2 has been pulled for discussion.

3. FINAL TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ADMINISTRATION POLICY (RECOMMEND)

TDA provides ¼ percent of State sales tax for operating and capital support of public transportation systems and nonmotorized transportation projects in the San Diego region. SANDAG, as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, is responsible for administering the program. At the January 14, 2004, Transportation Committee meeting, staff presented
the draft Transportation Development Act Administration Policy. SANDAG received two requests for revisions to the Policy, one from the North County Transit District (NCTD) and one from the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group. These changes have been incorporated into the final Policy. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend the adoption of the final TDA Administration Policy by the SANDAG Board.

4. 2004 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) ALTERNATIVES

The State Transportation Improvement Program is a five-year transportation funding program that is updated biennially. At the February 6, 2004, Transportation Committee meeting, staff obtained additional feedback on three options for the 2004 STIP. There were minor revisions requested, which have been incorporated into a Final Draft of the 2004 STIP. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the Final Draft 2004 STIP.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Jack Dale (East County), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 3 and 4.

2. CREATION OF A SANDAG TRANSIT ACCESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (APPROVE)

Councilmember Madaffer asked who are the members of this committee and how are they appointed. Staff indicated that the current members of the Trolley Access Advisory Committee (TAAC) at the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) will be invited to join the committee at SANDAG.

Councilmember Judy Ritter (NCTD) asked if this committee was for the MTS area or the North County area, or both. Staff replied that NCTD is retaining its active Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) committee. This TAAC is only for MTS work being transferred to SANDAG.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) suggested that it appears we are adding a committee and not consolidating committees. He hoped they could have a joint agenda. Staff clarified that MTDB had two committees: the Accessible Services Advisory Committee (ASAC) and the TAAC. ASAC will deal with trolley and bus operations for MTS and TAAC will deal with bus and trolley facilities development at SANDAG. Staff further clarified that there are different people on these two committees, though there may be one liaison member who attends both committees. The Executive Director said that we have to get down to one TAAC to serve the region and it should be called a “working group.” SANDAG staff will work with the accessible advisory committees to move toward the objective of one accessible working group for the San Diego region.

Public Comment:

Clive Richard, a member of the public, said that ASAC is primarily concerned with the accessible services that are being provided and how the customer receives that service. TAAC is more concerned with how the facilities are actually designed to ensure that they are accessible.
Chair Kellejian commented that the new advisory working group will report to the Transportation Committee.

Councilmember Madaffer asked that the approval of this item be conditioned upon the intent of SANDAG to consolidate these efforts at some point in the future. The Executive Director stated that staff will work with NCTD on the ongoing major construction projects in North County, and when the construction is completed, then we will look at consolidating the committees at that time.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Vice Chair Mickey Cafagna (North County Inland) and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee approved the establishment of a Transit Access Advisory Committee at SANDAG to provide review of bus and trolley capital facilities development to ensure access by persons with disabilities, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, with approval conditioned upon staff working toward the consolidation of all of the accessible advisory committees into one regional working group.

**REPORTS**

**6. TRANSIT OPERATING REVENUE ESTIMATES AND ALLOCATIONS (RECOMMEND)**

Staff described the role of SANDAG as the consolidated agency on FY 2005 apportionments, FY 2006-2009 projections, and reviewing the allocation methodology for the federal formula funds. Staff also reviewed the sources of transit revenues, and provided a history of each funding source.

Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego) questioned the allocation of TDA funds before and following consolidation. Staff replied that the allocation of TDA revenue is the same both before and after consolidation; some functions and accompanying funding have been transferred from MTS and/or NCTD to SANDAG.

The NCTD Executive Director clarified that a percentage of TDA funds has always come to SANDAG for planning purposes. Even though a majority of the planning efforts have been transferred from MTS and NCTD to SANDAG, the transit agencies retain an amount for administrative purposes. These are funds that MTS and NCTD previously received.

Paul Jablonski, MTS Executive Director, questioned the amount of funds being transferred to SANDAG. Staff responded that a portion of the TDA funds is for various capital projects that are now going to be implemented by SANDAG. The important thing to note is that all of the projects contained in the capital program are included and are being implemented. The question is, which agency is going to implement them—MTS or SANDAG.

Mr. Jablonski asked a question about the apportionment for administrative costs for MTS and NCTD. Staff stated that the amount for these costs has been estimated and is subject to change as we work with NCTD and MTS on an equitable sharing of resources.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe (South County) asked for clarification about planning purposes. Staff explained that the responsibility for all of the regional planning was transferred to SANDAG. The responsibility for local route planning and activities still rests with the transit
agencies. We are still working through the Joint Committee on Regional Transit (JCRT) on service evaluation and fare setting policies, and will report back to the Committee and the Board with this information.

Councilmember Ritter asked about the impacts of service growth on the funding. The Executive Director stated that as the Board deals with the issues, we have to work together to maximize mobility for the whole region. To the maximum extent possible we will keep to the formulas that have been historically used.

Leon Williams, Chairman of the MTS Board, conveyed his feeling that the MTS Board did not have a clear understanding of the funding situation following consolidation. Staff answered that when MTS worked on the TransNet formula change last year, the funding levels were agreed upon by MTS and SANDAG.

Mr. Jablonski stated that with the implementation of the Mission Valley East Line, MTS may have expenses in excess of revenues. He wondered at what point you maintain money for planning and project development when you may not have sufficient funds to operate service.

Vice Chair Cafagna commented that part of consolidation was to streamline the function redundancy in all three agencies.

Councilmember Rindone stated that if you don’t operate the transit system well, the public won’t be interested in the planning efforts. The determination of funding and the division of responsibility is the essential element to ensure that consolidation is successful.

Councilmember Ritter stated that the goal of consolidation is to move people more efficiently.

Vice Chair Cafagna asked if personnel have been added as a result of consolidation. The Executive Director replied that there have been a few positions but not a significant number. He also noted that we have been looking for opportunities to consolidate functions, and noted as an example that the General Counsel positions at SANDAG and MTS were consolidated.

Chair Kellejian stated that Mayor Mary Sessom will be a voting member for this action representing the San Diego County Water Authority.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Vice Chair Cafagna, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors: (1) adopt the FY 2005 apportionments, (2) approve the revenue projections for FY 2006 to FY 2009, and (3) direct staff to work with NCTD, MTS, and the JCRT to develop an equitable funding allocation methodology for federal formula-based funding.

5. **CONGESTION MITIGATION STRATEGIES RESEARCH (APPROVE)**

Staff stated that there are four components of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), related to the goals of the Congestion Mitigation Program (CMP): land use, systems development, demand management, and systems management. The process to identify
additional congestion mitigation strategies was reviewed. The research recommendations included three new categories of strategies: a toolbox of congestion mitigation strategies, a model trip reduction ordinance framework, and the trip reduction analysis guidelines. Each of these strategies was discussed in detail. Staff indicated that the proposed new CMP strategies can help local agencies evaluate and mitigate traffic impacts of new development projects, prepare CMP Deficiency Plans, and support other local congestion management programs. The recommendations were reviewed and endorsed by the San Diego Traffic Engineers Council, the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee, and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group.

Councilmember Madaffer asked who is using this data. Staff said that agencies use these strategies in varying degrees. Local agencies should try and test out these strategies in their particular jurisdictions.

Councilmember Madaffer inquired if local agencies are required to have the strategies, and if staff has provided this information to local agencies. Staff replied that local agencies reviewed this information in the strategy development phase, and they were supportive of this concept.

Councilmember Madaffer said that he would like to hear back on a city-by-city or region-by-region basis how these strategies have been used and resulted in lessened congestion. The Executive Director said that the intent of this effort was to develop a ready toolbox that didn’t previously exist to provide assistance to the local agencies. Staff can report back on the use of the toolbox.

Vice Chair Cafagna suggested that staff develop reports with accompanying implementation plans so that we can measure the effectiveness of developing the information. The Executive Director said that the purpose of this plan is to review deficiencies on a regular basis and have a strategy to work on those deficiencies.

Supervisor Horn asked about violations. Staff replied that there are two approaches: a voluntary approach that provides rewards for compliance, and a mandatory approach where certain things are required and fines and further regulation can be imposed for failure to meet the requirements.

Councilmember Guerin asked about the possibility of developing subregional groups to work on the model trip reduction strategies. She also wondered how this would be addressed. The Executive Director said that this effort fits in with the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) work. The piece that is missing is to develop subregional plans. We have done some subregional planning in North County. Staff indicated that this is a great opportunity to track regional plans and use some of the tools to improve our commute. We will look at subregional plans and corridors and encourage the cities to get involved. The Executive Director added that the key to the success of these strategies is the link with the RCP. One of the rewards for compliance could be tied into transportation dollars. Staff noted that the format for the subregional plans is now being developed to be included in the final RCP. A number of cities are interested in this effort.

Mayor Sessom said that these strategies can be used as criteria to incentivize jurisdictions. She was unclear how the strategies were developed. She asked if we will give appropriate
weight to the strategies when we look at incentives. Staff stated that the strategies were
developed from research obtained from across the nation. A workshop involving local
agencies was held. We then went through each strategy and its objectives and came to a
consensus. The Executive Director stated that when we start to develop how improvements
are made, the Board and Transportation Committee can discuss development of the criteria.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe commented that we are not managing congestion appropriately.
He doesn’t see a lot of new information in this report. He thought that there are some new
ideas that are not included in this report, for example, better ramp metering. There is
nothing in the report that increases the capacity of the system.

Councilmember Emery (MTS) asked how these strategies will be invoked. The Executive
Director replied that at this point they are voluntary. He provided examples of how the
strategies can be applied to local conditions.

Staff noted that there is a range of possibilities and options, and not all are meant to work
in each jurisdiction. Staff is willing to work with each jurisdiction to apply them in
combinations or to modify them according to the particular situation. There are some new
strategies included in this report; however, staff encouraged Committee members to inform
staff if they find other new strategies that should be included in this document. We are
working with public works directors and planners in the region to report back with project
evaluation criteria that can be weighed, and policy makers can make the decision on the
criteria.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Councilmember Madaffer,
the Transportation Committee approved the amendment of the 2002 Congestion
Management Program to incorporate the Congestion Mitigation Strategies Research results.

Chair Kellejian called a break at 10:40 a.m. and reconvened the meeting at 10:50 a.m.

7. DOWNTOWN SAN DIEGO COMPREHENSIVE TRANSIT STUDY AND COMMUNITY PLAN
UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Staff reported that this study is being conducted as a parallel effort with the Centre City
Development Corporation’s (CCDC’s) general plan update. The aim is to increase the role
transit plays in the downtown San Diego area. The two key tasks are to develop a long-
range transit vision for the community plan update, and develop a short-term phasing plan
for Transit First Early Action projects. Staff noted that we are nearing completion of the
first task.

Alexandra Elias from CCDC stated that they recognized that the important aspect about
downtown San Diego is its accessibility from transit. CCDC started two years ago to develop
a community plan. We have the opportunity to provide input on how downtown San Diego
should grow in the future. She described CCDC’s community outreach efforts for this study.
The milestones achieved to date are: a preferred plan endorsed by the steering committee,
the identification of parks, the development of a zoning philosophy, and the
commencement of an implementation strategy. The next steps are to refine the preferred
plan, develop a planned district ordinance, begin the Master Environmental Impact Report
(MEIR) analysis, draft the plan documents, and release the study for public review.
Staff described the MOBILITY 2030 land use plan travel demand. The focus of planning efforts is on a long-range vision. There are a number of bus rapid transit (BRT) lines planned to come into the downtown San Diego area. There is a suggestion for a BRT tunnel, however, this would be a costly and complex effort, and is probably not a realistic option for the future. We need to determine which corridor is best suited for BRT: Market Street, Broadway, or B/C Streets. Three B/C Street alignment options were discussed along with the pros/cons of each. Alignment issues as well as parking garage and traffic impacts for the B/C Street options and at the Fifth Avenue Station were discussed. The conclusions are that all three B/C Street alternatives appear feasible, and further preliminary engineering studies are needed to further assess the traffic and design issues before selecting a preferred alternative.

Staff reported that the need for a downtown San Diego shuttle system was explored and two options were developed. One shuttle would primarily be used by workers and residents, and another would be oriented to the visitor/tourist market. For such a shuttle system to be successful, there are three key elements: service frequency every 10 minutes or better throughout the day, smaller vehicles that would fit into the residential areas, and service for people coming into downtown San Diego. One comment heard consistently is the need to upgrade the image of C Street. It is recognized that more attention is needed on transit design and customer amenities in the downtown San Diego area. Staff reviewed the conclusions for the long-range transit vision: a downtown shuttle and a trolley/BRT corridor. The next steps include further analysis of the B Street extension and development of capital and operating costs, and for the short-range phasing plan to analyze financing strategies for possible near-term shuttle service and a phasing strategy for Transit First Early Action BRT projects. Staff noted that the final version of this study will be presented later this fall for action.

Chair Kellejian commented that these proposed actions are linked to the passage of TransNet. Staff agreed that the Transit First Early Action projects are linked to TransNet. It was noted that what happens in downtown San Diego affects other areas.

Councilmember Madaffer thanked staff for the excellent and comprehensive report. He commented that one of the big problems of C Street is that it is essentially a “dead” street because of trolley operations. It is important to do this planning now.

Councilmember Rindone stated that some other cities (such as Washington, D.C.) have come up with a policy that penalizes businesses that provide incentives for employee-paid parking in the downtown areas. Continuing to pay for employee parking in these areas supports downtown congestion. The money used for that purpose should be provided as incentives for employees to use public transit. He asked staff to look at that type of policy and to report back.

Chair Kellejian mentioned that SANDAG has participated in the Diamond Awards, which are given to firms in San Diego County that encourage employee transit use. Staff noted that on the CMP strategies, Exhibit 1 talks about parking restrictions.

Councilmember Rindone said this should be tied into the marketing campaigns to educate businesses that supporting public transit is a benefit to all.
Councilmember Madaffer said that we need more infrastructure to get people to use transit. As we continue to evolve, this is exactly the target that we need to be achieving.

Ms. Elias cautioned the Committee about a policy of that nature. She thought it would only be beneficial on a regional basis. She added that we don't want to be a residential suburb to University Towne Centre (UTC) or Sorrento Valley. We are seeing residential and not employment areas being developed in the downtown San Diego area.

Public Comment:

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, stated that the question is will people get out of their cars or will the new vehicles increase the downtown San Diego congestion. He agreed that we need incentives to encourage new practices. He found that the transit system here in San Diego works. The system has to be expanded regionwide so everyone can get to downtown San Diego or get out to other areas. The service frequency is not going to encourage people to ride transit; however, increased transit frequency in the future will get people out of their cars.

Action: the Transportation Committee accepted this report for information.

8. FOLLOW-UP REPORT REGARDING COMPACT COMMITTEE REPORT ON “ALTERNATE STRATEGY FOR TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE (ASTRIN) FUNDING” (INFORMATION)

Staff stated that this report had been deferred to staff for review. There are a lot of consistency between the principles contained in the report and the draft RCP. Staff noted that a written response to the COMPACT recommendations will be made as part of finalizing the RCP in the spring.

Bill Ferguson, Chair of COMPACT (Community Planners Advisory Committee on Transportation), said that communities are under stress due to the lack of transportation and infrastructure. As a result, COMPACT formed a subcommittee that came forward with the ASTRIN Report. This report will be forwarded to local, city, and state leaders as an alternative to multimodal transportation. Funding for infrastructure is a matter of political will, and we need to fund a proposal that makes sense.

Morton Printz, Chair of the ASTRIN Subcommittee, indicated that the ASTRIN report contains six principles that COMPACT would like SANDAG to consider: (1) planning for a comprehensive transportation policy and plan should precede the planning for densification of population and development; (2) traffic and transportation planning must anticipate and meet the needs of commerce and population demands and shifts, both present and future; (3) major highway transportation corridors should be multi-functional and not restricted to only automobiles, motorbikes, or commercial vehicles; (4) transportation corridors should have a defined list of priorities regarding their accessibility, use and multi-functionality, etc.; (5) the level of acceptable congestion on major highways must be defined in advance since such roads cannot be expected to be congestion-free; and (6) transportation infrastructure planning improvements predicated upon Principles 1 through 5 would enhance both present and future tax revenue sources. Therefore, the burden of the costs would necessarily be shared between present and future sources in order to promote economic expansion and transportation efficacy.
Mr. Printz said that the conclusions of ASTRIN are that the essence of these principles can serve to guide development of a transportation infrastructure, using available funds which will permit congestion relief, set the city and county on the road to a 21st century transportation system, and insure the area greater economic growth and stability while preserving our unique ecosystem and environment. He stated that half of the vehicles on our freeways are trucks.

Chair Kellejian asked the Caltrans representative, Pedro Orso Delgado, about the amount of semi-trailer truck traffic on the freeways. Mr. Orso Delgado said that they are trying to validate the numbers but he thought it was 5-8 percent. Mr. Printz said that they figured one truck is counted as four cars, and that has to be taken into consideration. Mr. Ferguson stated that we have to address the issue of truck traffic and that element of our economy. Chair Kellejian stated that Caltrans uses three cars for every semi-truck, and we are trying to address truck traffic issues with our managed lanes concept.

Councilmember Madaffer invited the COMPACT representatives to attend the various SANDAG committee meetings to obtain more information about what SANDAG is involved in. He said that some things in the report merit continued discussion but he felt that the COMPACT representatives need to be well-grounded in the fiscal responsibilities this region is facing.

Mr. Ferguson said that the real question is, how hard are we going to fight politically for financial considerations from the federal government? It is a matter of having a focused effort towards a multimodal transportation element. We should be looking at a fiscal bundle to accomplish what needs to be done.

Vice Chair Cafagna stated his belief that some of these concepts, such as frontage roads, are very effective in keeping the traffic off of the freeways. However, he didn't know that we have the financial ability to do that. He suggested that SANDAG should seriously look at these principles.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe said that the problem is we want trucks to come across the border in the early morning but the border is closed at that time. We need to work with U.S. Customs to get the border open. Mayor Pro Tem Monroe said that he would like a dialogue where we can compare theories.

Councilmember Guerin commented that frontage roads has been studied and talked about. There is a frontage road from Leucadia Boulevard to La Costa Boulevard in Encinitas, and our citizens are furious about that frontage road. They don't want more traffic on local frontage roads. Someone needs to explore the suggestion of frontage roads with the people who actually live and work in the area.

Mr. Printz explained that there is room to add frontage roads on the freeway rather than adding more freeway lanes. That way there would not be an invasion of private property. He said that the TransNet Extension is in trouble because people don’t see anything new and they feel that past dollars from TransNet have not been well spent.

Mr. Orso Delgado stated that Caltrans is building additional new lanes within the freeway median. They are also trying to connect all of the arterial lanes within the corridor. They
have looked at high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) versus collective distributor systems. One problem is the area topography and local streets that are not connected.

On another matter, Mr. Orso Delgado stated that Caltrans has been gathering data on the Interstate 15 express lanes, and the numbers indicate that 12,000 vehicles use the HOV lanes northbound on weekends and 6,000 vehicles in the southbound direction. Therefore, Caltrans will be recommending that the HOV lanes be used in the northbound direction on weekends from now on. Caltrans hopes to make a formal report at the March 5 meeting.

Action: The Transportation Committee accepted this report.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for March 5, 2004.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 12:00 Noon.
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NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORTATION FACILITY STUDY DEFFERAL

Introduction

In December 2003, the Transportation Committee approved a Phase I evaluation strategy for the North-South Transportation Facility Study. Focused on potential improvements for north-south mobility in North County, the strategy included an initial screening evaluation of environmental and development impacts of four different approaches. The initial assessment, to include the costs and benefits of identified options, would lead to a more effective focused evaluation approach during a Phase II evaluation. The Phase I strategy was to evaluate the following:

- new corridor options east or west of Interstate 15 (I-15)
- a re-evaluation of previously identified and deleted arterial transportation improvements
- enhancements to existing and planned transportation (including transit) facilities and services
- evaluation of inland rail corridor options

After discussions with the chairman of the Transportation Committee and a meeting of the Working Group (WG) on February 19, 2004, we recommend a postponement of the Phase I analysis, based on the unknown outcome and impacts of the proposed TransNet Extension ballot measure and the lack of planned land uses to accompany a post-2030 evaluation of future transportation corridors. The WG also agreed that it is inappropriate to re-evaluate any arterial link that in the recent past had been deleted from a local circulation element.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Transportation Committee:

1. Defer the North-South Transportation Facility Study until after November 2004 when the outcome of the TransNet Extension ballot measure is known.
2. Postpone Identification and evaluation of new long-range corridors until the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is updated and extended beyond 2030.
3. Not re-evaluate arterial connections previously deleted by local policy actions.

Discussion

Staff met with the chairman of the Transportation Committee after the December 2003 Transportation Committee meeting. Although the Working Group for the North-South
Transportation Facility Corridor Study had preferred to proceed with an evaluation of long-range corridors, post-2030 land use is not available to perform corridor analysis beyond 2030. In addition, funding would be an issue for new projects, with budget shortfalls and project commitments already identified in the TransNet reauthorization draft Expenditure Plan. As a result, a proposal to delay the study was taken to the WG for discussion.

The WG met on February 19, 2004, to discuss deferment of the overall North-South Transportation Facility Study. The WG agreed that a postponement of the study was warranted. On the issue of new corridors, the group discussed the infeasibility of developing traffic forecasts and identifying available transportation corridors beyond the current 2030 planning horizon. Adopted land use plans and growth forecasts are not available beyond 2030, and certain corridors may be in direct conflict with the goals and objectives of local general plans and the draft Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). Constrained land and existing and planned development leave little developable land to accommodate a future corridor. The WG supported the staff recommendation to evaluate new corridors when the RTP is updated beyond 2030 and post-2030 land use is available.

Given the obstacles of identifying a new corridor, the WG felt the initial focus of the study should be to enhance the existing or planned highway and transit facilities at congested locations. It may be the most viable option for north-south mobility improvements. The WG acknowledged that without a TransNet Extension, funding for new North-South Study projects not already in the RTP would be difficult. As a result, the recommendation is to postpone this task until after the outcome of the November 2, 2004 TransNet Extension ballot measure is known.

Related to the planned network, in the past local policy actions have deleted specific segments of the planned arterial network. These links were deleted after technical studies documented negative environmental impacts or the additional through traffic projected to impact a community or city. Given these relatively recent decisions, staff and the WG recommend that these links not be reevaluated when the study restarts in the future.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Michael Hix (619) 595-5377; mhi@sandag.org
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Introduction

Based on the Transportation Development Act (TDA) fiscal audit for the year ending June 30, 2003, an adjustment is required for the North County Transit District (NCTD). In addition, the City of Chula Vista has requested the approval of funds from its prior-year unallocated TDA funds.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee approve Resolution #2004-16 approving the claim amendments for NCTD and the City of Chula Vista, described below.

Discussion

NCTD TDA Fiscal Audit Claim Adjustment

Each recipient of TDA funds is subject to an annual fiscal audit under the provisions of the TDA. The purpose of the audit is to establish the financial position of the claimant, and to determine if the claimant is in compliance with the rules and regulations of the TDA. The original allocations for all claims are based on budget projections for the services to be provided during the fiscal year. The audit identifies any differences between the allocation and the amount of TDA funds that a claimant was eligible to receive based on actual expenditures for the fiscal year.

Based on the FY 2003 audit results, NCTD’s operating funds for Article 4.0 Claim 254 should be reduced by $151,657. Of the original allocation of $25,865,454 for operating purposes $25,713,797 was expended, leaving this $151,657 balance. Since NCTD has already been paid the full amount of the FY 2003 allocation, an adjustment should be made to their FY 2004 allocation.

City of Chula Vista Request for Prior Year Unallocated TDA funds

Since FY 2002 the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), formerly the Metropolitan Transit Development Board, submitted a consolidated TDA claim on behalf of all operators in its service area. Part of this funding consolidation includes the maintenance of unallocated TDA funds for each operator in the MTS service area. An agreement exists between MTS and the local operators that the funds will be made available for specific eligible purposes subject to SANDAG Transportation Committee approval.
The City of Chula Vista has requested $165,000 of its prior-year unallocated TDA funds to be used as a match to an Air Pollution Control District grant awarded to MTS, now transferred to SANDAG, for the purchase of a mid-size, low-floor, compressed natural gas (CNG) bus. The use of the City’s prior-year unallocated TDA funds was approved by Chula Vista’s City Council at its January 13, 2004, meeting.

RENÉE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Key Staff Contact: Heidi Calabrese, (619) 699-1942; hca@sandag.org
RESOLUTION NO. 2004-16

APPROVING REVISIONS TO TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIMS

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims listed below require revisions; and

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

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Transportation Committee:

1. pursuant to CCR Section 6659, 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>4.0</td>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$25,865,454</td>
<td>($151,657)</td>
<td>$25,713,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$59,031</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$59,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,372,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,372,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$27,296,485</td>
<td>($151,657)</td>
<td>$27,144,828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. does hereby authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, 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 5th day of March 2004.

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

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North San Diego County Transit Development Board, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, and Baja California/Mexico.
DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (PEIR/EIS) FOR THE PROPOSED CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM

Introduction

The California High Speed Rail Authority (“Authority”) is the state agency charged with planning, designing, and constructing a 700-mile, high-speed passenger rail system for California that would connect our major metropolitan areas. San Diego would be connected by a high-speed inland Interstate 15 (I-15) corridor and an improved conventional coastal rail corridor. In January 2004, the Authority released the draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (PEIR/EIS) for this statewide system. SANDAG’s High-Speed Rail Task Force will meet on March 4, 2004, to review and comment on this document.

Design options for the Coastal Los Angeles to San Diego via Orange County and the Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire Corridors are provided as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. These and other related reports are available at www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov. The official public comment period ends May 14, 2004.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the following comments on the draft PEIR/EIS for the proposed California High-Speed Train System and forward them to the Authority (pending a recommendation by the SANDAG Regional High-Speed Rail Task Force on March 4, 2004):

- SANDAG continues to support conventional improvements to the Coastal Corridor and high-speed train service along the Inland Corridor.
- SANDAG recommends a direct connection with downtown San Diego as part of the Inland Corridor.
- SANDAG supports a link from San Diego to Los Angeles and the Los Angeles International Airport.
- SANDAG concurs with the Authority that Maglev technology and other technology that cannot share tracks with existing rail services be dropped from further study.

Additional comments resulting from the Task Force review of the summary and detailed reports to the Draft PEIR/EIS are detailed in Attachment 3.
Discussion

Following is a summary of the Authority’s proposal, ongoing activities, and project development status:

- State-of-the-art, electrically-powered, high-speed, steel-wheel-on-steel rail technology is being proposed for the statewide system. Speeds could be as high as 200 mph in some areas.

- This system will primarily run on exclusive track with small portions of the route on shared track with other passenger rail operations, including Los Angeles to San Diego via the Orange County corridor. In this corridor, high-speed trains would not extend further south than Irvine.

- Cost to implement this statewide system is estimated between $33 billion and $37 billion. This includes right-of-way, track guideway, tunneling, stations, and mitigation.

- Several agencies are cooperating agencies including the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

- The Authority is the state lead agency responsible for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the federal lead, FRA, is responsible for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

- A final PEIR/EIS will be prepared after the close of public comments. In this final document, the Authority and FRA may select a preferred corridor, general station locations, and recommended mitigation strategy; or may recommend further strategies to consider at a more detailed, project level.

- Caltrans is the lead agency for a companion document for the Los Angeles to San Diego coastal rail corridor. This is more detailed for the coastal rail corridor compared to the Authority’s draft statewide document. This draft corridor document is tentatively scheduled for a May 2004 release, following the close of public comment on the statewide document. Both documents rely on the same technical studies for the corridor.

- In November 2003, the Transportation Committee directed the Task Force to evaluate Maglev and SANDAG’s role in a regional evaluation. The Task Force will continue to discuss this item and report back to the Transportation Committee at a future date.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Linda Culp (619) 699-6957, lcu@sandag.org.

Attachments: 1. Coastal Los Angeles to San Diego via Orange County Corridor
   2. Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire Corridors
   3. Additional Task Force Comments on Draft PEIR/EIS
The Draft Program EIR/EIS identifies all alignment and station options for the proposed 700-mile-long high-speed train system. Below is a brief overview of the options under consideration for connecting Los Angeles to San Diego via the Inland Empire.

The region from Los Angeles to San Diego via Orange County has been divided into four segments: Los Angeles to LAX, Los Angeles to Anaheim/Irvine, Irvine to Oceanside, and Oceanside to San Diego.

**LOS ANGELES TO LAX** *(Map 16)*

The Authority narrowed down to a single alignment option to connect Los Angeles to LAX — the MTA Harbor Subdivision rail right-of-way. This segment is a little over 15 miles long.

If service to LAX is selected, connectivity to LAX and southwest Los Angeles will be increased. If LAX is not directly served, local transportation (shuttle, regional transit or the automobile) will be needed between Los Angeles and the airport or to Western Los Angeles County.

**Potential Station Locations:**

There is one potential station location that has been investigated along the segment between Los Angeles and LAX. The LAX station would be a below-grade station adjacent to the airport terminals and would permit easy access to the airport by a potential people mover, shuttle, or walking.

**LOS ANGELES TO ANAHEIM/IRVINE** *(Map 10)*

Three options are being considered between Los Angeles and Orange County:

1. Direct high-speed train service on dedicated tracks — only for high-speed trains — along the Union Pacific Railroad Santa Ana freight line to Anaheim. To bring high-speed train service to Irvine, shared tracks with Metrolink and Surfliner service on improved LOSSAN rail corridor would be required.

2. Sharing tracks with an improved LOSSAN rail corridor — assumes four tracks to separate freight and passenger service between Los Angeles and Fullerton. Sharing tracks with non-electric Metrolink commuter rail and Surfliner means high-speed trains would operate at reduced speeds.

3. Different levels of improvement to conventional service that would act as a feeder service to the high-speed train system and require a transfer at Los Angeles Union Station.
Potential Station Locations:

There are several potential high-speed train station locations that have been investigated along the segment between Los Angeles and Anaheim/Irvine. The Authority could decide both the appropriate number of stations and the preferred location for those stations for this segment.

- **Southeast Los Angeles County (Gateway Cities): Norwalk (UP) or Norwalk (LOSSAN)**
- **Central Orange County: Anaheim Transportation Center**
- **Southern Orange County: Irvine Transportation Center**

**Irvine to Oceanside (Map 11)**

South of Irvine, only conventional “non electric” improvements are being considered. The conventional service options for the LOSSAN corridor are presented as a range between “high end” and “low end” improvements. The most significant differences between design options are at San Juan Capistrano and Dana Point/San Clemente.

There are two options for reaching San Juan Capistrano, both of which bypass the existing single-track alignment through San Juan Capistrano and reduce impacts to the historical district:

1. Tunneling under Interstate 5 with no station at San Juan Capistrano
2. Trabuco Creek alignment

There are two options for reaching Dana Point/San Clemente, both of which assume the construction of a new station in San Clemente to maintain Amtrak service to this area:

1. Split “Long” tunnel under I-5 (two split tunnels) that would completely bypass the beach
2. Single “Short” Tunnel along I-5 — about six miles long — that would bypass the beach at San Clemente, maintains the existing alignment along the beach at Dana Point

Potential Station Locations:

The Draft Program EIR/EIS includes improvements to the three existing Amtrak stations along the segment between Irvine and Oceanside that are served by the “Surfliner” service at: San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, and Oceanside Transportation Center.

**Oceanside to San Diego (Map 12)**

The conventional service options for the LOSSAN corridor between Oceanside and San Diego are presented as a range between “high end” and “low end” improvements. The most significant differences between these design options are at Del Mar and Mirimar Canyon. There are also trench and cover concepts being investigated through downtown Encinitas and Carlsbad.

There are two options for reaching Del Mar: tunneling under Camino Del Mar or tunneling under I-5.
improvements in the San Diego region are now the responsibility of SANDAG, working cooperatively with Caltrans, Amtrak, NCTD, MTS (formerly MTDB), and other agencies.

12. The following comments relate to Table S. 6-1:

- Under Land Use on page S-11, what is meant by Controlled growth around stations? Is this smart growth or related principles?

- Under Noise on page S-12, the mitigation strategy for the HST alternative is stated as “Consider sound barriers along noise-sensitive corridors, track treatment for vibration.” Consider stronger wording here in terms of coordination with local noise standards and jurisdictions’ general plans.

- Under Biological Resources and Wetlands on page S-13, the mitigation strategy for HST is stated as “Work with resource agencies to develop site-specific mitigation and impact avoidance strategies for project-level review.” Add to this strategy the coordination and consistency with local and regional habitat conservation plans.
South of Del Mar, there are two options which avoid the steep grades and tight curves along Miramar Canyon that greatly impact travel times:

1. Tunneling under I-5 with no station at University Towne Centre
2. Tunneling under University Towne Centre

**Potential Station Locations:**

There are two existing Amtrak stations along the segment between Oceanside and San Diego that are served by the non-electric Surfliner service — Solano Beach Transit Center and Downtown San Diego Santa Fe Depot. One additional potential station location at University Towne Centre is being considered.

Visit the California High-Speed Rail Authority Web site at www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov for a complete look at proposed alignments and stations, to download a copy of the Draft Program EIR/EIS, or for a listing of libraries carrying a hard copy of the Draft Program EIR/EIS.
Irvine to Oceanside
Oceanside to San Diego
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Map 12
The Draft Program EIR/EIS identifies all alignment and station options for the proposed 700-mile-long high-speed train system. Below is a brief overview of the options under consideration for connecting Los Angeles to San Diego via the Inland Empire.

The region has been divided into three segments: Los Angeles to March Air Reserve Base (March ARB), March ARB to Mira Mesa, and Mira Mesa to San Diego.

**LOS ANGELES TO MARCH ARB**  (Map 13)
Each option in this segment utilizes existing Union Pacific (UP) freight railroad alignments and would be either in or immediately adjacent to the freight right-of-way.

Between Los Angeles and Pomona there are two alignment options:

1. UP Colton freight line
2. UP Riverside freight line

Between Pomona and Ontario there is one alignment — UP Colton freight line.

Between Ontario and March ARB there are two options:

1. The UP Colton freight line — offers considerably higher speeds and faster travel times, but it does not directly serve San Bernardino.
2. A new San Bernardino route — offers direct service to San Bernardino and direct connection with the San Bernardino Metrolink Station.

**Potential Station Locations:**
There are a number of potential station locations that have been investigated along the segment between Los Angeles and March ARB. The Authority could decide both the appropriate number of stations and the preferred location for those stations for this segment.

- East San Gabriel Valley Station Locations: City of Industry, Pomona Metrolink, El Monte or South El Monte
- Ontario Airport Connector Station
- East San Bernardino/Riverside County Station: San Bernardino Metrolink, UP Colton, University of California, Riverside, March ARB

**MARCH ARB TO MIRA MESA**  (Map 14)
The alignment between March ARB and Mira Mesa would follow the Interstate 215 to the Interstate 15 corridor to Mira Mesa. This is the only major transportation corridor directly connecting the Inland Empire to San Diego.
**Potential Station Locations:**

There are three potential station locations that have been investigated along the segment between Los Angeles and March ARB. The Authority could decide both the appropriate number of stations and the preferred location for those stations for this segment.

- Temecula Valley Station: Murrieta
- Escondido Station Area: Escondido Transit Center or Escondido I-15

**MIRA MESA TO SAN DIEGO (Map 15)**

The alignment between Mira Mesa and San Diego was narrowed down to three alignment options:

1. Downtown San Diego via I-15 to LOSSAN rail corridor along Carroll Canyon alignment
2. Downtown San Diego via I-15 to LOSSAN rail corridor along Miramar Road alignment
3. The I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium option

**Potential Station Locations:**

There are several potential station locations that have been investigated along the segment between Mira Mesa and San Diego. The Authority could decide both the appropriate number of stations and the preferred location for those stations for this segment.

- **Mid-San Diego County Station: Mira Mesa, or University City**
- **San Diego Station: Downtown San Diego Santa Fe Depot, San Diego Airport or Qualcomm Stadium**

Visit the California High-Speed Rail Authority Web site at [www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov) for a complete look at proposed alignments and stations, to download a copy of the Draft Program EIR/EIS, or for a listing of libraries carrying a hard copy of the Draft Program EIR/EIS.
March ARB to Mira Mesa
Los Angeles to San Diego via Inland Empire - Mira Mesa to San Diego
Figure 6.2-11 - Mira Mesa to San Diego Alignment and Potential Station Options
Over the past two years, the Authority has worked closely with SANDAG and has been very responsive to the region’s priorities including screening undesirable alignments from further study.

Overall, the design options included in this document for the San Diego region are consistent with the region’s priorities and long-range strategies for transportation and land use. There will be opportunities in the future for SANDAG and the Authority to continue to work together to refine these options.

The following comments relate to the specific design options for the Los Angeles-Orange County-San Diego Corridor (Attachment 1):

1. **The coastal rail improvements in MOBILITY 2030 most closely mirror the third option listed in Attachment 1 (the Highest Level Improvements [Short Trench/Tunnel Camino Del Mar & UTC/Grade Sep. option, page 6-91 of the report). This option totals $1.77 billion. Major projects include tunnels under Camino Del Mar and University Town Centre (UTC), and extensive grade separations.**

2. **SANDAG has developed a draft expenditure plan for the TransNet Extension measure, an effort to extend the existing half-cent sales tax that provides local transportation funds. Traditionally, the region has contributed approximately 25 percent of project costs toward coastal rail improvements, with the remainder coming from state and federal sources. The draft expenditure plan calls for $200 million in local match and theoretically could help fund $800 million in coastal rail improvements if this cost sharing continues.**

The following comments relate to the specific design options for the Los Angeles-Inland Empire-San Diego Corridor (Attachment 2):

3. **In November 2001, in commenting on the Authority’s initial screening recommendations, SANDAG urged the Authority to look for a connection from the I-15 corridor to downtown San Diego. Therefore, the preferred design options would be the Carroll Canyon or Miramar Road alternatives that connect along the coastal corridor to Lindbergh Field and downtown San Diego. The I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium alternative would not provide direct service to downtown San Diego.**

4. **Initial travel time analysis shows a high-speed train trip between Riverside and San Diego taking less than 40 minutes. With the increase in residents moving north to San Bernardino and Riverside Counties and continuing to work in San Diego, this intercity service would be very attractive to commuters. SANDAG and the Authority should consider a future partnership to look at the details of such an intercity/commuter system in the I-15 corridor.**

5. **SANDAG’s MOBILITY 2030 long-range transportation plan calls for expansion of public transportation services for the Escondido Transit Center (ETC), including planned I-15 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service and the Sprinter light rail transit (LRT) service. Therefore, the**
preferred station location in Escondido would be the transit center rather than the State Route (SR) 78/I-15 station alternative. Preliminary estimates show that the ETC alternative would add to the cost of the high-speed train system by about $920 million, requiring extensive tunneling. Recognizing these constraints but also the need to integrate major transportation improvements, SANDAG and the Authority should continue to refine the alignment through Escondido to better connect the intercity service to local and regional services.

6. SANDAG and Caltrans are planning a major transit center at Mira Mesa Boulevard and I-15, which also would serve as a future BRT station and provide key linkages from the I-15 corridor to a major employment area in Sorrento Mesa and University City. As is the case in Escondido, these services need to integrate with high-speed service.

7. In December 2003, SANDAG approved a revised alignment for the Mid-Coast LRT project between the Old Town Transit Center and University Towne Centre (UTC) to be carried forward in the planning stage. The Authority needs to ensure that adequate right-of-way exists between Gilman Drive and Old Town for existing commuter/intercity rail services, future light rail service, and high-speed train service under the Carroll Canyon or Miramar Road alternatives.

8. A tunnel option under UTC is a major coastal rail improvement project included in MOBILITY 2030 and part of the Los Angeles-Orange County-San Diego high-speed train (HST) alternative. UTC also is the terminus of the Mid-Coast LRT project. How will this be reconciled with an HST alignment that could potentially serve a station south of UTC, closer to the Nobel Drive Coaster Station instead of UTC? (See map #15.)

These comments relate to the document, Draft PEIR/EIS for the proposed California High-Speed Train System, Summary (available on the Authority's website referenced above):

9. The Purpose and Need (page S-2) states, “The purpose of the proposed HST system is to provide a reliable mode of travel, which links the major metropolitan areas of the state and delivers predictable and consistent travel times. Further objectives are to provide an interface with commercial airports, mass transit, and the highway network and to relieve capacity constraints of the existing transportation system as intercity travel demand in California increases, in a manner sensitive to and protective of California's unique natural resources.” Consider incorporating public safety into the purpose and need for the high-speed train system, including the separation of rail from people and other vehicles.

10. The Purpose and Need section further discusses the capacity issues of the current highway and airport system. Consider noting that long-term regional plans in Southern California include increased capacities by 2020.

11. The last paragraph of Section S.4.3 (page S-5) states that, “Using the technical data from this document, Caltrans and the FRA are also preparing a separate program EIR/EIS that considers conventional (non-electric) improvements on the LOSSAN corridor, since Caltrans would be responsible for those improvements.” Per Senate Bill (SB) 1703, which consolidated the transit planning and implementation functions of SANDAG, MTDB and North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD), coastal rail corridor
SENIORS ACCESS TASK FORCE REPORT

Introduction

The Seniors Access Task Force was appointed by Transportation Committee Chairman, Joe Kellejian, after Committee discussion of senior transportation issues at the December 12, 2003, meeting. The Task Force is comprised of Councilmember Jack Feller (Chair), Councilmember Bob Emery and Mayor Pro Tem Phil Monroe. The Task Force was appointed to review the need for seniors’ transportation programs and propose actions to address the identified needs. The Task Force met four times during January and February 2004. Based on its review of current and future needs for seniors’ transportation and of existing programs, the Seniors Access Task Force recommends three programs to the Transportation Committee. If approved, the Transportation Committee will receive a report on the progress towards implementing the recommendations at its June 18, 2004, meeting.

Recommendation

The Seniors Access Task Force recommends that the Transportation Committee approve the following actions be taken to establish transportation programs for senior citizens in the region.

1. A short-term program consisting of two parts: (a) an educational effort to inform seniors and their families of existing transportation services that are available, and (b) pilot transportation programs to provide new or expanded transportation services to be operational before the end of 2004.

2. A mid-term program to develop an Action Plan to analyze needs for seniors' transportation in the region, identifying gaps and deficiencies, and develop more comprehensive programs to meet the needs. The Action Plan would address the feasibility of multi-jurisdictional programs, identify funding restrictions that may inhibit them, and propose alternatives to resolve such problems. This program would be completed in FY 2005.

3. A long-term program based on the TransNet Extension, which includes proposals to continue the discounted monthly pass for seniors and disabled transit riders and to establish a new mini-grant program to fund supplemental seniors’ transportation services throughout the region.

In addition, the Seniors Access Task Force recommends that the region’s transit operators retain the age of 60 for eligibility for discounted transit fares and the monthly transit pass.
Discussion

The Task Force was charged with assessing the need for improved services to seniors and developing proposed actions to help resolve those needs. Based on analysis and past surveys, the Task Force determined that seniors desire services that are highly personalized and require inter-jurisdictional travel for all trip purposes. At the same time, the Task Force acknowledged that the services need to be cost-effective by levering existing and new resources and in-kind contributions. The short-, mid-, and long-term programs recommended by the Task Force are described below.

Short-Term Program

The proposed short-term program consists of two activities: education and pilot projects.

Education. The first proposal is an education program to better inform the region’s citizens, especially seniors and their families, about the existing transit services that are available. Many seniors, especially those who have been auto drivers, are not familiar with public transit services and how to use transit to go to the places they want to go. SANDAG staff will work with the transit operators, the County of San Diego’s Aging and Independence Services, senior centers, senior commissions, the Coordinated Transportation Service Agency, and others to develop a Senior Transportation Fact Sheet. This Fact Sheet can be developed and distributed before the end of the current fiscal year within the current Overall Work Program (OWP) budget.

Pilot Projects. The second part of the short-term program consists of one or more pilot projects providing transportation services to seniors. Research provided to the Task Force showed that there are a number of private nonprofit agencies with transportation services for seniors, but they primarily serve the agency clients and are not open to those not attending the agency programs. There are some small programs in the region that do serve the general transportation needs of seniors within their service area.

The Task Force recommends that staff immediately begin an assessment of potential programs that could be operational by this November to provide transportation within communities. Staff proposes that there be no direct cost to SANDAG for the programs, but that some staff resources are allocated to the assessment. Three programs were discussed by the Task Force. The first is a “Neighborhood Shared Ride” program that would provide incentives to seniors to establish groups, similar to vanpools, to share a ride to a common destination such as a shopping center. The second is a community shuttle service, similar to the “Vista Out and About” program that provides transportation to seniors along a fixed route to various destinations frequented by seniors. The third is a “Mileage Reimbursement” program to subsidize volunteers, using their own autos, to transport seniors to their desired destination, such as medical services. A report on the assessment of these programs and funding will be provided to the Transportation Committee at its June 18, 2004, meeting. Attachment 1 outlines each of these proposals.

Mid-Term Program

Action Plan. The Action Plan is proposed as a mid-term program. It consists of a number of steps to develop specialized services for implementation. First, the evaluation of the implemented pilot projects, in the short-term program, will help identify those types of programs that successfully meet transportation needs of seniors. Based on the evaluation, subregions will be mapped and
travel needs of seniors within these zones will be identified along with gaps in existing services. Service options to meet the needs will be proposed and costs estimated. The evaluation criteria for mini-grants (proposed under the TransNet Extension program, below) will be developed and service options for each subregion will be evaluated. This section of the Action Plan will be completed by November 2004.

Pending the authorization of the TransNet Extension and approval of the mini-grant program, demonstration projects will be implemented and evaluated. The roles and responsibilities of SANDAG will be identified and included in the institutional structure. The implementation and finance plan will be put into place. This part of the Action Plan will occur with the TransNet reauthorization.

The Action Plan proposal will be added to the FY 2005 OWP as a Task within #80011, Transportation Planning for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities. Attachment 2 describes the Action Plan in greater detail.

Long-Term Program

TransNet Reauthorization. The long-term program is based on the reauthorization of TransNet and consists of four activities to promote seniors’ use of transit and to provide for specialized transportation programs for seniors and persons with disabilities.

The Task Force recommends that the TransNet Extension contains the following provisions under the transit program:

(a) continue funding for the discounted senior and disabled monthly pass, which is reduced 75 percent from the regular price;

(b) provide 3 percent of the transit funds to be allocated to ADA services, which serve persons, including seniors with disabilities;

(c) establish a program to designate 4 percent of the program funds for mini-grant programs primarily for seniors, which may fund 10–15 community senior projects a year with funding participation by the applicant agencies; and

(d) continue and expand general purpose transit service with the remaining funds.

Recommendations (a), (b), and (d) are all included in the current TransNet program and represent no change. Recommendation (c) would be new and is oriented to seniors.

It was recommended that the proposal to include a guaranteed senior cash fare for ten years be omitted due to the limited market that it would serve. Attachment 3 is the TransNet Extension proposal.
Existing Programs

Age Eligibility. The Seniors Access Task Force discussed whether the age at which a person is eligible for the senior’s reduced transit pass and fare should remain at 60 years of age or be changed. It was noted that local and state programs serving seniors usually set the eligible age no higher than 60, while federal Social Security programs' lower age limit is 62. Because seniors in our region are accustomed to receiving the discounted transit fare at the age of 60, it is recommended that this age requirement not be changed.

Existing Programs. Attachment 4 is a chart that was reviewed by the Task Force, which shows transportation programs for senior citizens in the region. It lists public and private providers of senior transportation. As shown on the chart, many of the seniors’ transportation programs are restricted to agency clients.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Nan Valerio, (619) 699-6965; nva@sandag.org
PILOT PROJECTS

The following are three innovative senior services that may be pursued prior to the proposed TransNet mini-grant program. Each of these programs demonstrates the service characteristics that are identified in the proposed grant program. For example, they are highly personalized, inter-jurisdictional travel for all trip purposes, while being cost effective by leveraging existing resources and in kind contributions.

Central San Diego – Neighborhood Shared Rides

Partner Organization: This project would serve senior residential and recreation centers throughout City of San Diego Council District 4, National City, and west Chula Vista by selling “blocks” of service hours to the senior citizen groups from these establishments. The senior groups would then be responsible for scheduling trip times and destinations that maximize ridership, thus promoting efficient scheduling of trips by groups.

- All Congregations Together
- Local Jurisdictions - City of San Diego, City of National City, City of Chula Vista
- SANDAG

Travel Origins:

- City of San Diego Council District 4, National City, west Chula Vista
- Senior Residence
- Senior/Recreation Centers

Common Travel Destinations:

- Medical trips
- Shopping trips
- Senior/Recreation Center Trips
- Other Trips

Preliminary Cost:

- $17,000 for 260 service hours per year (five hours per week)
- Cost can be reduced if:
  - Cities provide vehicles (including insurance, certification, and maintenance) as in kind services
  - Fuel purchased through transit district or local jurisdiction
  - Volunteer drivers are used
  - Destinations (e.g., Walmart, Henrys, Target) sponsor trips
  - Subsidy provided by local jurisdiction or regional agency (i.e. mini-grants)
  - Charge minimal fare
Oceanside– Out & About Shuttle Service

Partner Organization:

- Oceanside Senior Center
- Cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, and Vista
- Aging & Independence Services (AIS), County of San Diego

Senior Origins:

- Oceanside

Travel Demand:

- Service hours between 8:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m.; scheduling between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.
- Medical
- Shopping and Necessary Errands
- Senior/Recreation Centers
- Church and Other

Concept:

- Utilize the County’s vehicles provided by the Aging and Independence Services
- Provide cross-jurisdictional transportation through Memoranda of Understanding among the cities, allowing vehicles to travel outside city limits;
- The senior centers and parks departments commit a coordinator and allocate funding for operational costs

Poway & Rancho Bernardo– Mileage Reimbursement Program

Partner Organizations:

- Jewish Family Services
- Weingart Senior Center
- Pomerado Healthcare

Senior Origins:

- Rancho Bernardo
- Poway

Travel Demand:

- Service flexibility in hours of operation; scheduling between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.
- Medical
- Shopping and Necessary Errands
- Senior/Recreation Centers
- Churches and Other Locations
Concept:

- Create a database of volunteers and create a system of matching need to the volunteer availability.
- Umbrella agency provides secondary insurance over and above the private driver insurance.
- Full-time volunteer coordinator.
- Volunteer reimbursed for up to 150 miles per month at $.36/mile.
ACTION PLAN

Following is the proposed Action Plan, which is recommended by the Seniors Access Task Force as a Mid-Term program.

Action Plan

The following Action Plan is proposed to be completed by November 2004. It will identify and propose development of specialized services for implementation pending TransNet reauthorization.

1. Based on the implementation of the short range demonstration projects, evaluate the projects to determine the level of success and challenges to implementation and operation of such services.


3. Identify senior-based travel demands in these subregions/zones.

4. Identify gaps/deficiencies in senior transportation for each subregion/zone.

5. Identify service options.

6. Evaluate best service option(s) for each subregion/zone; this may include a combination of options.

7. Establish criteria for the evaluation of applications, services to be provided, and program effectiveness.

8. Evaluate best service option(s) for each subregion/zone, based on experience from the demonstration projects. This may include a combination of options.

First Milestone: Evaluate and recommend service plan for each subregion/zone (November 2004)

9. Identify demonstration projects to implement to evaluate the success of various service options.

10. Develop an institutional structure to implement and administer the mini-grant program and demonstration projects, including SANDAG roles and responsibilities.

11. Develop an implementation and finance plan.

Second Milestone: Identify and implement various demonstration services, pending TransNet reauthorization.
TransNet PROPOSALS

TransNet Extension Proposals Regarding Public Transit Program

In addition to the major congestion relief projects, which include several major transit capital projects, the initial draft TransNet Expenditure Plan included five potential transit program components. Over the course of the 30-year extension period, it is estimated that $1.235 billion would be available (13 percent of the total funding plan) for the transit program. On an annual basis, we have estimated that approximately $5 million would be available for existing and new services under this formula. In addition, similar to the local streets and roads category, in FY 2009 Proposition 42 will kick in and provide additional operating support. The updated draft Expenditure Plan includes a recommended provision that would guarantee an equivalent Proposition 42 amount if the proposition were to be suspended as is the case this year.

For today’s discussion, we have listed the initial draft’s five transit program categories and have presented recommendations for the Task Force’s consideration. We have organized our recommendations to address fare pricing and three service categories: Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), senior transportation needs, and general public services. We recommend that the three current components be continued and a new one be added:

1. CONTINUE: the reduced price monthly transit pass programs for seniors, persons with disabilities, and youth.

2. CONTINUE: the TransNet funding provided for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit services.

3. ADD: provide grants to nonprofit organizations and public agencies focused on the transit needs of seniors.

4. CONTINUE: expand general purpose transit service improvements.

Our recommendation would delete from further consideration freezing the cash fare at $1.00 for the next ten years. Based upon the success of the monthly pass discount over the course of the current TransNet program, we believe that the senior and disabled transit users will continue to utilize the passes as their most cost-effective option.

| Continue, with no change; this is a key program for seniors and persons with disabilities, and for youth. | 1. Continue the reduced price monthly transit pass programs for seniors, persons with disabilities, and youth. The current TransNet program requires that reduced-price senior/disabled monthly transit passes be provided at a 75 percent discount off the regular monthly pass. Approximately 400,000 senior/disabled passes are sold per year. Monthly passes for youth (18 years or under) are required to be provided at a 50 percent discount. One of the incentives to encourage seniors and persons with disabilities to continue to use public transit is the senior/disabled pass because it provides a low-cost option for those still able to use public transit. It is recommended that the monthly pass be continued... |

---

Attachment 3
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programs continue to be a requirement of the TransNet program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete this program from further consideration. The cash fare market is relatively small and the monthly pass program above generally addresses this need.</td>
<td>2. Freeze the current cash fare for seniors and persons with disabilities for ten years. One of the concepts discussed at the recently completed focus groups was a freeze in the senior/disabled cash fare at the current level ($1.00 in the MTS area and $.75 in the NCTD area) for the next ten years of the TransNet Extension. The focus group participants responded very favorably to this proposal as a way of protecting those on fixed incomes from periodic increases in transit fares due to inflation over time. The cost of this program has been estimated at approximately $200,000 in the first year (FY 2009), increasing to about $900,000 by the tenth year. The cost could vary depending on the growth in the senior/disabled ridership and the rate of inflationary increases in the transit fare structure. This senior/disabled cash fare guarantee would provide an additional financial incentive for seniors and persons with disabilities to use public transit, and would complement the discounted monthly transit pass program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue but change the formula to 3 percent off the top of the transit program portion to provide an amount equivalent to the current TransNet program.</td>
<td>3. Continue the TransNet funding provided for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit services. Currently, 1 percent of the transit one-third allocation from TransNet helps to fund the ADA paratransit services for those unable to use public transit. TransNet is providing $700,000 this fiscal year, combined with $4.7 million in Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4.5 specialized transit funds and about $2.5 million in TDA general public transit funds to support the ADA paratransit service. This service is valuable to persons with disabilities who are able to use it for necessary medical and other trips. The ADA services currently cost approximately $9.0 million per year and carry over 450,000 annual trips. By federal law, the boundaries for ADA paratransit service extend ½-mile from public transit routes. Those areas without any public transit service are not covered by ADA paratransit service. An equivalent amount of TransNet under the new proposed formula for transit programs would require 3 percent off the top of the transit account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add this new program to focus primarily on the transportation needs of seniors.</strong> The funding level would be 4 percent of the transit program funds (roughly $1.0 million, annually).</td>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Provide grants to nonprofit organizations and public agencies focused on the transit needs of Seniors. Proposed would be 4.0 percent of TransNet transit program funds to be used each year to provide mini-grants to nonprofit community organizations and local jurisdictions, through a competitive mini-grant process, to provide transportation services with the primary focus being for seniors. Brokerage of multi-jurisdictional nonprofit transportation services, shared group services, special shuttles using volunteer forces, and private contractor options are examples of the types of services that would be emphasized. The objective of this program would be to allow for innovative and cost-effective approaches to providing these options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continue, and no change. This program will be the primary funding source for new and expanded general public services within the region, outside of the major congestion relief projects.</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Continue and expand general purpose transit service improvements. These funds would also be used to continue funding for transit operations covered under the current TransNet program and to provide additional bus and rail services, including local circulator/shuttle routes. As the major bus rapid transit (BRT) and rail improvements specified in the Congestion Relief Project list are implemented, opportunities would exist to reassign the resources being used to provide service to those corridors and use them to enhance local shuttle and feeder services to the new higher-speed routes. These funds would be eligible to be used for capital projects as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attached is the chart, reviewed by the Seniors Access Task Force, showing transportation services for seniors in the San Diego region. The right side of the chart shows the subregion(s) in which the service is provided.

The first listing is of general seniors’ transportation programs. This listing is divided into two sections—those programs provided or funded by public agencies and jurisdictions and those provided by social service or other nonprofit and for-profit agencies. All of these programs will transport the senior to any destination. However, they have age, residency in the community, income, or other restrictions as to their use. All the programs funded by public agencies are accessible to persons using wheelchairs, while many of the nonprofit services are available to ambulatory persons only. Almost all programs require advance reservations. All of the public and private providers charge for the service while more than half of the programs provided by the nonprofits do not charge.

The second listing is of senior transportation programs that are restricted to the clients of the organization providing the transportation. All of the organizations provide transportation to their services only or to general medical services. Many organizations use vans that are lift-equipped. The organizations require either a subscription or a reservation in advance, but some will accept same-day calls if space is available. Only one organization charges a fee; the others do not charge their clients.

Attachment: Chart
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Reservations</th>
<th>Fare Description</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>Ni</th>
<th>City SD</th>
<th>ECo</th>
<th>SCo</th>
<th>Rural SE</th>
<th>Rural NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Agency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas DAR</td>
<td>Taxi Voucher</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age, disabled, residency, income</td>
<td>door to door taxi, ambulatory only</td>
<td>Same-day</td>
<td>$20 book for $7.50 cost</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista Out &amp; About</td>
<td>Shuttle &amp; Volunteer *MRP/private cars</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age, residency</td>
<td>door to door, wheelchair accessible shuttle</td>
<td>2-day (some same-day)</td>
<td>Shuttle: $1 donation, MRP: free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Regional Center</td>
<td>Bus/ADA Pass, contracted shuttle</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>developmental disabled, income, residency</td>
<td>door to door, curb to curb, fixed route, wheelchair accessible</td>
<td>2-day (some same-day)</td>
<td>Free or subsidized up to $17.50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DART (MTS)</td>
<td>DAR or Flex-route</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Curb to curb, flex route (deviating 3/4 mile), wheelchair accessible</td>
<td>2-day (some same-day)</td>
<td>$3.00/adult &amp; $1.50 for seniors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST (NCTD)</td>
<td>DAR or Flex-route</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Curb to curb, flex route (deviating 3/4 mile), wheelchair accessible</td>
<td>2-day (some same-day)</td>
<td>$1.75/adult &amp; $.75 for seniors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Service or non-profit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Congregations Together</td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age or disabled and residency</td>
<td>door to door, ambulatory only</td>
<td>1-week to same-day</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Neighbors (LSS)</td>
<td>Volunteer *MRP/Private cars &amp; Shuttle</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age or disabled, income and residency</td>
<td>door to door, wheelchair accessible</td>
<td>1-week to same-day</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Ave Sr Center (JFS)</td>
<td>Agency vehicles &amp; volunteer *MRP/private cars</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age or disabled and residency</td>
<td>door to door, ambulatory only</td>
<td>1-week to same-day</td>
<td>Agency vehicles: $4/roundtrip; MRP: free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Lutheran Church</td>
<td>Volunteer/private cars</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age or disabled and residency</td>
<td>door to door, ambulatory only</td>
<td>1-week to same-day</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar Community Connections (Out &amp; About)</td>
<td>Shuttle &amp; Volunteer *MRP/private cars</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age, disabled and residency</td>
<td>door to door, wheelchair accessible</td>
<td>2-day (some same-day)</td>
<td>Shuttle: $1 donation, MRP: free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas Sr Center</td>
<td>Volunteer/private cars</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age, residency</td>
<td>door to door, ambulatory only</td>
<td>1-week to same-day</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido Out &amp; About (Redwood)</td>
<td>Shuttle and agency vehicles</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age or disabled and residency</td>
<td>door to door, wheelchair accessible</td>
<td>2-day (some same-day)</td>
<td>Shuttle: $1 donation, MRP: free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Matrix</td>
<td>JFS Sr Center</td>
<td>Volunteer *MRP/Private cars</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age, residency and agency member</td>
<td>door to door, ambulatory only</td>
<td>1-week to same-day</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.I.T.E.</td>
<td>Volunteer/private cars</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age or disabled and residency</td>
<td>door to door, ambulatory only</td>
<td>1-week to same-day</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Lifeline, Inc.</td>
<td>Travel Training on Public Transit</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age and residency</td>
<td>Fixed route, wheelchair</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Shepherd (Out &amp; About)</td>
<td>Van &amp; volunteer/private cars</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age or disabled and residency</td>
<td>door to door, ambulatory only</td>
<td>1-week to same-day</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Community Centers of SD</td>
<td>Taxi Voucher</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age, income, residency</td>
<td>door to door taxi, ambulatory only</td>
<td>Same-day</td>
<td>Sliding scale based on income &amp; distance</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Companion Prgrm (LSS)</td>
<td>Volunteer/private cars</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age and income</td>
<td>door to door, ambulatory only</td>
<td>1-week to same-day</td>
<td>Same-day</td>
<td>Sliding scale based on income &amp; distance</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St David's Sr Center</td>
<td>Volunteer &amp; agency vehicles</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>age or disabled and residency</td>
<td>door to door, ambulatory only</td>
<td>1-week to same-day</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For-profit providers**

| MV Transportation | Fee based private for profit | Any | none | door to door, wheelchair accessible | Same-day | $20 pick-up & $2/mile for w/c lift | X X X |
| Seniors on the GO | Fee based private for profit | Any | none | door to door, ambulatory only | 1-week to same-day | $2.50 pick-up $1/mile | X X |
| USA Cab (W/C lift equipped taxi) | Fee based private for profit | Any | none | door to door, wheelchair accessible | Same-day | $1.80/mile | X X X X |

**RESTRICTED SENIOR TRANSPORTATION**

| Social Service or non-profit | Adult Protective Svcs, Inc. (ADHC) | Vans/Paid Drivers | To/from agency | Agency client | door to door, wheelchair accessible | Subscription (preset schedule) | Free | X |
| American Cancer Society | Volunteer/private cars | Diagnosis | Cancer diagnosis | door to door, ambulatory only | 1-week to same-day | Free | X X X X X X X X |
| Arc of SD | Vans/Paid Drivers | To/from agency | Agency client | door to door, wheelchair accessible | Subscription (preset schedule) | Free | X X X X |
| Blind Community Center | Vans/Paid Drivers | To/from agency | Agency client | door to door, wheelchair accessible | Subscription (preset schedule) | Free | X X X X X X X X |
| Boys & Girls Club | Vans/Paid Drivers | To/from agency | Agency client | door to door, ambulatory only | Subscription (preset schedule) | Free | X X |
| Braille Institute | Vans/Paid Drivers | Diagnosis | Agency client | door to door, wheelchair accessible | Subscription (preset schedule) | Free | X X X X X X X X |
| CARE Act (HIV/AIDS) | Shuttle | Medical | HIV/AIDS diagnosis | door to door, wheelchair accessible | 2-1 day (same-day) | Free | X X X X X X X X |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Program Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carlsbad Senior Center</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centro Hispano Center</strong></td>
<td>Volunteer/private cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choices In Recovery</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clairemont Friendship Center (ADHC)</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comm. Connection Resource Center</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comm. Housing of NC</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coronado Senior Center</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elizabeth Hospice</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Escondido Joslyn Sr Center</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fallbrook Joslyn Sr Center</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISH</strong></td>
<td>Volunteer/private cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>George Glenner Alzheimer</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hanblecy</strong></td>
<td>Volunteer/private cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link Shuttle Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mountain Health Comm. Svcs</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Sclerosis Society</strong></td>
<td>Volunteer/private cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oceanside Sr Center</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parkinson's Association</strong></td>
<td>Volunteer/private cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poway Sr Center</strong></td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>Service Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promising Futures, Inc.</td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos Sr Center</td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Madeline's Sophie Center</td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Cerebral Palsy Assoc.</td>
<td>Volunteer/private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Sr Center</td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hospitals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Travel Type</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Mental Health</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>2-day (some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>same-day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar/Pomerado Mental Health</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>2-day (some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>same-day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripps Memorial, Mercy, La Jolla</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>2-day (some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>same-day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARP, Cabrillo, Memorial, Grossmont</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>2-day (some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>same-day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-City Hospital</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>2-day (some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>same-day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Veteran, patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>1-week to same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment Program Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provider</th>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Travel Type</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos Sr Center</td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
<td>To/from agency</td>
<td>Agency client</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>1-week to same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Bright Families Project</td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
<td>To/from agency</td>
<td>Agency client</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>1-week to same-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Center for the Blind</td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
<td>To/from agency</td>
<td>Agency client</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>Subscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>(preset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accessible</td>
<td>schedule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Madeline's Sophie Center</td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
<td>To/from agency</td>
<td>Agency client</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>Subscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>(preset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accessible</td>
<td>schedule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Cerebral Palsy Assoc.</td>
<td>Volunteer/private</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Medical CP diagnosis</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>1-week to same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ambulatory only</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Sr Center</td>
<td>Vans/Paid Drivers</td>
<td>To/from agency</td>
<td>Agency client</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>1-week to same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Travel Type</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Mental Health</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>2-day (some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>same-day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar/Pomerado Mental Health</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>2-day (some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>same-day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripps Memorial, Mercy, La Jolla</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>2-day (some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>same-day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARP, Cabrillo, Memorial, Grossmont</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>2-day (some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>same-day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-City Hospital</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>2-day (some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>same-day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Veteran, patient</td>
<td>door to door,</td>
<td>1-week to same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wheelchair</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The Grossmont Trolley Station is a 7.5-acre, Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB)-owned parcel located within the Fletcher Parkway Redevelopment Area of the City of La Mesa (see Attachment 1). The site contains the Grossmont Center Trolley Station and a 600-car surface parking lot, which is shared by the station and the adjacent Pacific Theaters under an agreement between MTDB and CCRT Properties that will expire in 2021. The station will be an important transfer site between the Orange Line and the Mission Valley East extension of the Blue Line, which is currently under construction. More than 11,000 daily on/oFFs are forecast for this station by the year 2015. Seven bus routes currently serve the site.

In 1999 the La Mesa Community Redevelopment Agency (Agency) and MTDB agreed to jointly plan for development of the site to maximize transit ridership and to facilitate construction of a transit-oriented project. The Agency contracted with Keyser Marston Associates and Gruen Associates in 1999 to prepare a planning and feasibility study to create a vision for the site and to provide guidance on future development proposals. The study analyzed a range of joint-use alternatives and narrowed the analysis to two key site concepts that were most compatible with a transit-oriented design vision and that demonstrated the highest financial feasibility.

In July 2003, the Agency and MTDB entered into an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement (ENA) with Fairfield Realty LLC (Fairfield) to develop plans to design, construct, and manage a transit-oriented project on the site. The ENA has since been transferred to SANDAG, although the real property ownership remains with the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS; formerly MTDB).

The goal of joint development of transit stations is to improve surrounding communities, enhance transit ridership, and generate revenue to help defray transit operating costs. It conforms with MOBILITY 2030, which calls for integrating transit into our communities and neighborhoods, as well as the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which recommends integrating transportation, land use, and public investment within a regional smart growth framework.

City of La Mesa staff will make a presentation on the project at the Transportation Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION

Fairfield has been working to prepare a development plan. The preliminary design resembles one of the development scenarios of the 1999 Feasibility Planning Study.
Fairfield has submitted the deposits prescribed in the ENA, and these deposits have been used to analyze the preliminary pro forma for the project. The preliminary pro forma shows the potential for a modest cash flow to MTS. However, refinements to the pro forma continue to be made.

The preliminary plan includes approximately 500 apartments and related parking on both sides of the Grossmont Center Drive Bridge. Approximately 15 percent of these units will be affordable to low- and moderate-income families. The proposed affordable housing component will help the La Mesa Redevelopment Agency and the region meet affordable housing goals. The apartments would be built over two levels of structured parking, including trolley parking on the ground floor and residential parking on the second floor. There will be three to four levels of apartments over the two-story deck parking. The project will provide 600 replacement transit parking spaces and ground-floor commercial space.

The bus and trolley station will be retained on site, along with publicly funded pedestrian enhancements to facilitate access to Grossmont Center ($2.7 million). This $2.7 million is already identified in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget, and consists of federal and local funds. The specific work to be done with federal funds will need to be negotiated between the developer, MTS, and SANDAG. A separate capital project, currently under way, will raise the trolley station to accommodate level boarding of the new trolley cars. The cost of any additional public improvements beyond the $2.7 million in the CIP budget and platform modifications will require developer and/or grant funding.

It is anticipated that approximately 12 months will be needed to complete design work and negotiations on the project. Entitlement processing may require an additional six to nine months. Construction could be phased to provide the replacement parking structure prior to construction of the apartments. It is estimated that construction would take three to five years. We will bring status reports to the Transportation Committee as plans for the project progress.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Miriam Kirshner, (619) 557-4585; mkirshner@mtdb.sdmts.com
The attachment to this agenda item is available in hard copy only and may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Clerk of the Board at (619) 699-1912.
February 26, 2004

Gary L. Gallegos, Executive Director
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Gary,

Interstate 15 Reversible Express Lanes (Weekend Study)

This summary provides an assessment to date on the weekend use of the Interstate 15 (I-15) Reversible Express Lanes.

Between August and December 2003 the California Department of Transportation (Department) opened the express lanes on weekends in the northbound direction, as the first phase of an overall study to determine the traffic operational benefits to the I-15 freeway within the vicinity of the Express Lanes. The northbound use of the lanes proved to be successful in helping reduce light congestion on the northbound main lanes. In the southbound direction, sporadic main lane congestion continued to exist in the vicinity of the Mira Mesa Boulevard interchange. This was due in part to the ongoing construction activities at this location. Traffic volumes during this first phase on the Express Lanes on Saturdays averaged just above 12,000 and on Sundays about 11,000 vehicles (see attached Charts 1 & 2).

In January 2004 the Department initiated the second phase of this study, reversing the weekend use of the Express Lanes to the southbound direction. The southbound use of the lanes thus far has not been as successful as the northbound use. Sporadic congestion has returned to the northbound main lanes, and to a lesser extent the southbound main lanes in the vicinity of the Mira Mesa Boulevard interchange. Traffic volumes on the southbound Express Lanes on Saturdays averaged just above 7,000 and on Sundays just below 5,000 vehicles (see attached Charts 3 & 4).

The results of this study thus far has shown that weekend use of the lanes in the northbound direction provides greater overall benefits to the I-15 freeway than use of the lanes in the
southbound direction. Congestion on the northbound main lanes within the limits of the Express Lanes is nearly nonexistent, and thereby maintains improved traffic flow in this direction. And although sporadic congestion exists in the southbound direction with the Express Lanes in the northbound direction, it is expected to dissipate when construction is complete at the Mira Mesa Boulevard interchange.

Based on the results of this study the Department will reverse the weekend use of the lanes on March 6, 2004 to the northbound direction. The northbound direction has proven to be the most effective use, and provides the greater overall benefits to the I-15 freeway within the limits of the Express Lanes. The Department will continue to assess the operations of the Express Lanes as traffic trends or demands change. The Department also has plans to expand weekday operations of the Express Lanes by maintaining the northbound use of the lanes overnight and reversing the lanes to the southbound direction on the following morning. We anticipate implementing this expanded weekday operation in Spring/Summer 2004 due to the ongoing construction of a “slip-ramp” from the Express Lanes to the northbound main lanes.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

PEDRO ORSO-DELGADO
District Director
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