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1. APPROVAL OF JUNE 4, 2004 DISCUSSIONS AND ACTIONS

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

3. 2002 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP) AMENDMENT NO. 19 (Resolution No. 2004-24) (Sookyung Kim)

The SANDAG Board, at its meeting on June 28, 2002, adopted the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the five-year program of major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period from FY 2003 to FY 2007. Amendment No. 19 includes requests for changes submitted by the City of Escondido and two projects from SANDAG. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2004-24 approving Amendment No. 19 to the 2002 RTIP.

4. SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM UPDATE (Conan Cheung)

On March 5, 2004, the Transportation Committee adopted three recommendations from the Senior Transportation Task Force to improve and better coordinate transportation services for seniors. The recommendations included short-, mid- and long-term programs. The short-term program consists of an educational effort to inform seniors of existing services and three pilot programs that would better coordinate existing senior service resources. The mid-term program would develop an Action Plan for senior services, and the long-term program is a mini-grant for senior services included in the TransNet reauthorization expenditure plan. This report provides an update on the short-term program recommendations.

5. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) CLAIM AMENDMENT FOR CITY OF EL CAJON (Sookyung Kim)

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) submits one TDA claim on behalf of all operators in its service area. An agreement between MTDB and the cities that used to receive TDA funds stipulates that any unused TDA balances held by the jurisdictions would be available for eligible TDA projects. The City of El Cajon has requested $10,000 from its unallocated TDA reserve for its mural project at the Transit Center on Marshall Avenue. The MTS Board at its meeting on June 10, 2004, approved amending its TDA claim to include the El Cajon request. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve this claim amendment.
+6. **FY 2005 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ALLOCATIONS**  
(Sookyung Kim)

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides ¼ percent of state sales tax for operating and capital support of public transportation systems and non-motorized transportation projects. SANDAG, as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), is responsible for the allocation of TDA funds to the region’s cities and transit operators. This report presents the allocation requests for the TDA Article 3, Article 4, Article 4.5, and Article 8 claims, and one State Transit Assistance (STA) claim. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the FY 2005 TDA allocations and the FY 2005 Productivity Improvement goals at its June 25, 2004 meeting.

**REPORTS**

+7. **TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) TRIENNIAL PERFORMANCE AUDIT**  
(Sookyung Kim)

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires that once every three years SANDAG, as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), commission a performance audit of each transit operator receiving TDA funds. An audit of the RTPA is also required. This audit period takes place prior to SB 1703 (FY 2001 through FY 2003) when the Metropolitan Transit System was the Metropolitan Development Board (MTDB) which performed certain TDA administration functions for operators in its service area. The administrative role performed by MTDB will be referred to as SANDAG for purposes of this report. The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the Executive Director to take the following actions: 1) Transmit the performance audit report of SANDAG to the Director of the State Department of Transportation as required; 2) Implement the performance audit recommendations pertaining to SANDAG’s TDA activities; and 3) Transmit the other recommendations to the transit operators for implementation.

+8. **DRAFT 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP)**  
(Sookyung Kim)

SANDAG, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), is required by state and federal laws to develop and adopt a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) every two years. The RTIP is a multi-year program of proposed major highway, arterial, transit, and non-motorized projects, including the TransNet Program of Projects. The current 2002 RTIP, adopted by the SANDAG Board on June 28, 2002 expires September 2004. The 2004 RTIP covers Fiscal Years 2005 to 2009, and is due to the state by August 1, 2004. The Transportation Committee is asked to accept the draft 2004 RTIP including the draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis and the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Conformity Re-determination, and schedule a public hearing for the July 16, 2004 meeting.
+ 9. TRANSIT AGENCY FY 2005 OPERATING BUDGETS (Renee Wasmund)  

As part of SANDAG’s expanded role with transit operating funding, the Transportation Committee is responsible for approving the transit operating budgets for funding. NCTD and MTS will present the FY 2005 transit operating budgets for approval of the funding, contingent upon the Transit Agency Boards approval.

+ 10. SOUTH BAY-DOWNTOWN TRANSIT FIRST BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) PROJECT - STATUS REPORT (Jennifer Williamson)  

The South Bay-Downtown San Diego Transit First BRT project was adopted for early implementation by the MTD Board in February 2003. The project would provide high-speed BRT service between downtown San Diego and the inland south county communities of Otay Ranch, Chula Vista and National City along SR 94 and I-805, arterial streets and dedicated transit rights-of-way through the Otay Ranch transit-oriented villages. Planning and engineering studies are currently underway on Phase I for the BRT alignment, stations, and transit priority treatments. This item will provide a status report on the work to date, future work tasks, and project schedule.

11. UPCOMING MEETINGS  

The July 2, 2004 Transportation Committee meeting has been cancelled. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held on Friday, July 16, 2004 at 9 a.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT  

+next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of June 4, 2004

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:12 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

Chairman Kellejian asked that everyone introduce themselves.

1. APPROVAL OF MAY 21, 2004 DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer (City of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), the Transportation Committee unanimously approved the discussion and actions from the May 21, 2004 meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chairman Kellejian indicated that one Committee member has a comment, along with a member of the public.

Transportation Committee and Staff Comments:

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe (South Bay) distributed a letter from his colleague, Councilmember Frank Tierney, to the Committee. The letter was requesting that the Coronado City Council discuss the issue of seeking an exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) when studying and instituting temporary traffic planning solutions for up to a six-month test period. He noted that the City of Coronado tested temporary barriers to prevent left-turns from Third Street onto A, B and C Streets. When the Coronado City Council voted to take the barrier down, five residents on A, B and C Streets did not like this action and sued the City of Coronado indicating that the barriers could not be taken down unless an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was conducted. The Judge noted that the statue of limitations ran out on putting the barriers up but an EIR was needed to take the barriers down, even though the action was a six-month trial period. The City of Coronado is just completing the final stages of the EIR. He requested that this issue be agendized at a future Executive Committee meeting for its legislative review.

Staff responded that the Executive Committee is the appropriate Committee to discuss this issue. Staff stated that the City of Coronado should work with SANDAG’s lobbyist in Sacramento to investigate this issue and added that changing CEQA law will be challenging.
Mayor Pro Tem Monroe commented that a negative outcome regarding this issue would make it difficult for any City to make changes to its streets and roads if any residents were to file a complaint.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe added the he just attended an Environmental Seminar, at the City of San Diego’s Environmental Services Department, where the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency, Terry Tamminen, and the Secretary of the California Resources Agency, Mike Chrisman, were the keynote speakers. The topic of the seminar was the perfect storm in the energy crisis and the speakers indicated this was due to several factors including trips that take longer, and that sixty percent of the State’s resources come from countries that are 10,000 miles away and that dislike the United States. The speakers also noted that the state is on track for three things to help this issue: (1) conserve; (2) fuel efficiency; and (3) hydrogen use (cars, highways, etc.). Transit’s ability to reduce energy consumption was only casually mentioned. Mayor Pro Tem Monroe suggested that SANDAG staff work directly with these offices to discuss issues that could be beneficial to the San Diego region.

Chairman Kellejian interjected that if everyone rides transit at least one day a week, there would not be a transportation problem in San Diego.

Public Comment:

Chuck Lungerhausen, a San Diego resident, commented that during the formation of SB 1703 (Peace), the County Board of Supervisors declined involvement and the potential to add an additional seat on the SANDAG Board of Directors for the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors. He urged the Transportation Committee to stand firm on how funds are spent for mobility in the county.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 5)

3. LOS ANGELES – SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY (LOSSAN) BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING REPORT (INFORMATION)

4. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) PEDESTRIAN CLAIM AMENDMENTS AND TRANSNET BICYCLE AMENDMENT (APPROVE)

Chairman Kellejian noted that Item #5 – Interstate 15 (I-15) Managed Lanes/Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project Update - has been pulled by the public for comment.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee unanimously approved Consent Items 3 and 4.
INTERSTATE 15 (I-15) MANAGED LANES/BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) PROJECT UPDATE (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Staff noted that it periodically provides updates to the Transportation Committee on current issues relating to project implementation. Caltrans and SANDAG are jointly managing implementation of the I-15 Managed Lanes/Bus Rapid Transit (ML/BRT) project in the north I-15 corridor. The planning, development, and implementation of the BRT project components were transferred to SANDAG from the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) in October 2003. Caltrans is responsible for all activities within its right-of-way, including construction of the four-lane, bi-directional managed lanes and a moveable barrier; and the direct access ramps to the five BRT stations along the 20-mile project corridor.

Kathy Donnelly, Project Manager for the BRT study, commented that three BRT stations will be built as part of the Middle Segment (Phase 1) Managed Lanes Project between State Route (SR) 56 and Centre City Parkway. Future phases would extend the I-15 Managed Lanes south to SR 163 (reconfiguring the existing one-way, two-lane reversible High-Occupancy-Vehicle (HOV) facility and adding a BRT station in Mira Mesa) and north to SR 78 (including a direct access ramp to tie in with the Escondido Transit Center). Staff noted that the I-15 BRT schedule ensures that the BRT stations will be complete and ready to open concurrent with the opening of the managed lanes in December 2007. On March 24, 2004, the project team held a successful public workshop Open House for the three BRT stations. The primary focus of the Open House was to educate the public about the project and received input about the urban landscape and hardscape elements of the project. The forum included project overviews, as well as voting boards on station features, project priorities, and service attributes, and a detailed survey to determine customer operational needs. Staff also highlighted key recent milestones, noted on-going issues and next steps.

Chairman Kellejian questioned if there is enough funding available to purchase the transit vehicles and to complete the managed lanes concurrently with the BRT stations. Staff replied that the TCRP funding has been lost so the schedule for acquisition of vehicles is uncertain at this time, but the issue will be resolved in time for the 2007 opening.

Chairman Kellejian asked how the managed lanes, BRT, and purchase of the vehicles are tied into TransNet. Staff responded that these projects are directly tied into TransNet. If the TransNet extension measure does not pass, the projects will be unable to be completed.

Chairman Kellejian asked what effect would a 40% increase in funding for highways have on this project. Staff commented that it would depend where the funding would be taken from. In order to increase the proposed TransNet allocation for highways to 40%, other areas would have to be decreased by 7%.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe asked if the original cost estimate anticipated for growth in the future, was inclusive of the 20% for contingency. Staff noted that the cost will exceed the original estimate and the 20%. Staff added that they will bring the exact numbers back to Committee in September.
Mayor Pro Tem Monroe expressed concern regarding these types of projects and the cost estimates. Staff commented that Mayor Pro Tem Monroe brings up a good point. Cost estimates are challenging for staff and staff is currently developing a program that would do a better job.

Karen King (North San Diego County Transit Development Board [NCTD]) pointed out that there are on-going operating costs associated with a funding shift.

Leon Williams (Metropolitan Transportation System [MTS]) indicated that a large part of the movement for more highways is the people’s perspective to just drive cars. Part of the reason for the consolidation is to portray what the current problems are, what they’ll be in the future, and what changing life style patterns will do to help solve the region’s traffic problems. SANDAG needs to do a better job getting the information to the public. Staff stated they are trying to do just that. However, no one believes what the SANDAG staff is saying and SANDAG is taking a beating in the newspaper. Staff noted that completion of the I-15 corridor will be the region’s first opportunity to demonstrate the need for transit. It is a critical project for San Diego.

Public Comment:

Chuck Lungerhausen, a San Diego resident, indicated that he is supportive of the BRT concept as long as the existing MTS services are maintained and expanded to handle the increased ridership and not sacrificed to put the BRT system in place. He added that the SANDAG Board of Directors cannot let the County Board of Supervisors dictate to the Board what it is going to do regarding transit.

Councilmember Emery stated that long-range costs of operations need to be considered and there needs to be a demonstration project in the region to show that transit does work. There needs to be more work done in the public education area. He concluded that the transit side of transportation needs to become a focus; building more highways is not going to solve the region’s transportation problems.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe commented that he feels like he’s on a train and doesn’t know where it’s going. He expressed the he is uncomfortable with the fact that Mayor Cafagna (North County Inland) is brokering a deal with Supervisor Jacob regarding the proposed TransNet extension. He indicated that the SANDAG BOARD would do better to try to get a third vote from the County Board of Supervisors. There should not be a negotiator without parameters.

Supervisor Roberts (County of San Diego) noted that Mayor Cafagna is very capable of creating a compromise with the County Board of Supervisors’ Chairwoman. He mentioned that the SANDAG Board is making a mistake thinking a 3-2 vote with the County Board of Supervisors is acceptable. It is unfortunate that the Board will not allow the Supervisors to take their time to come to consensus and hopes that it doesn’t result in a ballot measure not passing. Gaining a two-thirds vote for TransNet in November 2004 is important.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Councilmember Ritter (NCTD), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Item 5.
6. INTERSTATE 15 (I-15) MANAGED LANES/HIGHWAY STATUS REPORT (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Pedro Orso-Delgado (Caltrans) introduced Gustavo Dallarda. He noted that Larry Carr has departed and Mr. Dallarda replaced him as Project Manager. He added that Bill Valle has joined the Caltrans team as its Program Manager.

Gustavo Dallarda, Caltrans Project Manager for I-15 and SR 56, provided the Committee with an update on the construction activities along the I-15 Corridor including the recently opened northbound slip ramp on the existing Managed Lanes, just south of SR 56. Mr. Gallarda noted that the Managed Lanes are broken down into five units and all of them are lined up to be completed one after the other.

Chairman Kellejian congratulated Mr. Dallarda on his new job responsibilities and thanked him for a good report.

Councilmember Feller (NCTD) asked what prevents people from crossing the double yellow lines in the carpool lanes and questioned how long will the construction on I-15 go on. Pedro Orso-Delgado commented that the entire project will be completed by Fall 2007.

Supervisor Roberts asked when the HOV lanes will be open 24 hours. Pedro Orso-Delgado responded that Caltrans is currently looking into that situation. But because of safety issues, that option cannot be implemented while construction is still underway on I-15.

Councilmember Emery questioned who removed the southbound gate on I-5. Pedro Orso-Delgado indicated that there was an accident this past weekend where a wrong-way vehicle crashed into the gate. Currently, there is emergency work taking place to reconstruct the gate.

Councilmember Emery commented that education and signage should be used when the opening of the HOV lanes takes place.

Supervisor Roberts stated that he would like to see whatever HOV lanes that are available opened. He added that the lanes should be used and fully utilized whenever possible.

Chairman Kellejian reiterated that Caltrans will look at the issue and bring back its findings to the Transportation Committee.

**Action:** The Transportation Committee accepted this report.
7. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDING UPDATE (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Chair Kellejian noted that the Transportation Committee requested a monthly update on transportation program funding. This report includes updates on the 2004 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) as well as the recently released May Revise of the state budget.

Staff provided the Transportation Committee with the current status on the 2004 STIP and the Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP). At its May 28, 2004 meeting, the SANDAG Board approved the no-GARVEE option as an initial submittal to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The CTC is maintaining its position that it will not begin to discuss which projects get GARVEE bonds until after adoption of the 2004 STIP in August 2004. As part of the May Revise, the Governor proposed to eliminate the current $800 million cap on additional GARVEE bonds and to work with the CTC to raise the ceiling. The CTC has indicated that the San Diego region’s projects would compete well and raising the ceiling would increase the likelihood of obtaining the funding when the projects need it. Currently, only the San Diego region and the Los Angeles MTA have proposed GARVEE bonds. The CTC will be holding a STIP hearing for Southern California Counties on Thursday, June 17, 2004, in Los Angeles.

Regarding the TCRP, during the mid-year Budget review in January 2004, Governor Schwarzenegger proposed eliminating the funding for TCRP projects currently underway. This would have impacted such regional projects as SR 56, the I-5/805 Merge and the East Village Station project. Further, the administration was proposing to terminate the TCRP program altogether, which would impact the possibility of receiving funds for other projects, such as the Sprinter. The Governor’s May Revise includes the following four proposed actions: (1) convert the previous suspension of Proposition 42 funds to a loan, payable in FY 2007/08; (2) include $163 million for TCRP projects statewide in the upcoming fiscal year; (3) withdraw the proposal to recapture $189 million that had been set aside for this year’s TCRP program; and (4) withdraw the proposal made in January 2004 to terminate the TCRP program. Staff will continue to monitor these issues and provide the Committee with any pertinent information during the next update. Staff added that there will be an opening ceremony for SR 56 on July 17, 2004.

Chairman Kellejian commented that the proposal to not terminate the TCRP program nor withdraw those funds is good news. He asked if the funding from the sales tax on higher-priced gasoline will be used to fund future projects that were eligible for TCRP monies. Staff noted that is part of the answer. The additional amount collected this year was approximately $80 million.

Action: The Transportation Committee accepted this report.

8. I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (IRP) DRAFT FINAL REPORT (INFORMATION/COMMENT)

Staff reported that approximately 3 years ago, the I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) was formed to address the imbalance of jobs and housing that has developed between the San Diego region and southwestern Riverside County during the past ten years, and the resulting impacts on freeway congestion. The I-15 IRP is a voluntary compact between local
elected officials representing the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG). The project was one of eight funded throughout the state by grants from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Both WRCOG and SANDAG contributed matching funds (staff time) to the project.

Staff highlighted the three-year work program which included the preparation of an Existing Conditions Report (January 2003), initiation of an ongoing public outreach program, strategy development and evaluation, completion of a Short-Range Strategy Report, and a draft of the final I-15 IRP Report. The draft final report includes 21 strategies proposed to address the jobs-housing imbalance between the two regions and its effects, and an Implementation and Monitoring Program. The strategies have been organized into four categories: housing, economic development, transportation and program-related. Each category has both short- and long-range strategies. Staff mentioned that two years ago, a survey was done and it was determined that approximately 29,000 individuals commute every day from southwestern Riverside County to San Diego County.

Chairman Kellejian stated that originally there were 13 strategies and some have been deleted. Staff responded that some strategies have been deleted and others have been added.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe commented that he is a member of this group and added that both staffs have kept the meetings interesting and informative. Through this group, he learned that the people that have moved from San Diego up to Riverside County don't want to come back. He added that it is time to begin the same communication and coordination efforts with Imperial County.

Chairman Kellejian noted that is a good comment. Local developers are looking to expand to Imperial County.

Pedro Orso-Delgado indicated that currently, approximately 22,000 homes are being built in Imperial County. He noted that Caltrans has started the dialogue with the Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG) and is currently working with them on their 30-year Transportation Plan.

Chairman Kellejian added that the Committee has done a good job regarding inclusion of all the regional issues. He noted that Riverside County is prepared to expand its section of I-15 by three lanes while the San Diego region has not yet made that commitment – especially because of the funding issues.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe stated that the Board has different theories regarding solving this problem. Some members think that we should not make it easy for people to move out of San Diego.

Councilmember Ritter commented that another entity that SANDAG needs to strengthen its communication with is Orange County. Staff replied that they have been trying to augment that situation by meeting with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
on a quarterly basis. At those meetings, discussions are being held with representatives from Orange County that attend.

Supervisor Roberts stated that at some point, there is an insanity in this process that needs to be acknowledged. The region already knows that you can’t resolve traffic issues with more highways and it also knows that there is a difference between planning and projecting. It would appear that a more sensible goal is to allow those that live here to be able to buy homes here. He added that he doesn’t feel an obligation to expand freeways in San Diego so people can live 90 miles away from where they work. This is a major problem which SANDAG is contributing to.

Chairman Kellejian agreed but noted that the Transportation Committee is taking a step by getting transit involved with the moving of those 29,000 people to Riverside County. There has to be another way, possibly in the form of a managed lane, to keep those people moving. He commented that Supervisor Roberts’ points regarding housing needs are on target. Staff noted that the presentation focused on transportation strategies that developed as a result of this study. The other strategies in the study, housing and economic development, carry just as much weight. The study projects that the amount of regional commuting could be cut in one-half to reduce traffic, if strategies are implemented correctly.

Supervisor Roberts questioned the planning from which the overall strategies will flow. Staff responded that the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is the document from which the overall planning derives and added that the RCP will head in the direction that policy makers in the region decide it should go.

Councilmember Rindone (South Bay) shared that there is a shift of the mind set of the policy makers in the region, specifically in the City of Chula Vista. A few years back, he lead an effort, through editorial and public comments, to create housing caps on the developers to slow down the building of houses in Chula Vista. It is the first time this has been done – which will last through 2006 – based on the opening of SR 125. Recently, a white paper was distributed for the City Council to evaluate the quality of life and in that discussion, a major effort was sought to create a new cap on developers. This effort was defeated. The current housing caps are in place and the City of Chula Vista is not creating new housing caps. If a new set of housing caps are created, there has to be justifiable public issues to support that. With the current affordable housing shortage in the San Diego region, a housing cap would not be in the best interest of the community of Chula Vista. The first housing cap vote was 5-0; the second housing cap vote was 2-3. The SANDAG Board needs to act accordingly.

Staff noted that is a good example to emphasize the dilemma that the region is in as the local jurisdictions begin to update their housing elements to coincide with the State, which has determined that the San Diego region needs to accommodate an additional 107,000 housing units in the next fiscal year. Currently, the local jurisdictions’ housing elements don’t comply.

Councilmember Ritter commented that SANDAG needs to recognize that the region is running out of land. She is uncertain if the region can provide what the residents want –
which is bigger yards. Mass transit is the answer because people will continue to move out of San Diego otherwise.

Councilmember Emery stated that the City of Chula Vista may be removing its housing cap but will not be providing affordable housing. Each jurisdiction should be designating 80% of its housing units as affordable housing and the only way to do that is to subsidize housing – which cannot be done. If a community wants to grow, that’s one thing, but those communities that don’t want to grow, that are built out, should not be forced to cram housing into their cities.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe expressed concern regarding staff’s comments that the commute from San Diego to Riverside could be one-half of what it could be otherwise, without a strategy or document that could reduce the current amount. Staff clarified that the number of regional commuters could be reduced by one-half.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe requested that Imperial Valley be added to the maps presented by staff.

Mayor Smith (North County Inland) mentioned that in the City of San Marcos, there is an initiative that will require a vote to change the City’s general plan. Changing a city’s General Plan may not be as easy to change as people think.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe announced that Chairman Kellejian is being honored at the WTS Annual Dinner Meeting on Thursday, June 24, 2004, at the Prado in Balboa Park. He encouraged all Committee members to attend.

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

9. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next two Transportation Committee meetings are scheduled for Friday, June 18, 2004, and Friday, July 2, 2004.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 10:53 a.m.
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<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Jerry Rindone</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Dick Murphy (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Dianne Jacob</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Board</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>Leon Williams</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Board</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Dave Druker</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Terry Johnson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2002 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP) AMENDMENT NO. 19

Introduction

The SANDAG Board, at its meeting on June 28, 2002, adopted the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the five-year program of major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period from FY 2003 to FY 2007. During the course of the two-year RTIP cycle, SANDAG processes amendments on a quarterly basis. Amendment No. 19 includes changes requested by the City of the Escondido, the San Dieguito River Park, and SANDAG.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee adopt Resolution No. 2004-24 approving Amendment No. 19 to the 2002 RTIP, as shown in Table 1.

Discussion

This quarterly amendment includes revisions to two existing projects and one new TransNet funded project as briefly described below (Table 1 provides further details).

City of Escondido

Bear Valley/East Valley/Valley Center (ESC02): The current program shows all the funds in the Construction phase. This amendment would spread the funds between the three phases, Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way Acquisition, and Construction. The total project cost remains $9 million.

SANDAG

Regional Performance Monitoring System (PeMS) (SAN18): Adds $40,000 for costs associated with oversight activities. The total project increases to $240,000.

San Diego River Park

Lake Hodges Bridge (SAN20): This project would design the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge. The Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG) reviewed this project and recommended approval to the Transportation Committee. At its meeting on June 4, 2004, the Transportation Committee approved the allocation of $250,000 in TransNet-B (Bicycle) funds to begin the initial design.
Air Quality Analysis

On March 28, 2003, SANDAG adopted the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), including the air quality conformity finding, and re-determined that the 2002 RTIP was in conformance with the Regional Air Quality Strategy/State Implementation Plan for the San Diego region.

Projects in Amendment No. 19 have demonstrated that they satisfy the requirements of 40 CFR 93.118 without a new regional emissions analysis in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR 93.122(e)(2)(ii). The capacity increasing projects in Amendment No. 19 were included in the regional emission analysis of the 2030 RTP with design, concept, and scope adequately detailed to determine their contribution to the RTP’s regional emissions at the time of conformity determination. The design concept, scope, and implementation schedule of the projects are not significantly different from that described in the 2030 RTP. Other projects identified in Amendment No. 19 are either noncapacity-increasing or exempt from the requirement to determine conformity according to Section 93.126 of the Transportation Conformity Rule. SANDAG followed interagency consultation procedures to determine that these projects were exempt. The funding for the projects in Amendment No. 19 will not delay the implementation of the RTIP. The 2002 RTIP, including Amendment No. 19, remains in conformance with the air quality program.

RENNÉE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Attachment

Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909; ski@sandag.org
APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 19 TO THE
2002 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, on June 28, 2002, SANDAG adopted the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), including the air quality conformity finding with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality; and

WHEREAS, on March 28, 2003, SANDAG made a finding of conformity of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and re-determined conformity of the 2002 RTIP with the SIP and the 1998 Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS); and

WHEREAS, local agencies have requested project revisions for inclusion into the 2002 RTIP as shown in Table 1; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendment is consistent with the 2030 RTP; and

WHEREAS, the regionally significant capacity increasing projects have been incorporated into the quantitative air quality emissions analysis and conformity findings conducted for the 2030 RTP and the 2002 RTIP Amendment No. 19; and

WHEREAS, projects in Amendment No. 19 have been demonstrated to satisfy the requirements of 40 CFR 93.118 and 93.119 without a new regional emissions analysis in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR 93.122(e)(2)(ii); and

WHEREAS, the capacity increasing projects in Amendment No. 19 were included in the regional emission analysis of the 2030 RTP with design, concept, and scope adequately detailed to determine their contribution to the RTP's regional emissions at the time of conformity determination; and the design concept, scope, and implementation schedule of these projects are not significantly different from that described in the 2030 RTP.

WHEREAS, all other projects included in Amendment No. 19 are either non-capacity increasing or exempt from the requirements to determine conformity; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors delegated the authority for RTIP amendments including findings of air quality conformity to the Transportation Committee; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Transportation Committee does hereby approve the attached Table 1 as Amendment No. 19 to the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that SANDAG finds the 2002 RTIP, including Amendment No. 19, in conformance with the SIP and RAQS for the San Diego region.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Amendment No. 19 to the 2002 RTIP is consistent with SANDAG Intergovernmental Review Procedures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Amendment No. 19 to the 2002 RTIP is consistent with SANDAG Public Participation Policy.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 18th day of June, 2004.
# Table 1
2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program  
Amendment No. 19  
San Diego Region (in $000s)

## City of Escondido

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID:</th>
<th>ESC02</th>
<th>CAPACITY STATUS:</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE:</td>
<td>Bear Valley/E. Valley/Valley Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>From Citrus Ave. to East Valley Pkwy; from Bear Valley to Lake Wohlford Road - widen roads to 4 lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Reason:</td>
<td>Revise FY and phases to reflect revised project schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$7,967</td>
<td>$1,770</td>
<td>$5,754</td>
<td>$443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,770</td>
<td>$5,754</td>
<td></td>
<td>$443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$1,033</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$746</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$746</td>
<td></td>
<td>$57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$7,967</td>
<td>$7,967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$1,033</td>
<td>$1,033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SANDAG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID:</th>
<th>SAN18</th>
<th>CAPACITY STATUS:</th>
<th>EXEMPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE:</td>
<td>Regional Performance Monitoring System (PeMS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>Incorporate arterial and transit data; develop additional highway applications to monitor system performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Reason:</td>
<td>Increase funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$213</td>
<td></td>
<td>$213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-H</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$177</td>
<td></td>
<td>$177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-H</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td></td>
<td>$23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MPO ID: SAN20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID:</th>
<th>SAN20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE:</td>
<td>Lake Hodges Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>Design bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Reason:</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-B</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA</td>
<td>Bicycle Transportation Account (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>Corridors and Borders Infrastructure Program (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Community Development Block Grants (Local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO</td>
<td>Demonstration (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Repair &amp; Replacement (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRC</td>
<td>Innovative Bridge Research &amp; Construction (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JARC</td>
<td>Jobs Access Reverse Commute (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLH</td>
<td>Public Lands Highway (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Recreational Trails Program (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>State Highway Operation &amp; Protection Program (for Caltrans use only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Interregional Program (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Regional Improvement Program (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program under FHWA Administrative Program (congressionally directed FY 2003 appropriations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td>Transit Capital Improvement Program (State, no longer exists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion Relief Program (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSP</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Community &amp; System Preservation (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>Transportation Systems Management (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA-B</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act-Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Facilities (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>Transportation Enhancement Activities Program (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-H</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Highway (Local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-L</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local Streets &amp; Roads (Local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-T</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Transit (Local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5307</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 NS</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary - New Starts Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 FG</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Fixed Guideway Modernization (Rail Mod)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5311</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Rural Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5310</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Elderly &amp; Disabled Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM UPDATE

Introduction

At its March 5, 2004 meeting the Transportation Committee approved the recommendations of the Senior Access Task Force to provide short-, mid-, and long-term programs to address the issue of senior transportation within the region. The Transportation Committee requested a status report at its June meeting on the advancement of the short-term program to date.

The short-term program consists of two parts: (a) develop an educational effort to inform seniors and their families of existing transportation services available in the region, and (b) assist in the development of pilot transportation programs to provide new or expanded services, which could be available by the end of 2004.

Discussion

Ongoing Technical Assistance

As the regional transportation planning, research, and information agency, SANDAG’s role related to senior transportation services is to provide general technical assistance to local jurisdictions and nonprofit agencies to develop self-sufficient and coordinated subregional transportation programs for seniors in the region. Over 130 specialized senior transportation programs, provided by various public, private, and nonprofit entities, exist throughout the region. The following are examples of technical assistance that SANDAG has and will continue to provide to enhance existing senior transportation programs, and to develop additional programs throughout the region:

Information Resources - SANDAG is required to designate and fund a Coordinated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA) under state law. SANDAG provides the staff and resources for the CTSA, which is a nonprofit corporation. CTSA provides information to local jurisdictions and nonprofit groups on existing transportation within the region (including services and fares, eligibility, and service areas), senior specific programs such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit system and senior discount fare program, and technical data and analysis for senior transportation services (including applicability, costs, benefits, and implementation requirements). Based on this information, local jurisdictions and nonprofit agencies are better able to identify the specific gaps in senior transportation services that should be filled to address their community’s needs. This information is provided by the CTSA at meetings held at the requests of the jurisdictions and nonprofit agencies in their communities.

Facilitation/Coordination - CTSA facilitates the coordination of all appropriate agencies and transportation providers into senior transportation networks for each subregional area, and hosts meetings to provide a forum for these networks to discuss unmet transportation needs and to
develop solutions to address these needs. Facilitating these networks ensures that services being
developed and operated by various agencies and organizations are coordinated, provided most cost
effectively, and are not duplicative. These networks also promote a sharing of ideas and lessons
learned to promote information dissemination on innovative approaches and concepts for these
specialized transportation services. The CTSA is assisted in these programs by its advisory
committee, the Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC), which is comprised of representatives of
nonprofit agencies providing transportation services to seniors and other clients throughout the
region.

Research/Analysis - SANDAG staff continues to research “best practices” for state and national
supplemental/alternative service concepts. SANDAG also supports the investigation of issues and
questions related to service provision including insurance requirements, compliance with related
laws and standards, costing of operations (such as vehicle leases, fuel, maintenance), and assists in
other analytical tasks (such as conducting background checks on volunteer drivers, investigating
opportunities to reduce operating costs, and other tasks as needed).

Marketing - The STRIDE Web site (www.stridesd.org) is the means through which nonprofit
agencies with transportation programs for seniors can provide service data and other marketing
information to agency staff serving seniors, the adult children of seniors (who frequently are the
caregivers), and to the seniors themselves. The STRIDE Web site is maintained by the CTSA
Coordinator, who is advised by a marketing subcommittee of the PCC.

Senior Service Fact Sheet

The short-term program approved by the Transportation Committee included conducting an
educational effort to inform seniors and their families of existing transportation services available in
the region. One barrier limiting seniors from accessing existing services is lack of information about
the programs. Therefore, a “Senior Transportation Fact Sheet” is being developed to provide an
overview of senior transportation services throughout the region, along with contact information
to request more detailed descriptions of each program. The front page of the Fact Sheet will briefly
describe existing transit, paratransit, and supplemental transportation programs that are available
to seniors in the region. Contact numbers will be listed on the reverse side for detailed information
for each of the various travel options. A draft Fact Sheet will be distributed to the Transportation
Committee at the June 18, 2004 meeting. The final Fact Sheet will be available to the public by
July 1.

Pilot Programs

As part of the short-term program, the Transportation Committee also directed staff to assist in
developing and evaluating the merits of three “pilot programs” with different service concepts.
The three programs are described below.

Oceanside Smart Shuttle - The City of Oceanside is proposing a door-to-door “Smart Shuttle”
service for senior residents in Oceanside, Vista, and Carlsbad. The program would operate
12 centrally dispatched shuttles accommodating from 6 to 18 passengers each. The program would
operate between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, with shorter hours on weekends. City
of Oceanside staff has held meetings with the staffs of Vista and Carlsbad and with representatives
of senior organizations to discuss the formation of the shuttle service. SANDAG has helped
facilitate coordination of interjurisdictional services and resources to promote and provide for cross-jurisdictional travel for seniors in these three adjacent cities.

Poway-Rancho Bernardo Volunteer Drivers Program - Two collaborating “volunteer driver” programs in Poway and Rancho Bernardo have been organized by nonprofit agencies. Volunteer drivers are reimbursed for mileage for driving seniors to medical appointments and other requested trips. The program in Rancho Bernardo is already operational and the one in Poway will begin by August. The agencies are using about $5,000 of their own funds for the reimbursement program. SANDAG has provided information and education on service options and concepts for these two programs, including ways to coordinate cross-jurisdictional services and travel.

Neighborhood Shared Ride Program - An existing program to help seniors contract for shared rides to a common destination, similar to vanpooling, has been successful in the southeast area of the City of San Diego. It is operated by All Congregations Together, which also operates transportation services under Welfare to Work programs in southeast San Diego and National City. SANDAG staff is providing technical assistance to All Congregations Together to continue and expand the program including investigating opportunities to reduce the operating costs. The analysis identified insurance, vehicle leasing, and fuel as being the most costly components of its operations. SANDAG staff is working with the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS), and the cities of San Diego and National City to identify opportunities to reduce costs of the program by purchasing fuel from the transit agency and/or local jurisdictions, and possibly leasing self-insured vehicles from the local jurisdictions.

Future Activities

SANDAG staff will continue to provide technical assistance to the three programs with the participation of the CTSA. This assistance will include providing information on existing and potential services for subregions, facilitation of meetings, promotion of coordinated efforts, and research into “best practices” and operating efficiencies.

The mid-term action plan to identify unmet transportation needs and develop solutions for each subregional area will be initiated in the beginning of FY 2005. The long-term program includes a mini-grant program to support the planning and development of innovative services (assuming voter approval of the TransNet Extension). SANDAG would develop and administer the mini-grants in support of locally initiated transportation solutions for seniors.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Conan Cheung, (619) 557-4582; conan.cheung@sdmts.com
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

June 18, 2004

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) CLAIM AMENDMENT FOR CITY OF EL CAJON

Introduction

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS, formally the Metropolitan Transit Development Board) submits one TDA claim per year on behalf of all operators in its service area. One of the operators, the City of El Cajon, has requested an amendment to the claim to use $10,000 from its unallocated TDA reserve for its mural project at the Transit Center on Marshall Avenue. The MTS Board, at its June 10, 2004, meeting approved amending its TDA claim to reflect the request from the City of El Cajon.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee approve the MTS claim amendment to allocate funds for a mural at the Marshall Avenue station.

Discussion

Senate Bill 521 (effective January 2003) consolidated all transit funding in the MTS service area. As a result, MTS submits one TDA claim on behalf of all operators in its service area. An agreement reached between MTS and the cities that previously received TDA funds, stipulates that any unused TDA balances held by the jurisdictions would be available for eligible TDA projects. The concept of the mural was developed by the City of El Cajon’s Arts and Culture Commission and would depict a history of transportation. The mural would be composed of ceramic tile and would be located on the walls flanking the staircase leading up to the trolley platform.

Staffs of both MTS and SANDAG have determined that the mural project for the Marshall Avenue Transit Center is an eligible use of TDA funds.

RENÉE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909; ski@sandag.org
FY 2005 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ALLOCATIONS

Introduction

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides \( \frac{1}{4} \) percent of the State sales tax for operating and capital support of public transportation systems and non-motorized transportation projects. SANDAG, as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), is responsible for the allocation of TDA funds to the region’s cities, the County, and transit operators.

This report presents the allocation requests for the TDA Article 3, Article 4, Article 4.5, and Article 8 claims, and one State Transit Assistance (STA) claim. Attachment 1 summarizes the funds available and the amount of claim by the different articles. Additional information regarding each of the claims is discussed below.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the final FY 2005 TDA allocations and the FY 2005 Productivity Improvement goals at its June 25, 2004 meeting.

Discussion

The recommended FY 2005 allocations are authorized under four separate articles of the TDA. Article 3 funds are designated for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Article 4 funds are used to provide general public transit services. Article 4.5 funds are designated for community transit services, and by SANDAG Board policy, are allocated within the San Diego region to support paratransit services required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Article 8 provides special provisions to support express bus and ferry services. Finally, the STA fund is a state program administered locally that provides additional support for public transit services. Claims under each category are discussed below. A summary of the FY 2005 claims is shown in Attachment 1.

Article 3 - Non-Motorized Claims (Bicycle and Pedestrian)

For FY 2005, $4,209,208 in TDA and TransNet-Bicycle funds are available ($2,187,513 in TDA, $2,021,515 in TransNet-B) for non-motorized projects. The Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG) recommends the allocation of $4,072,821 leaving a reserve balance of $136,207. The process for selecting bicycle and pedestrian projects have been updated to use criteria that support the regional transportation goals included in SANDAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan and Regional Transportation Plan. Project readiness, land use-transportation connectivity, cost effectiveness,
public safety improvements, and innovation in design were criteria used to prioritize projects. An analysis was also performed on all projects to determine their potential to serve concentrations of population, employment, and activity centers.

A total of 43 projects, estimated at $8,948,731 were submitted for consideration. Including three projects with prior funding commitments totaling $735,060 brings the total claim amount to $9,083,791 for FY 2005. The BPWG reviewed these projects using the new project selection criteria and has recommended 22 projects for funding. Due to flexibility in construction schedules, the BPWG recommends that two of these projects receive funding in future years to make more funds available for this claim cycle. The working group recommends that the $601,949 Escondido Creek Bike Path Undercrossing be funded evenly between FY 2006 and FY 2007 and that the $179,000 Bayshore Bikeway project be funded in FY 2006.

Additionally, there are several projects with prior year commitments that will be funded in FY 2005. These include $5,727 local match for three federally funded bicycle projects (Bayshore Bikeway, Coastal Rail Trail, and SR 15 Bikeway); $250,000 for the San Dieguito River Park Lake Hodges Bridge; and $479,333 local match for the federally funded Inland Rail Trail project. Attachment 2 presents a list of the TDA and TransNet non-motorized claims recommended for funding in FY 2005.

Article 4 - General Public (Fixed Transit Route)

For FY 2005, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) has available $74,518,355 in TDA funds of which $69,587,680 is requested for Article 4. The North County Transit District (NTCD) has a total of $41,202,345 available and has requested an allocation of $27,406,983 for Article 4. These allocations include the transfer of $8,559,040 to SANDAG for planning/administration and for local match for various capital projects transferred as part of the SB 1703.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99244, an operator can be allocated no more in FY 2005 than it was allocated in FY 2004, unless SANDAG determines that the operator made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvement recommendations adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors for the current fiscal year.

FY 2004 is the first full year in which the Productivity Improvement Program (PIP) was implemented for transit operators within the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS, formally Metropolitan Transit Development Board) area of jurisdiction. As part of the PIP, each operator is required to develop a list of Performance Improvements Recommendations (PIRs) for next fiscal year (FY 2005) that aim to improve their operational performance and move towards the goals established by SANDAG’s Regional Transit Vision. Operators are also responsible for monitoring the progress of prior year PIRs.

For fiscal year 2005 performance goals place greater emphasis on productivity, cost effectiveness, and schedule adherence. These performance improvement objectives fall into three categories: (1) productivity, (2) service efficiency, and (3) quality of service. The North County Transit District (NCTD) has in place its own performance measurements. SANDAG is currently working to incorporate NCTD into this new regional PIP process.

Attachment 3 shows performance goals for all operators and indicates whether they were met for FY 2004. Not all of the objectives were met. Productivity suffered as the result of lower ridership
due to several factors, including a fare increase (for operators in the MTS area), major wildfires in October of 2003, border crossing restrictions, the departure of military personnel to the Middle East and decline in tourist activity. Due to higher operating costs (increased liability and insurance and fuel costs), operators were unable to maintain their goal of keeping the cost per passenger to below the Consumer Price Index (CPI) of 4.05 percent. Given these factors and based on discussions with MTS operators and NCTD, staff believes that reasonable efforts were made toward achieving the established goals. Attachments 4 and 4a shows the proposed performance goals for FY 2005 which continue to focus on improvements in productivity, efficiency and quality of service. As stated above, NCTD has not yet joined in the PIP process; hence, NCTD’s goals are shown as a separate attachment.

Also, the productivity measurement (first objective listed in attachments 3 and 4) has changed from passengers per revenue mile in FY 2004 to passengers per revenue hour in FY 2005. Passenger productivity is measured in terms of both passengers per revenue mile and passengers per revenue hour, each providing a different assessment of productivity in different operating environments. As a result of agency consolidation, area operators agreed that passengers per revenue hour would provide a more comparable measure of passenger productivity across the region. However, individual transit operators will continue to measure passengers per revenue miles for analytical purposes.

MTS Area Services ($69,587,680): The total MTS claim for operators in its service area includes $56,551,577 in operating support for rail, fixed-route bus, and paratransit service and in administrative pass through to cities; $847,800 in capital support to match federal grants; and $4,779,803 for MTS planning and administrative activities. Also included are fund transfers to SANDAG for local match to MTS area capital projects that were transitioned to SANDAG ($4,848,500) and fund transfers to SANDAG for transferred administrative functions ($2,560,000). The MTS claim is subject to change pending resolution of outstanding audit issues related to National City Transit. It is likely that there will need to be some reimbursement of ineligible costs that were incurred in FY 2002.

The MTS area operators are estimated to carry approximately 73.6 million passengers over 27.9 million annual fixed route service miles. MTS is estimating a 1.5 percent increase in ridership but a slight decrease in revenue miles for FY 2005. Revenue miles are estimated to decrease from FY 2004 levels as a result of reduction in service for various unproductive routes.

MTS’ overall budget reflects a five percent increase in cost from FY 2004 including the start-up activities for Mission Valley East (MVE) LRT. The total increase is actually 3.5 percent when the MVE LRT start-up costs are excluded. The largest increases are due to energy (up 6 percent) and personnel (7.4 percent) costs. Risk Management, which accounted for the greatest increase in FY 2004, is projected to decrease by 8 percent.

NCTD Area Service ($27,406,983): The NCTD claim includes $25,781,867 in operating support for bus, rail, and demand response services, $194,735 to meet the ADA requirement for complementary paratransit service and $374,749 for capital projects to match FTA grants. Also included are fund transfers to SANDAG ($650,632 for capital projects and $405,000 for planning/administrative costs) associated with the SB 1703. Major capital projects include purchase of rolling stock, rail and bus equipment, and improvements to rail right-of-way. The majority of the capital support will be used to match the FTA grants.
NCTD’s budget reflects a seven percent increase in cost from FY 2004. The largest increases are services (up 300% from $5,000 to $23,000) for ADA related study, flash books, Braille and large print schedules, fringe benefits (31 percent) and salaries and wages (29 percent) due to reorganization and the addition of a special projects administrator for ADA.

The fixed-route, demand response and rail services are estimated to carry 12 million passengers over eight million annual service miles. Both are slight increases from FY 2004 projections.

Article 4.5 - Community Transit Service (Accessible Service for the Disabled)

Article 4.5 funds are allocated in the San Diego region to support demand response transit services required by ADA. By SANDAG Board policy, the funds are distributed between the two transit agencies in the region based upon service area population. These operations also are supported by one percent of the annual transit revenues in the TransNet program. MTS, NCTD, and the Coordinated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA) have filed claims for Article 4.5 funds as discussed below.

MTS Service Area ($3,311,551): This claim will support the accessible paratransit services, known as MTS Access in the central metropolitan area. Other operating support comes from fares and the TransNet program. Because ADA-mandated paratransit service is limited to those who cannot use regular fixed-route service, each customer must be certified as eligible users of this service.

NCTD Service Area ($1,338,925): This claim includes $1,273,686 for operating support, with an additional $65,239 for capital support. NCTD operates the LIFT, which provides service for ADA eligible riders in its service area. The capital funds will be used as the local match to purchase ADA service vehicles with FTA funds.

CTSA ($94,908): State law requires the formation of a regional agency to coordinate social service agency transportation programs. The CTSA in San Diego assists nearly 400 of the region’s nonprofit agencies to better manage transportation services for their clients through coordination, joint training, and other activities. The American Red Cross which had been the designated CTSA for the San Diego region since 1985, no longer provides this service. Effective January 1, 2003, the CTSA functions were transferred to SANDAG.

Under the Article 4.5 fund distribution formula, the CTSA is eligible to claim up to two percent of the Article 4.5 fund, and the CTSA’s claim represent the entire two percent. The CTSA’s activities during FY 2005 will include providing information and referral service for persons seeking transportation, providing technical assistance to social service agencies on transportation issues, and continuing its efforts to match agencies that have resources with other agencies in need of transportation services.

Article 8 - Special Provisions (Express Bus, Ferry)

MTS ($1,619,124): This claim provides operating support for the express bus ($1,488,000) and ferry services ($131,124). The express bus service includes commuter service on I-15 to downtown San Diego from the City of Poway and the communities of Rancho Bernardo and Rancho Penasquitos, from the Cities of El Cajon and Santee to Kearny Mesa. The City of Coronado operates passenger ferry service by subsidizing trips to and from downtown San Diego to Coronado and North Island.
NCTD State Transit Assistance Funds (STA) Claim: $1,538,889

For FY 2005, the State Controller has estimated that $1,538,889 in State Transit Assistance (STA) funds will be available for allocation by SANDAG to eligible operators in the SANDAG area. The SANDAG area, as defined under the STA program, consists of the area outside of the MTS area of jurisdiction. For FY 2005, NCTD is the only claimant of STA funds in the SANDAG area. The entire claim will be used for capital support.

RENÉE WASMUND
Director of Finance
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Transit System</th>
<th>North County Transit District</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>Bicycle and Pedestrian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005 Available Apportionment (includes prior year carryover)</td>
<td>$74,518,355</td>
<td>$41,202,345</td>
<td>$8,559,040</td>
<td>$4,209,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005 Claims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 3 - Non-Motorized (bicycle and pedestrian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 4 - General Public Transit Operations/Capital</td>
<td>($57,399,377)</td>
<td>($26,351,351)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Planning/Administration</td>
<td>($4,779,803)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Transfer to SANDAG</td>
<td>($4,848,500)</td>
<td>($650,632)</td>
<td>($5,499,132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative/Planning Transfer to SANDAG</td>
<td>($2,560,000)</td>
<td>($405,000)</td>
<td>($2,965,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 4.5 - Community Transit Service Operators (accessible service for the disabled)</td>
<td>($3,311,551)</td>
<td>($1,338,925)</td>
<td>($94,908)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 8 - Special Provisions Express bus</td>
<td>($1,488,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry service</td>
<td>($131,024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Balance</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$12,456,437</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$136,207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 2005 TDA/TransNet Non-Motorized Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Claim</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Moss St Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>Jefferson Ave to Fourth Ave</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$502,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>H Street Sidewalk</td>
<td>Hidden Vista Dr to Del Rey Blvd</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$460,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>F Street/Hilltop Dr Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>First Ave to Center Dr</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$226,103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>I Street Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>First Ave to Hilltop Dr</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$131,516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Plaza Bonita Road Bike Path</td>
<td>Bonita Mesa Road to Bonita Road</td>
<td>bike path</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Marilla Dr Sidewalk</td>
<td>Woodside Ave to Waterhill Rd</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Pasadena Ave Sidewalk</td>
<td>Elder St to Ivy St</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Trans-County Trail Study</td>
<td>Highway 67 Underpass</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>North Beach Pedestrian Crossings</td>
<td>Camino Del Mar at 25th St and 29th St</td>
<td>sidewalk/crossing</td>
<td>$434,930</td>
<td>$434,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>Downtown Streetscape (Phase 2)</td>
<td>K St to Swami’s</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$173,631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Encinitas Blvd/Railroad Crossing</td>
<td>sidewalk/crossing</td>
<td>$115,558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Regal Road</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$112,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Study</td>
<td>North Vulcan Ave</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>Class III Bicycle Signs</td>
<td>Balour and Bonita Dr</td>
<td>signage</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path Undercrossing</td>
<td>Ash S/ SR 78</td>
<td>bike path</td>
<td>$601,949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Bicycle Facilities Master Plan Update</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>$56,274</td>
<td>$56,274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path Alignment Study</td>
<td>Transit Center to Broadway</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>$12,770</td>
<td>$12,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>SR 75 Bike Spur Project</td>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway to Rainbow Dr</td>
<td>bike path</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Walkability Study</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mt Vernon Sidewalk and Speed Table</td>
<td>Skyline Dr to school</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$285,078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Broadway lighted crosswalk</td>
<td>Between Lemon Grove Ave and Grove St</td>
<td>sidewalk/crossing</td>
<td>$51,465</td>
<td>$51,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway Plan Update</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway Project</td>
<td>bike path</td>
<td>$179,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bicycle Lockers Program</td>
<td>parking</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Bird Rock Ped Facilities and Circulation</td>
<td>La Jolla Blvd - Camino de la Costa to Sea Ridge</td>
<td>sidewalk/bike lane</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Rose Creek Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Lee St to Mission Bay Dr</td>
<td>bike path</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Via de la Valle widening</td>
<td>San Andreas Dr to El Camino</td>
<td>bike lane</td>
<td>$358,722</td>
<td>$358,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Balboa Ave/Tierrasanta Blvd bike lanes and bike route</td>
<td>Morena Blvd to Santo Road</td>
<td>bike lane</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Shool Creek School Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Ted Williams Parkway at Shool Creek Drive</td>
<td>pedestrian bridge</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Mira Mesa Blvd Bikeway Project</td>
<td>Parkdale aver to Scripps Ranch Blvd</td>
<td>bike lane</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>54th St and Euclid Ave Bike Lanes and Bike Route</td>
<td>Trojan Ave to Market St</td>
<td>bike lane</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Fairmount Ave/Camino del Rio South Traffic Signal and</td>
<td>Camino del Rio South to Montezuma</td>
<td>bike lane</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FY 2005 TDA/TransNet Non-Motorized Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Claim</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Beyer/East Beyer Blvd Bikeway Project</td>
<td>Dairy Mart Rd to San Ysidro Blvd</td>
<td>bike lane</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Rose Creek Bicycle Path design study</td>
<td>North Mission Bay Dr to Mission Bay Dr</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>Fairmount Ave Bike Path Retaining Wall</td>
<td>North of Montezuma</td>
<td>bike path</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Oceanside to Escondido Rail Trail</td>
<td>Pacific St to Buena Creek Station</td>
<td>bike path</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Pedestrian Rail Crossing</td>
<td>Mission Road and Marcos St at Autumn Dr</td>
<td>sidewalk/</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Las Flores sidewalks</td>
<td>Grand Ave to Isty St</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$178,068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Linda Vista sidewalks</td>
<td>Rancho Santa Fe Road to Las Flores Dr</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
<td>$118,803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Local match for TEA-21 CMAQ funded projects</td>
<td>Various projects*</td>
<td>path</td>
<td>$5,727</td>
<td>$5,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Lake Hodges Bridge (Year 2 of a 2-year commitment)</td>
<td>Coast to Crest Trail to West Bernardo Dr.</td>
<td>bridge</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Inland Rail Trail - Local match for CMAQ (Year 1 of a 3-year commitment)</td>
<td>Various projects</td>
<td>path</td>
<td>$479,333</td>
<td>$479,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Claims: $9,083,791

Total Recommended Allocations: $2,124,887
Recommended Reserves: $62,626
Total FY 2005 Funding: $2,187,513
Available Funding:
FY 2005 Funds: $2,086,683
Prior Year Carry-over: $100,830
Total Available Funding: $2,187,513

(1) To be funded at $601,949 in FY 2006 and FY 2007 with TransNet Bicycle Program funds.
(2) To be funded at $179,000 in FY 2006 with TransNet Bicycle Program funds.
*Bayshore Bikeway, Coastal Rail Trail, and SR 15 Bikway projects
## MTDB Objectives (Fixed Route)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Productivity</td>
<td>Passengers per Revenue Mile</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Service Efficiency</td>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger (below CPI 4.05%)</td>
<td>$1.71</td>
<td>$1.96</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery Ratio (increase from prior year)</td>
<td>43.00%</td>
<td>43.09%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51.91%</td>
<td>51.40%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.19%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60.42%</td>
<td>62.63%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54.68%</td>
<td>53.77%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of Service</td>
<td>On-Time Performance</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Completed Trips</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Service Effectiveness: Passengers per Population MTDB area ridership to grow at a rate faster than that of MTDB area</td>
<td>Objective Met?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MTDB service area population grew by less than one percent, but ridership fell by 5.1 percent.</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>
</tbody>
</table>

## MTS Objectives (Demand Response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>FY 2004 Goal</th>
<th>FY 2004 Estimate</th>
<th>Objective Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Productivity</td>
<td>Passengers per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Service Efficiency</td>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger (below CPI 4.05%)</td>
<td>$12.44</td>
<td>$12.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery Ratio (increase from prior year)</td>
<td>9.35%</td>
<td>16.93%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of Service</td>
<td>On-Time Performance</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Completed Trips</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NCTD Objectives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>FY 2004 Goal</th>
<th>FY 2004 Estimate</th>
<th>Objective Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Productivity</td>
<td>Passengers per Revenue Mile</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Service Efficiency</td>
<td>Operating Cost Revenue Mile (below CPI 3.25%)</td>
<td>$7.14</td>
<td>$5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery Ratio (increase from prior year)</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These objectives are slightly different from the MTDB Productivity Improvement Program

FY 2004 estimates are based on the first six months of data (July to December 2003)
## Objectives

Chula Vista Transit

MTDB Contract (Fixed Route)ⁱ

MTDB Contract (DAR)²

SD Transit

SD Trolley

National City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Chula Vista Transit</th>
<th>MTDB Contract (Fixed Route)¹</th>
<th>MTDB Contract (DAR)²</th>
<th>SD Transit</th>
<th>SD Trolley</th>
<th>National City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passengers per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>188.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Service Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Total Passenger</td>
<td>Limited to CPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery Ratio</td>
<td>Increase from prior year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Time Performance</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>98.30%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Completed Trips</td>
<td>99.80%</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
<td>99.80%</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Service Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passengers per Population</td>
<td>To grow at a rate faster than that of the MTS area population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Fixed Route Contract Services includes former County Transit System (CTS) Suburban, Express, and Poway Service.
²Demand Response Contract Services includes former CTS Rural, East County DAR, DART/FLEX, and Sorrento Valley Coaster Connection
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) TRIENNIAL PERFORMANCE AUDIT

Introduction

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires that once every three years SANDAG, as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), commission a performance audit of each transit operator receiving TDA funds. An audit of the RTPA is also required. This audit period takes place prior to SB 1703 (FY 2001 through FY 2003) when the Metropolitan Transit System was the Metropolitan Development Board (MTDB) which performed certain TDA administration functions for operators in its service area. The administrative role performed by MTDB will be referred as SANDAG for purposes of this report. The conclusions and recommendations for the SANDAG performance audit, along with an overview of the transit operators' audits are included in Attachment 1. Copies of the final performance audits are available upon request.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the Executive Director to:

1. Transmit the performance audit report of SANDAG to the Director of the State Department of Transportation as required;

2. Implement the performance audit recommendations pertaining to SANDAG's TDA activities; and,

3. Transmit the other recommendations to the transit operators for implementation.

Discussion

By law, the performance audits of transit operators must be conducted by an independent entity. For this performance audit, SANDAG entered into an agreement with the firm of Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc. (BAH), to carry out the performance audit program. The operators included in these performance audits are: Chula Vista Transit, MTS Contract Services, National City Transit, North County Transit District (NCTD), San Diego Transit Corporation, and San Diego Trolley, Inc.

In addition, BAH conducted a performance audit of SANDAG as the administrator of the TDA program. The consultant prepared draft reports and submitted them to each operator and agency for comment. Those comments were incorporated into the final performance audits where appropriate. The transit operator performance audits were based on an analysis of various performance indicators (such as operating cost per hour and passengers per mile) over the three-year period of FY 2001, FY 2002, and FY 2003. In addition, key personnel at each system were interviewed by the
auditors in order to better understand the goals and objectives of each system, its operating characteristics, and factors which might influence its performance. Based on the performance indicator analysis and other information, the auditors developed conclusions and recommendations for each transit operator which are included in the final Performance Audit report.

The auditors found that all operators were in compliance with the requirements of the TDA. One of the major changes during the audit period was the divestiture of transit service by the County of San Diego (County Transit System) to the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS formally the Metropolitan Transit Development Board) beginning with FY 2003. The former County transit lines are included as part of the Contract Services audit. In general, performance trends showed declining efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity for the region’s fixed-route operators while the demand-response service showed improvements over the audit period. These performance trends are discussed as part of the Executive Summary in Attachment 1. In each case, the auditors provided recommendations for improving performance.

The audit of SANDAG resulted in four recommendations:

1. SANDAG should continue to focus efforts to achieve increased efficiencies and ensure effective communication following the consolidation.

2. SANDAG should work with MTS and NCTD to establish a coordinated strategy for developing and delivering transit services throughout the region by incorporating both the operators’ service delivery objectives and SANDAG’s regional goals and objectives within the regional Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP).

3. SANDAG should work with transit operators to develop a common performance improvement and reporting program, tied to TDA requirements, that incorporates incentives/disincentives or other means to ensure compliance with the program.

4. SANDAG should coordinate with MTS and NCTD and assist them in efforts to improve transit marketing programs.

As SANDAG moves forward as the new Consolidated Agency under the auspices of SB 1703, roles and responsibilities between SANDAG and the transit operators will be better defined with increased communication. It is anticipated that recommendation numbers 1, 2, and 3 can be implemented within the next year while making progress on recommendation number 4, subject to budgetary constraints.

RENÉE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909; ski@sandag.org
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Introduction

TDA TRIENNIAL PERFORMANCE AUDITS ARE A STATE REQUIREMENT

- Triennial performance audits are a requirement for the continued receipt of State Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds for public transit under California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99246.

- Booz Allen Hamilton Inc. was retained by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) to conduct the State-required transit operator and Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) performance audits for the period from July 1, 2000, through June 30, 2003 (i.e., Fiscal Years 2001, 2002 and 2003).

- Performance audits have been prepared for six operators:
  - San Diego Transit Corporation
  - North County Transit District
  - Chula Vista Transit
  - National City Transit
  - MTS Contract Services
  - San Diego Trolley, Inc.

- A performance audit was also conducted of the San Diego Association of Governments as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and Metropolitan Transit Development Board.
PERFORMANCE AUDITS ARE INTENDED TO PROVIDE USEFUL AND OBJECTIVE ASSESSMENTS

• The scope of the Performance Audit Program for the San Diego Region was designed to meet State requirements. It includes assessments of:
  - progress to implement prior audit recommendations
  - compliance with the California State Public Utilities Code (PUC)
  - effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of operations

• In addition, the performance audits should provide information useful to the transit agencies and the RTPA for assessing and improving the efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity of the services they provide.

• SANDAG should be able to use the performance audit results to:
  - satisfy State requirements
  - provide clear direction that enables SANDAG to verify that each transit operator is making satisfactory progress in implementing recommendations and improving effectiveness, efficiency and productivity

• Opportunities to further improve operating efficiency and effectiveness have been identified

THIS EXECUTIVE SUMMARY DISCUSSES AUDIT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOTH THE TRANSIT OPERATORS AND THE RTPA
Prior Audit Recommendations

TRANSIT OPERATORS ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE PUC REQUIREMENTS

- All transit operators in the San Diego region are in full compliance with applicable state PUC requirements, including:
  - PUC Section 99246 (d) which requires that operators give consideration to the needs and types of passengers served, including students, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities.
  - PUC Section 99314.5 (c), which specifies that transit agencies that receive State Transit Assistance (STA) funds shall not be precluded from employing part-time drivers or contracting with private carriers for service provision.
  - PUC Section 99244, which states that, at a minimum, transit operators are required to show a reasonable effort to implement productivity improvement recommendations made in the prior performance audit.

- Of the 36 recommendations made by the prior performance audit for the ten transit systems that were then in operation, four are no longer relevant. Of the rest, 28 have been fully implemented and four have been partially implemented (see Table 1):

---

In July 2002, the County of San Diego divested all of its CTS transit services to MTS. MTS now oversees the delivery of all transit services formerly operated as MTDB Contract Services, CTS (including Suburban Service, Rural Service, and Poway Service) and La Mesa Dial-A-Ride.
## TABLE 1
STATUS OF PRIOR AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATOR</th>
<th>Number of Prior Audit Recommendations</th>
<th>Fully Implemented</th>
<th>In Progress or Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>No Longer Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista Transit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Multimodal Services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City Transit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Transit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Trolley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DURING THE AUDIT PERIOD, MTDB CONTRACT SERVICES ASSUMED RESPONSIBILITY FOR COUNTY TRANSIT SERVICES

- In July 2002, the County of San Diego divested all of its CTS transit services to MTDB Contract Services (now MTS Multimodal Services).

- All former MTDB Contract Services and CTS transit services are now overseen by a single entity, MTS Contract Services, which is responsible for:
  - MTS 900 Series (formerly MTDB Contract Services): 28 routes serving the City of San Diego and nearby communities
  - MTS 900 Series Flex: four route deviation services that pick passengers up and drop them off up to ¼-mile from the scheduled route
  - MTS 800 Series (CTS East County Suburban): routes serving El Cajon, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Santee, and unincorporated areas of Lakeside and Spring Valley
  - MTS 800 Series Flex: three route deviation services that pick passengers up and drop them off up to ¼-mile from the scheduled route
  - MTS Poway (formerly CTS Poway): fixed routes in the City of Poway, Rancho Bernardo, and Rancho Penasquitos
  - MTS Express (formerly CTS Express) – five commuter express routes
  - MTS Rural (formerly CTS Rural): fixed and route-deviation routes that serve rural areas of San Diego County

EACH OF THE SERVICES OPERATED BY MTS MULTIMODAL SERVICES IS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY IN THE FOLLOWING PERFORMANCE TREND ASSESSMENT
### TABLE 2
**FIXED-ROUTE OPERATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Route Operators</th>
<th>Cost per Hour FY03</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Cost per Passenger FY03</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Passengers per Hour FY03</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Passengers per Mile FY03</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>VSH per FTE FY03</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista Transit</td>
<td>$53.40</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>$1.78</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Multi-Modal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 Series</td>
<td>$51.63</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>$1.72</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 Series Flex</td>
<td>$34.44</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>$2.61</td>
<td>-21.0%</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 Series</td>
<td>$49.72</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>$2.65</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 Series Flex</td>
<td>$37.49</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>$4.58</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>$48.52</td>
<td>-12.2%</td>
<td>$3.34</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td>$167.90</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>$7.56</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>$103.31</td>
<td>128.0%</td>
<td>$14.97</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>117.4%</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>-46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City Transit</td>
<td>$58.78</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District - Bus</td>
<td>$79.21</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>$3.80</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District - Coaster</td>
<td>$2,040.93</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
<td>$9.18</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>222.4</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Transit</td>
<td>$72.52</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>$2.29</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Trolley</td>
<td>$107.43</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>-20.5%</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Hours and miles for Coaster and Trolley are train hours and miles.
- Percent change is from the base year, FY00, to FY03.
ON THE WHOLE, PERFORMANCE TRENDS SHOWED DECLINING EFFICIENCY, EFFECTIVENESS, AND PRODUCTIVITY\(^2\) (See Table 2)

- Using cost per hour as a measurement of **cost efficiency**, two of the MTS services and the Coaster experienced decreases in cost per hour. Three more operators, including SDTC and SDTI, held increases in this indicator below the 14.9 percent inflation rate from FY 00 to FY 03. Cost per hour increases exceeded the inflation rate at Chula Vista Transit, National City Transit, NCTD-Bus, and three of the MTS services.

- Cost per passenger measures **cost effectiveness**. Using this measure, four of the MTS services and the Coaster held their cost increases below the growth in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). The remaining operators reported increases in excess of inflation.

- **Service productivity** is measured by passengers per hour and passengers per mile. Only three operators (all MTS operations) showed improved productivity for both of these indicators. Two more MTS operations and NCTD-Bus experienced improvements in boardings per mile. Service productivity fell for the remaining operators.

- **Labor productivity**, is measured by vehicle service hours per full-time equivalent employee. National City Transit, the Coaster, and SDTI, along with three of the MTS operations, experienced improved performance in this indicator.

- It should be noted that two of the MTS operations (900 Series Flex and Poway) showed improvement in all areas of performance.

\(^2\) Details of these performance trends are included in the individual transit operator performance audits
Among demand response operators, DART’s cost performance remained below the inflation rate while North County experienced improved labor productivity (See Table 3)

- **Cost efficiency**, measured by cost per hour, improved only for MTS’ DART service, which held its increase to 11.7 percent, under the 14.6 percent growth in the inflation rate. NCTD’s FAST and LIFT services both exceeded the inflation rate.

- **Cost effectiveness** (i.e., cost per passenger), also improved for MTS' DART service and fell for NCTD’s FAST and LIFT services.

- **Service productivity** is measured by passengers per hour and passengers per mile. MTS’ DART service experienced an improvement in passengers per hour, but a drop in passengers per mile. NCTD’s service productivity fell for both performance measures.

- **Labor productivity** (i.e., vehicle service hours per full-time equivalent) improved for both of NCTD’s services, but declined for MTS’ DART service.
### TABLE 3
DEMAND RESPONSE OPERATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand Response Operators</th>
<th>Cost per Hour FY03</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Cost per Passenger FY03</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Passengers per Hour FY03</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Passengers per Mile FY03</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>VSH per FTE FY03</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS Multi-Modal Services (DART)</td>
<td>$37.39</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>$12.44</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District - FAST</td>
<td>$44.07</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>$7.72</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>-20.4%</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-18.0%</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District - LIFT</td>
<td>$49.76</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>$25.74</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI Increase from FY00 to FY03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Percent change is from the base year, FY00, to FY03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations – Transit Operators

RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED FOR THE TRANSIT OPERATORS CONSIDERATION ARE INTENDED TO ADDRESS PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY AND PRODUCTIVITY

• Recommendations are generally categorized in six areas:
  – Performance oversight and reporting: 4
  – Cost management: 4
  – Service improvements/ridership: 2
  – Regional consolidation: 2
  – Capital needs: 1
  – Coordination with City: 1

• In some cases, recommendations are carried over from the prior audit

• In general, the recommendations reflect concerns about ridership and cost trends, and continuing concerns that data should be reported more accurately and that performance monitoring should be a priority for all operators to ensure efficient, effective and productive performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS ARE SUMMARIZED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES
## SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATOR</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chula Vista Transit            | • Work closely with the new contractor to control growth in operating costs  
                                 | • Look for ways to implement service enhancements within available financial resources                                                                                                                    |
| MTS – Multimodal Services      | • Separate capital costs and vehicle lease costs from purchased transportation costs  
                                 | • Work with SANDAG to establish a process for reconciliation of B-10/B-11 performance data                                                                                                                   |
| National City Transit          | • Coordinate and work more closely with City staff  
                                 | • Make a concerted effort to identify opportunities to attract additional riders  
                                 | • Work to control growth in operating costs                                                                                                      |
| North County Transit District  | • Leverage data management and reporting capabilities to further improve performance reporting  
                                 | • Continue to identify opportunities to reduce costs or improve cost efficiency  
                                 | • Work with SANDAG to clarify impacts and implications of the regional consolidation for NCTD and its participation in the Performance Improvement Program |
| San Diego Transit Corp.        | • Document external reporting requirements and procedures, and work with SANDAG to establish a process for reconciliation of B-10 performance data  
                                 | • Work with MTS to further clarify and refine the organizational structure of the restructured MTS in light of ongoing organizational changes between MTS and SANDAG |
| San Diego Trolley Inc.         | • Work with SANDAG and MTS to assure that capital needs are met  
                                 | • Document external reporting requirements and procedures, and work with SANDAG to establish a process for reconciliation of B-12 performance data                                                  |

---

3 Detailed recommendations are included in the individual performance audit reports.
SANDAG – PUC Compliance

SANDAG’S COMPLIANCE AND PERFORMANCE RESULTS ARE POSITIVE

• **Compliance** – SANDAG is full compliance with all but two of the State PUC requirements for Regional Transportation Planning Agencies:
  - SANDAG is in partial compliance with the requirement to make a finding that operators have made “reasonable efforts” to implement productivity improvements prior to allocating an increase in TDA funding. No such finding was made for the FY 03 TDA claims because SANDAG was working with the MTS operators to develop meaningful performance indicators. However, NCTD was not part of that effort and SANDAG should have made a finding specific to NCTD.
  - SANDAG is responsible for ensuring that its claimants have submitted annual fiscal and compliance reports to the State Controller within 180 days after the end of the fiscal year. SANDAG is in partial compliance because many of the audits have not been completed within that timeframe.

• **Prior Audit Recommendations** – SANDAG has implemented two of the three recommendations from the prior audit and achieved the intent of the third.
  - MTDB should development and implement meaningful productivity improvement program: MTDB implemented the Productivity Improvement Program (PIP).
  - SANDAG should update its performance monitoring activities by updating reporting guidelines: SANDAG has revised various reporting forms to better review performance.
SANDAG – PUC Compliance

SANDAG'S COMPLIANCE AND PERFORMANCE RESULTS ARE POSITIVE (CONTINUED)

- SANDAG should work with MTDB and NCTD to automate data reporting: SANDAG developed web-based reporting for operators but concluded that it would be difficult to implement especially in light of the PIP which collects more comprehensive data submitted to MTDB via spreadsheets.
SANDAG EFFECTIVELY ACCOMPLISHES ITS TDA RESPONSIBILITIES

- **TDA Administration** – SANDAG’s RTPA administration and management activities support the requirements of the Transportation Development Act and effectively meet TDA claimants’ needs. Staff have been working to update policies and procedures (e.g., Policy 27 and SANDAG’s *TDA Claim Guidelines*) to accommodate the organizational changes brought about by the consolidation, but some roles and responsibilities are still being clarified.

- **Claimant Relations and Transit Productivity Oversight** – During the audit period, MTDB and the MTS operators worked together to implement a more meaningful performance improvement program. Next steps will include implementing the program regionwide. With the consolidation, the program should be extended to include the North County Transit District (NCTD).

- **Transportation Planning and Regional Coordination** – SANDAG is responsible for transportation planning and efforts to ensure regional coordination of transportation services, but works closely with the transit operators and other entities in this process. Long-term planning was expanded during the audit period and included the development of a Regional Transit Vision, the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, the Regional Comprehensive Plan (which is scheduled to be adopted in July 2004), the first Regional Short-Range Transit Plan, and the bi-annual Regional Transportation Improvement
Program. MTDB and NCTD also implemented their strategic business plans during this period. As part of the RTP development, particular efforts were made to ensure that the Plan was responsive to concerns that the previous plan did not adequately provide for performance measurement.
SANDAG EFFECTIVELY ACCOMPLISHES ITS TDA RESPONSIBILITIES (CONTINUED)

• **Marketing and Transportation Alternatives** – While SANDAG is not directly responsible for marketing, its market research benefits the region's operators. Further marketing efforts may be merited to assist the operators in expanding their locally focused marketing efforts to address the region-wide mobility envisioned by the San Diego Regional Transportation Consolidation Act and the Regional Transportation Plan. Additional SANDAG programs include the regional rideshare program, a guaranteed ride home program, funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and the recently-developed design guidelines for pedestrian mobility, safety, and accessibility.

• **Grants Applications and Management** – SANDAG provides concurrence in grant applications, ensures that projects are programmed in the RTIP, holds public hearings for formula grants and TIP amendments, and administers and monitors expenditures of TEA funds.
SANDAG/MTDB – Recommendations

FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS ARE OFFERED FOR SANDAG’S CONSIDERATION

1. SANDAG should continue to focus efforts to achieve increased efficiencies and ensure effective communication following the consolidation.

2. SANDAG should work with MTS and NCTD to establish a coordinated strategy for developing and delivering transit services throughout the region, by incorporating both the operators’ service delivery objectives and SANDAG’s regional goals and objectives within the Regional Short Range Transit Plan.

3. SANDAG should work with transit operators to develop a common performance improvement and reporting program, tied to TDA requirements, that incorporates incentives/disincentives or other means to ensure compliance with the program.

4. SANDAG should coordinate with MTS and NCTD and assist them in efforts to improve transit marketing programs.
DRAFT 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP)

Introduction

SANDAG, serving as the region’s Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), is required by state and federal law to develop and adopt a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) every two years. The RTIP is a multi-year program of proposed major highway, arterial, transit, and nonmotorized projects, including the TransNet Program of Projects. The current 2002 RTIP was adopted by the SANDAG Board on June 28, 2002, and covers the five-year period FY 2002/03 through FY 2006/07. The 2004 RTIP is a $4.8 billion program for highway, transit, local street, and road and other projects.

Of the $4.8 billion program total (see Attachment 1), $2.5 billion is allocated for highway projects, including the I-15 Managed Lanes/Bus Rapid Transit project, SR 56, SR 905, and the SR 125 Toll Road. For transit, the $1.5 billion allocation includes Mission Valley East and the Sprinter rail projects, Fare Technology (Smart Card), and other projects such as vehicle purchases and various infrastructure rehabilitation projects. Local Street and Road ($703 million) and other miscellaneous projects ($134 million) such as Bicycle/Pedestrian and Transportation Demand Management projects make up the rest of the 2004 RTIP. Federal and state funds account for more than 66 percent of project funding.

A major component of the RTIP includes the state and federally funded transportation projects approved by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The CTC normally adopts the 2004 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) in April of each even-numbered year. However, due to the uncertainty in both federal and state transportation funding, the CTC has delayed the adoption of the 2004 STIP until August 5, 2004, four days after the 2004 RTIP is due to the State. The Transportation Committee recommended and the Board adopted SANDAG’s 2004 STIP at its meeting on February 27, 2004, which included the use of Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) bonds to complete major transportation projects. However, the CTC later requested that SANDAG revise its 2004 STIP without assuming any GARVEE financing as the Commission would not make any decisions on the GARVEE program until after it adopts the 2004 STIP at its meeting on August 5, 2004. As a result, the Board adopted a revised 2004 STIP (Option A) at its May 28, 2004, meeting. The draft 2004 RTIP includes this revised 2004 STIP. The final 2004 RTIP is due to the State by August 1, 2004.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to accept for review and distribution the Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Improvement Program including its Air Quality Conformity Analysis and the draft Air Quality re-determination of the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP; and schedule a public hearing for July 16, 2004.
Discussion

RTIP Content

Federal and state regulations identify the process and required content of the RTIP. In general, the RTIP must include all major projects receiving certain categories of federal or state transportation funding, projects needing federal project approval, and/or projects identified as being regionally significant. This includes projects funded by the federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program, Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) program, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula and discretionary programs and other federal sources, as well as projects funded by the STIP and SHPO. The RTIP also includes the TransNet Program of Projects.

Background

On January 9, 2004, SANDAG sent out a memorandum to all local agencies requesting project submittals for the 2004 RTIP. Submittals were to include new projects, project deletions, or changes in existing programmed project scope, funding or phasing. The project listings were due to SANDAG by March 5, 2004. Staff has reviewed the projects and conducted the required air quality conformity analysis for the 2004 RTIP. In addition, SANDAG is required to re-determine conformity of the 2030 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the new emissions budgets approved by the United States (US) Environmental Protection Agency in July 2003.

The 2002 RTIP allocated all federal funds (CMAQ, RSTP, TEA) available through the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). Although no new transportation bill has passed, the RTIP assumes continuation of these programs, and Caltrans has provided the program revenue estimates. The draft 2004 RTIP does not assume any federal discretionary programs (i.e., Corridors and Borders Infrastructure, High Priority, etc.) apart from that already committed by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs) for the Mission Valley East Light Rail Transit Extension and the Sprinter. When a federal reauthorization bill passes and should the CTC approve GARVEE financing for some or all of the projects requested by SANDAG, an RTIP amendment process will be initiated to program the additional funds.

Air Quality Conformity Requirements

Federal regulations require that SANDAG conduct an air quality conformity analysis of all regionally significant projects that increase the transportation system capacity. This includes major local and privately funded projects and any other state or federally funded projects that might not otherwise appear in the RTIP, as well as new projects or major changes in project scope for existing programmed projects.

The draft quantitative emissions analyses for the 2004 RTIP and for the re-determination for the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP have been conducted, and draft results indicate that the 2004 RTIP and the 2030 RTP meet the air quality conformity requirements. The draft Regional Emissions Analysis and Modeling Procedures report was distributed for public review on June 9, 2004. Written comments are due to SANDAG by July 16, 2004. The San Diego Region Conformity Working Group (CWG) is scheduled to review the draft air quality conformity assessment at its June 16, 2004, meeting. The CWG will be providing comments throughout the RTIP process.
Schedule

Should the Transportation Committee accept the staff recommendation, the Draft 2004 RTIP will be distributed for public review and comment, and a public hearing will be held at the next Transportation Committee meeting on July 16, 2004. Pending the Transportation Committee’s action, the Board of Directors will be requested to adopt the final 2004 RTIP at its July 23, 2004, meeting.

RENÉE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Attachment/Enclosure

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909; ski@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Overall Work Program #40003

Note: A copy of the draft 2004 Regional Transportation Improvement Program report is available via SANDAG’s Web site at www.sandag.org\2004rtip. Hard copies may also be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Publications Hotline at (888) 707-7827.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>TransNet</th>
<th>Local/ Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 (HOV/Added Lanes/Auxiliary Lanes)</td>
<td>$18,763</td>
<td>$128,186</td>
<td>$358</td>
<td>$12,037</td>
<td>$159,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 (Managed Lanes-Freeway including debt service)*</td>
<td>$53,227</td>
<td>$537,039</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$590,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 (SR 125 to SR 67)</td>
<td>$19,800</td>
<td>$215,435</td>
<td>$44,340</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$279,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56 (Carmel Country Road to Black Mountain Road)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$86,116</td>
<td>$26,100</td>
<td>$888</td>
<td>$113,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125 (Toll Road, Gap &amp; Connector)</td>
<td>$115,984</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,596</td>
<td>$332,946</td>
<td>$471,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 905 (I-805 to Otay Mesa Border Crossing)</td>
<td>$67,002</td>
<td>$142,614</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$213,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management Systems</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 241 Toll Road</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$257,360</td>
<td>$257,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Replacement &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$49,594</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,378</td>
<td>$60,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operations Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>$134,355</td>
<td>$18,715</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$153,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Highway Projects</td>
<td>$32,473</td>
<td>$91,266</td>
<td>$5,424</td>
<td>$888</td>
<td>$138,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Highway Projects</strong></td>
<td>$491,198</td>
<td>$1,243,871</td>
<td>$102,818</td>
<td>$623,507</td>
<td>$2,461,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley East Light Rail Project</td>
<td>$340,185</td>
<td>$72,829</td>
<td>$80,806</td>
<td>$2,047</td>
<td>$495,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside-Encinitas Rail Extension</td>
<td>$157,000</td>
<td>$104,200</td>
<td>$90,320</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$351,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Bus Rapid Transit (Rolling Stock/Stations)</td>
<td>$23,132</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td>$7,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$59,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Coast Corridor Project</td>
<td>$1,159</td>
<td>$19,791</td>
<td>$16,371</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$37,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Fare Technology</td>
<td>$18,220</td>
<td>$20,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td>$39,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/Rail Vehicles Purchase</td>
<td>$40,269</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,887</td>
<td>$71,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/Rail Infrastructure</td>
<td>$62,892</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$2,264</td>
<td>$14,446</td>
<td>$81,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Rail Projects</td>
<td>$11,892</td>
<td>$35,214</td>
<td>$6,439</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$53,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Transit Projects (Operations/Planning)</td>
<td>$134,803</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$130,526</td>
<td>$34,096</td>
<td>$299,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Transit Projects</strong></td>
<td>$789,552</td>
<td>$303,634</td>
<td>$333,826</td>
<td>$61,576</td>
<td>$1,488,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Street &amp; Road Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Arterial System</td>
<td>$32,828</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$100,268</td>
<td>$113,773</td>
<td>$252,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Maintenance &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$88,162</td>
<td>$19,675</td>
<td>$107,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Projects</td>
<td>$30,144</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,684</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td>$36,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$23,090</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,562</td>
<td>$5,512</td>
<td>$30,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Street &amp; Road</td>
<td>$43,403</td>
<td>$4,750</td>
<td>$165,741</td>
<td>$61,715</td>
<td>$275,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Local Street &amp; Road Projects</strong></td>
<td>$129,465</td>
<td>$10,750</td>
<td>$361,417</td>
<td>$201,199</td>
<td>$702,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects</td>
<td>$28,797</td>
<td>$4,025</td>
<td>$9,601</td>
<td>$304</td>
<td>$42,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>$4,621</td>
<td>$19,336</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,598</td>
<td>$26,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Enhancement Activities (District 11)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,104</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</td>
<td>$8,557</td>
<td>$15,064</td>
<td>$464</td>
<td>$686</td>
<td>$24,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management System</td>
<td>$20,494</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>$2,440</td>
<td>$2,971</td>
<td>$26,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$1,649</td>
<td>$3,068</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$681</td>
<td>$5,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other Projects</strong></td>
<td>$64,118</td>
<td>$49,272</td>
<td>$13,005</td>
<td>$7,240</td>
<td>$133,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,474,333</td>
<td>$1,607,527</td>
<td>$811,066</td>
<td>$893,522</td>
<td>$4,786,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes debt service for 11 years (to 2015)
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SOUTH BAY-DOWNTOWN TRANSIT FIRST BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) PROJECT - STATUS REPORT

Introduction

One of the top-ranked transit projects in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service that would provide high-speed connections between the Otay Mesa Border Crossing and downtown San Diego. As shown in Attachment 1, the long-range plan envisions the BRT line providing access to regional employment centers in downtown San Diego, the Otay Mesa Business Park, and the future Eastern Urban Center in eastern Chula Vista, as well as serving residential communities in Chula Vista and National City. The long-range service plan would operate in a Managed Lanes facility along the Interstate 805 (I-805) corridor, with connections to adjacent stations via direct access ramps similar in design to the I-15 Managed Lanes/Bus Rapid Transit project.

In July 2002, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) adopted a first phase Transit First project between downtown San Diego and Otay Ranch for further planning and development. While the Managed Lanes facility is a longer-range improvement (2020 – 2030 in the RTP), the Phase I project is premised on low capital cost improvements that could be implemented by 2008 (assuming funding availability). With this action, we embarked on planning and engineering studies on the Phase I alignment, station locations, and transit priority treatments, as well as development of detailed capital and operating cost estimates. This work will conclude with environmental studies and preparation of appropriate environmental documentation. At that time, we would be ready to move into final engineering and design. A Project Development Team (PDT) consisting of SANDAG, Caltrans, and the cities of San Diego, National City, and Chula Vista staffs meets bi-monthly to provide input and guidance on this project.

This item provides a status report on Phase I of the South Bay Transit First project, including an outline of future tasks leading towards eventual project implementation.

Discussion

Overview

The South Bay Transit First Project is a key component of the Mobility 2030 Regional Transit Plan, designed to serve the area experiencing the highest population and employment growth in the region over the next 30 years. As a result of this growth, traffic congestion is also expected to worsen with the greatest impact occurring in the I-805 corridor. This project will offer a high-speed travel connection to this rapidly growing area. Many people are currently using the trolley to make
this trip; however, as development continues to expand to the east, the trolley becomes a less direct travel pattern for many people than traveling along I-805 and State Route (SR) 94 into downtown San Diego. The South Bay project would provide that connection, offering a faster trip for many existing transit users as well as opening up a new travel choice for others.

In addition, the South Bay project has the unique opportunity to showcase the kind of transit/land use integration principles outlined in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) by directly tying into several of the Otay Ranch Villages. These villages have been designed as walkable communities and have rights-of-way reserved for dedicated transit lanes that will be used by the BRT line.

There are a number of benefits, as well as challenges, related to pursuing this BRT project in the short-term, including:

- **Service to Transit-Oriented Developments in Otay Ranch.** This route would serve five Otay Ranch villages, which have incorporated transit as an integral part of the villages. The City of Chula Vista and the developers of Otay Ranch have been proactive in dedicating the right-of-way (ROW) necessary for the transit lanes throughout this development. Station sites in Otay Ranch have been identified in the village centers and the ROW for those stations has been dedicated as well.

- **Illustrates Several Components of Transit First.** This project would allow us to demonstrate key elements in the Transit First Strategy – use of dedicated lanes, effective transit/land use integration, and signal priority.

- **Regionally Significant.** This project would connect the cities of Chula Vista and National City to downtown San Diego (in the first phase) and ultimately Otay Mesa in the second phase, implementing a significant part of the 2030 RTP with new regional transit.

- **Short-Term Benefits.** Because much of this project is proposed to operate along the existing freeways and in available dedicated lanes, we are pursuing it as one of several early action BRT projects in the region (the others being the Showcase Project along El Cajon Boulevard, the Super Loop in North University City, and a project in North County to be determined through an FY 2005 BRT study).

- **Bi-Directional Trip Patterns.** An analysis of trip patterns has indicated that this project has a strong bi-directional pattern of trip making. Ultimately, when Phase II is completed with service into Otay Mesa, we anticipate strong ridership into this area as well as into downtown San Diego.

- **Funding Opportunities.** This project is included in the 2030 Revenue Constrained Scenario of the RTP; therefore, it may be eligible for funding in the short-term because of its high priority. In addition, it has received a $900,000 Congressional Appropriation for planning and design work.

Challenges to implementing this project are primarily related to minimizing the level of capital investment in the near-term while still providing the high level of transit priority and amenities expected of BRT. It will be a challenge in the short-term to directly access some of the project station sites and secure adequate park-and-ride capacity at stations. Still, with innovative planning and a phased approach, we can develop and implement a quality Phase I BRT project.
The discussion on our work effort to date is divided between the work on the freeway segment between downtown San Diego and Chula Vista, and the arterial segment east of I-805 to Otay Ranch.

Freeway Segment: Downtown San Diego – I-805/Olympic Parkway

Between downtown San Diego and Olympic Parkway in Chula Vista, the South Bay BRT alignment would travel along the SR 94 and I-805 freeway corridors. As noted above, the long-term plan calls for the service to operate in the proposed I-805 Managed Lanes facility identified in the 2030 RTP. The Managed Lanes would include direct access ramps to several stations. For the Phase I project, we evaluated several alternative routings to determine the optimum routing over the short-term until the Managed Lanes facility is constructed. These alternatives were developed and evaluated based on the goals of maximizing operating speeds and schedule reliability, minimizing capital costs, facilitating implementation within the existing freeway right-of-way, and ensuring feasible operations and safety.

Four alternatives for the freeway segment were carried forth for detailed analysis; these alternatives are summarized below:

1. No Build. Buses would operate on the existing SR 94 and I-805 freeways with no special priority treatments or improvements.

2. Transit Lanes with Minor Capital Improvements. In various areas along SR 94 and I-805, the outside freeway shoulders would be converted to transit lanes and used by buses to bypass congestion in the main lanes. Only minor capital improvements would be included, meaning that the implementation of transit lanes would be limited to those freeway segments where adequate shoulder widths (10 feet minimum) exist (Attachment 2).

3. Enhanced Transit Lanes. This alternative would expand the freeway segments where outside shoulders could be converted to transit lanes by widening them where there is adequate right-of-way. The higher level of capital improvements (versus Alternative 2) may include minor freeway widening and main lane/median re-striping.

4. Arterial/Freeway Combination. This alternative evaluates whether a combination of travel in mixed-flow freeway and arterial streets (see Attachment 3) would provide faster running times than a freeway-only alignment. To address arterial congestion, use of signal priority treatments would be required at key intersections along the arterials.

Based on the analysis done to date, we have carried the two freeway transit lane alternatives into preliminary engineering and design. They offer the best potential for this route to achieve a BRT level of performance for the following reasons:

- Travel Time Reliability. Transit priority provided through the use of freeway transit lanes provides a high level of confidence that despite traffic conditions, the vehicle will arrive and depart at the times indicated in the schedule. Travel time reliability also equates to passenger perception of faster speeds and confidence in using transit, especially when compared to the often uncertain auto travel times in the main travel lanes.
• Directness of Travel/Travel Time Savings. These two alternatives offer the most direct path of travel, similar to the automobile experience. In addition, the transit lanes are projected to result in a three- to seven-minute travel time savings when compared with travel in the main lanes.

• Operational Efficiencies. The increased schedule reliability will allow BRT services to operate more efficiently with fewer vehicles required. This benefit translates into lower operating costs.

• Feasibility. The transit lane improvements can be implemented within the existing freeway right-of-way, minimizing capital costs and expediting the implementation timetable.

The Arterial/Freeway Combination (Alternative 3) results in a slow and circuitous route that would not provide the qualities of BRT service. In addition, travel time studies show that this routing has a much longer travel time (14 to 16 minutes) than operating transit in the main freeway lanes.

Freeway Transit Lanes

SANDAG and Caltrans are evaluating the potential for development and operation of freeway transit lanes using available freeway shoulders and ROW. The upcoming preliminary engineering and design work on the I-805 and SR 94 segments for the South Bay Transit First project will provide valuable information on the opportunities and constraints related to the use of transit lanes on the freeway. Transit use of freeway shoulder lanes occurs successfully in other cities, most specifically Minneapolis, which has over 200 miles of such lanes.

In addition to the freeway alignment evaluation, we are currently working on a detailed analysis of stations that would be located adjacent to the freeway (see Attachment 1). Several stations in the long-range plan are not being pursued for the Phase I project (SR 94/I-15, SR 94/30th Street and I-805/Orange Line). The SR 94/I-15 station is primarily a transfer point between various BRT routes in the RTP Unconstrained Plan and so are not needed for the Phase I Project. Serving the other two would result in travel time and access constraints and there is existing parallel transit service along these segments to downtown San Diego.

The stations being pursued as part of the Phase I project are outlined below, along with any outstanding planning issues:

• Plaza Boulevard. This station would be located on the northeast corner of the Plaza Boulevard/I-805 interchange in an existing vacant lot that the City of National City has identified as a redevelopment area (Attachment 4). We are working with the City’s Community Development Corporation to formally designate the site for the BRT station, which is supported by City staff at this time.

• Plaza Bonita/Sweetwater Park-and-Ride. Two locations have been identified as potential BRT stations. One site is the existing Sweetwater park-and-ride lot located at the I-805/SR 54 interchange (see Attachment 5). We are evaluating the potential to expand the park-and-ride facility to about 200 spaces. The advantage of the site is that it is located directly off the I-805 freeway and would require minimal time delay to serve. The other BRT station site is the existing transit center at Plaza Bonita, which would provide transfer opportunities to six local bus routes serving the surrounding area. While it would be desirable to serve the transit center to maximize
access from these routes, as well as providing direct access to the shopping center, a six-minute out-of-direction loop would be required. In addition, Westfield Shoppingtown management has not indicated a willingness to allow park-and-ride usage in any of the existing parking areas adjacent to the transit center. The ridership analysis discussed below will be used to determine the best station site for the Phase I Project. (Note: the long-term project envisions a direct access ramp from the I-805 Managed Lanes facility to directly serve Plaza Bonita).

- **H Street.** Two potential station locations have also been identified at this site (see Attachment 6). One site is on a current Caltrans park-and-ride lot on the southeast corner of H Street in Chula Vista, adjacent to the Terra Nova shopping center. This park-and-ride lot is located on the back side of the shopping center, making it difficult to access since it would require buses to travel through the shopping center. The management of the Terra Nova shopping center has indicated reluctance to allow any kind of priority access (to minimize delays/conflicts with auto traffic) to this station location. In addition, the site would require a four- to six-minute out-of-direction loop for BRT operations without any priority. A variation of this alternative would create a station along the outside of the freeway in both directions, with pedestrian bridge access to the park-and-ride lot. While this would minimize out-of-direction travel for BRT operations, the feasibility and capital costs of such an improvement have not yet been evaluated. A second site under consideration is in the northwest quadrant of the I-805 / H Street interchange and is currently being used by the City of Chula Vista as a materials storage yard. Initial analysis of this site has shown that it would require significant infrastructure improvements to access the site from H Street (the storage yard is currently accessed from local streets to the west of the site). However, it offers a better location as a longer-term station site from the standpoint of park-and-ride capacity. We will be conducting further analysis of both sites, including a cost-benefit analysis, to determine the preferred site for the Phase I Project.

- **East Palomar/Brandywine Street.** We have worked closely with the City of Chula Vista on identifying a station location on the east side of I-805 as the route exits onto Olympic Parkway. This station is essential to provide residents in western Chula Vista, as well as adjacent neighborhoods, access to the BRT route. The preferred site is along Brandywine Street, just south of E. Palomar Street (see Attachment 7). The City has developed an innovative concept that would place the station in the street right-of-way by narrowing the auto travel way from four to two lanes, and utilizing part of the street for a curb-side station design with parallel park-and-ride spaces for up to 75 cars.

The flexibility of BRT services is that there is a wide range of options on how the BRT services can be operated. The tradeoffs of the various alternative station sites for the Plaza Bonita and H Street stations and the impact out-of-direction travel might have on ridership potential of the BRT route will be analyzed in the coming months to help in the selection of preferred station sites.

**Arterial Segment: I-805/Olympic Parkway to Otay Ranch**

This portion of the route would operate in the main travel lanes between Olympic Parkway and East Palomar Street. As it nears Heritage Village in Otay Ranch, the route would transition into a dedicated transitway serving five Otay Ranch villages/retail areas. The right-of-way and station locations have been located and dedicated in the residential villages of Heritage, Lomas Verde, and Santa Venitia through the planning and development of these new communities. Currently, the villages of Heritage and Lomas Verde have been built and occupied. Santa Venitia is under
construction. Although the transit way is dedicated in this area, it requires conversion of the existing landscaped median into the concrete transit way. We plan to work closely with the City of Chula Vista and developers to provide public information materials and presentations to alleviate any concerns by residents.

We are currently working closely with the City of Chula Vista to identify the alignment and station locations in the Freeway Oriented Commercial (FOC) site and the Eastern Urban Center (EUC). Both of these sites are essential to the success of this route – the FOC is the location of the biggest park-and-ride (200 spaces) on the easternmost end of the route and the EUC has been designed with the highest residential and commercial densities in Otay Ranch. In addition, the existing General Development Plan for the City of Chula Vista shows the EUC transit center as being within walking distance of 90 percent of the EUC population.

Community Outreach

The project scope includes an extensive public outreach element which includes community workshops, a Web site, and staff presentations to interested parties. The first formal public workshop will be held once conceptual plans and designs for the proposed alignments and stations have been developed. To date, the Phase I Project has been presented to the public as part of the I-805 Corridor Study.

Next Steps

Key dates for the current planning and engineering study effort includes:

• Late Summer 2004 – Complete Ridership Analysis and Finalize Station Locations
• Late Fall 2004 – Complete Conceptual Engineering on the Phase I Project
• Late 2004 to Mid 2007 – Conduct Preliminary Engineering/Environmental on Phase I Project

The current schedule and budget allows us to begin preliminary engineering on the freeway transit lanes and select stations by the end of the calendar year. Upon passage of the TransNet Extension, this schedule would lead to project implementation in 2009.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Jennifer Williamson, (619) 699-1959; jwil@sandag.org

NOTE: The attachments to this Agenda Item are available in hard copy only and can be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Clerk of the Board at (619) 699-1912.