TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, February 4, 2005
9 a.m. – 12 Noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDING UPDATE

• TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING AND PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

• IMPACT OF WINTER STORMS ON COASTAL RAIL CORRIDOR

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

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

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip which is located in the rear of the room and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

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

+ 1. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 21, 2005 MEETING MINUTES   APPROVE

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 and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

REPORTS

+ 3. IMPACT OF RECENT WINTER STORMS ON THE COASTAL RAIL CORRIDOR AND STATUS OF RESTORING INTERCITY AND COMMUTER RAIL SERVICE (Linda Culp)

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor stretches 351 miles from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Substantial damage to portions of the corridor from the recent winter storms have impacted both Pacific Surfliner intercity passenger service operated by Amtrak, and commuter rail services operated by the Coaster and Metrolink. Many agencies have worked cooperatively to restore service to passengers between Los Angeles and San Diego, but much work is still needed along segments to restore service north of Los Angeles.

+ 4. TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING AND PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS (Toni Bates)

In December 2004, the Transportation Committee indicated its desire to refine the transit service change process involving SANDAG and the transit agencies to more directly reflect the policy role of SANDAG and the implementation role of the transit agencies. This report proposes a transit service planning and public hearing process for both ongoing service planning and implementation and for the unique circumstance of the Comprehensive Operational Analysis currently underway for the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) area. Based on Transportation Committee direction, staff will return to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors to amend SANDAG Policy No. 18: Regional Transit Service Planning to reflect the new process.
5. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDING UPDATE (Susan Brown)  

The transportation program funding picture for the remainder of FY 2004/05 and for FY 2005/06 at the state level remains uncertain. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) continues to defer allocations from the 2004 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP). This report outlines the impacts to regional projects as well as potential job loss and economic impacts from another suspension of Proposition 42 as proposed by the Governor.

6. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next two Transportation Committee meetings are scheduled for Friday, February 18, 2005, and Friday, March 4, 2005.

7. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF JANUARY 21, 2005

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

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) and a second by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the January 7, 2005, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 5)

Chair Kellejian noted that Item No. 4 would be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

3. 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP) QUARTERLY AMENDMENT (APPROVE)

At its meeting on July 23, 2004, the SANDAG Board adopted the 2004 RTIP, the five-year program of major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period from FY 2004/05 to FY 2008/09; and the Federal Highway Administration/Federal Transit Administration (FHWA/FTA) approved the 2004 RTIP on October 4, 2004. SANDAG processes amendments to the RTIP on a quarterly basis. This amendment includes changes as requested by member agencies and also includes projects that received funding from the federal FY 2005 appropriations. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2005-13 approving Amendment No. 3 to the 2004 RTIP.

5. JANUARY 2005 TRANSIT SERVICE CHANGES (INFORMATION)

Changes to bus, trolley, and Coaster service are generally implemented three times a year: in the fall, winter, and summer. The next scheduled dates for implementing transit service changes are January 16, 2005, for North County Transit District (NCTD) and January 30 and
31, 2005, for Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). There are minor service changes proposed by both transit agencies. More significant service changes for MTS are pending results from the Comprehensive Operational Analysis currently underway. This report provides the Transportation Committee with information on the January 2005 service changes.

Action:  Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 3 and 5, including Resolution No. 2005-13.

Councilmember Phi Monroe (Coronado) stated that he voted on the consent calendar in place of regular member, Chula Vista Councilmember Jerry Rindone.

4. GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF FY 2006 TRANSIT OPERATING BUDGETS (APPROVE)

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, reported that SANDAG as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, it is the responsibility of SANDAG to approve regional transit agency operating and capital budgets for funding. To meet this need, it is recommended that the Transportation Committee approve a set of guiding principles and objectives to be used to prepare the FY 2006 transit operating budgets and five-year projections. Mr. Gallegos said that this is a tight schedule but we will make every effort to get the fund estimates to the operators in February in time for them to prepare their budgets.

Mr. Gallegos noted that item No. 6 of the proposed guiding principles and objectives indicates “preserve current service levels,…” He said that as MTS enters into its Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) and tries to balance service levels, it may not be able to keep all of the levels in all areas. When it comes to determining capital needs, the operators will need to make that decision based on available funding.

Councilmember Monroe questioned whether the word “preserve” will send an incorrect signal if we have to make changes to current service levels. Mr. Gallegos suggested that the word “consider” be used rather than “preserve.”

Paul Jablonski, MTS Chief Executive Officer, stated that we should try to maximize service to the public but within budget levels.

There was discussion among Transportation Committee members about the meaning of “preserving current service levels.”

Public Comment:

Robert Hoffman, representing SMART, said that on page 2, in the next to the last paragraph from bottom, there is a phrase stating that public hearings will be held regarding the fare ordinance in April 2005. He agreed this is a way for people to provide input, but he suggested that the public be provided full disclosure on the complete cost of the service including the amount of subsidy.
Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Emery and a second by Mayor Mary Sessom (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority), the Transportation Committee unanimously approved the Guiding Principles and Objectives for use in preparing the FY 2006 transit operating budgets and the five-year projections, with one change to replace the word “preserve” with the word “consider” in item 6.

Councilmember Jerome Stocks (North County Coastal) mentioned that the North County Transit District (NCTD) Board expressed a specific desire to use the word "preserve."

Mr. Gallegos pointed out that these are guiding principles for the operators to use in developing their budgets.

REPORTS

Chair Kellejian stated that he was revising the order of the agenda as follows: 9, 8, 6, and 7.

9. TRANSNET EARLY ACTION PROGRAM (RECOMMEND)

Chair Kellejian stated that the public wants congestion relief and they want it now. To that end, and with the urging of the Chair and Vice Chair, staff was directed to develop a list of Early Action projects. We want to get the Transportation Committee's buy-in an affirmative action to move it forward to the SANDAG Board.

Chair Cafagna said that in the past, Projects are usually constructed one behind another. What we have been talking about us changing the procedures to concurrently construct projects in a more broad basis so we are accelerating what we have promised to do with TransNet. We have a revenue stream from TransNet for bonding purposes that provides this opportunity.

Mr. Gallegos added that if the Transportation Committee and SANDAG Board concur with this Early Action Plan, we can proceed in the first week of February.

Craig Scott, TransNet Project Manager, said that at the December SANDAG Board meeting, a TransNet work program was approved. The work tasks that are currently underway include the Plan of Finance Update, establishment of an Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program that requires a nexus study related to the private developer finding requirement, and the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). He noted that the eligibility for the Local Streets and Road program in the TransNet Extension is different than that in the original measure. We will be working through the City/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) on the Local Streets and Road program.

Jack Boda, Director of Project Implementation and Mobility Management, reported that transportation projects typically take several years to design and construct. Therefore staff is proposing to develop a TransNet Early Action Plan with two tiers of projects. Tier 1 projects are those that are remaining on the existing TransNet program. We are committed to finishing those projects. Tier 2 is to complete work on two corridors for construction or to
be construction ready, and to complete two environmental documents on two other corridors. Starting with Tier 1, the first item is the widening of State Route (SR) 76 in two phases, the first phase is between Melrose to Mission and the second phase is from Mission to Interstate 15 (I-15). Both phases would be underway concurrently. The second project in the Tier 1 is to purchase the necessary right-of-way to relocate residents and businesses for SR 52. The third project is the Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit (LRT) extension from Old Town to University City.

Tier 2 projects would be complete within 5-7 years, and we will start work on two environmental corridors. The fourth project is the I-15 Managed Lanes both the north and south extensions. The fifth project in the Early Action Plan is the SR 52 high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) managed lanes (reversible). The sixth project is the I-5 North Coast Corridor – Environmental Effort, and the seventh project is the I-805 Corridor – Environmental Effort (North and South Phases). Many of these corridors include various transportation mode projects. We are currently working to develop project schedules and cash-flow needs.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director, stated that in anticipation of TransNet passage, he has had dedicated staff working on various corridors and Caltrans has been working closely with SANDAG.

Mr. Gallegos said that we recognize Caltrans has limited resources so Mr. Orso-Delgado has indicated his willingness to use consulting teams to assist in this work.

Councilmember Madaffer commented that in light of the state’s budget situation, the people of San Diego need to be grateful that TransNet passed. We would not be doing any of these projects without it. He asked about the gap funding. Mr. Gallegos responded that we will have a challenge in trying to get matching funds from the state and federal governments. TransNet will allow us to get ready but it doesn’t take away from the fact that we do need some help from the state. We have been working with the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on creative ideas such as advancing the cash and having the state pay us back with the dollars that would come to the San Diego region. We are also encouraging the Commission to move forward on the Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) bond proposal. In our effort to streamline the environmental work in I-5 we are working with the federal government and there is a potential to use a “TIFIA” (a transportation innovation finance pool). Mr. Orso-Delgado explain that this is similar to a GARVEE bond but the repayment period is a little more lenient. This is currently being used on the SR 125 toll road. This funding pool has been underutilized. We had some federal Department of Transportation (DOT) representatives here and encouraged us to look into this possibility.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if we are foreclosing the opportunity for matching dollars from the state because we are accelerating projects. Mr. Gallegos responded that we are not foreclosing on any opportunity.

Chair Cafagna stated that we will need to talk about the size of the contracts and contractors. He thought that we should meet with the Associated General Contractors (AGC). The mega contractors are not in town any more and these large projects will require a co-op between more than one contractor or out-of-town contractors. Mr. Gallegos said
that staff has been talking with the AGC about this issue. He said that there would be plenty of work for local as well as outside contractors. The improvements that we are proposing to make on the freeways will require the replacement of overcrossings on the interchanges. If we can move on these Early Action Projects, we may be in the position to let out a series of small contracts for these interchanges before we let the large freeway improvement contracts. This would provide opportunities for smaller and local contractors to participate. He suggested that that contracting industry consider partnering and forming joint ventures.

Deputy Mayor Emery asked if the project 4 in Tier 2 related to the I-15 corridor will include the whole corridor. Mr. Gallegos replied that the goal is to get the whole 20 miles completed.

Councilmember Jack Feller (NCTD expressed his appreciation that SR 76 is at the forefront of the projects. He asked about the time frame on these projects. Mr. Gallegos answered that we will bring this information back to the Board. On SR 76, the Caltrans work will be augmented with consultants. Caltrans will continue to manage the highway pieces. We are also considering the creation of an ad hoc committee of North County mayors or councilmembers to keep a focus on this project.

Councilmember Peters asked if SR 76 is under construction. Mr. Gallegos said that only first part is under construction, and we would assist Caltrans with the design of the next segment.

Councilmember Peters asked the Tier 2 projects were selected. Mr. Gallegos said that staff looked at project readiness and traffic congestion relief.

Councilmember Peters asked what obligation is there at the state to payback the money we advance. Mr. Gallegos said that the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process is embodied in law and driven by formula. The formula is based on population and road miles. What we are trying to do by advancing the TransNet monies is to accelerate project progress.

Councilmember Peters asked about the status of the Nobel Drive Coaster Station. Mr. Gallegos stated that we are continuing to work with the City staff. The issue is the cost or value of the necessary property. We are working to reach resolution on this matter.

Councilmember Peters asked about the shortfall amount. Mr. Boda said that there has been a project cost increase related to access over the track, grade separations, and security issues, and the real estate value has gone up in that areas. The cost difference is in the $4 million range. Mr. Gallegos noted that this project is in the existing TransNet program.

Councilmember Monroe asked Mr. Scott which group is looking at the Local Streets and Road Program. Mr. Scott replied the area public works directors and planners on the City/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) are involved. He added that the new TransNet Ordinance has different requirements for the Local Streets and Road Program, and that difference will need to be reviewed with CTAC.
Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) expressed his support of this proposal. He noted that the South Bay was a major contributor to the positive vote of TransNet. He said that when we look to expand service in areas currently without it, he asked that the Board consider the eastern area of Chula Vista. Mr. Gallegos said that staff hopes to come back with another set of projects, and key to that is using freeway shoulder lanes for buses. If our pilot project is successful, our goal would be to advance transit service in the smart growth areas adjacent to I-805 in the South Bay.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jack Dale (East County) and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors authorize staff to proceed on the Early Action Projects.

8. TEA-21 REAUTHORIZATION AND FY 2006 APPROPRIATIONS FUNDING REQUESTS (RECOMMEND)

Ellen Roundtree, Director of Governmental Relations, reported that our federal help is an important piece of the financial puzzle. Last January the Transportation Committee recommended a list of projects for the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) or for full funding authorization. The multi-year bill is still pending, and the latest extension is due to expire in May 2005. Last year, we were successful and received over $154 million. Last week we were notified that we need to submit a new list of projects for the next multi-year transportation bill. To begin to work with congressional staff, we propose the following recommended actions: reaffirm last year’s project list with modifications resulting from funding received or project deletion, add new projects as submitted by MTS and NCTD, authorize staff to send letters of support for projects requested by the Port of San Diego, and authorize staff to submit letters of support for the Shoal Creek Pedestrian Bridge in the City of San Diego. Ms. Roundtree noted that a number of Board members and staff will go to Washington, D.C. to work with congressional staffs on the funding requests.

Chair Kellejian noted that the bus rapid transit (BRT) project on I-805 to serve the eastern end of Chula Vista is part of this request.

Ms. Roundtree added that several BRT projects and the technology enhancements are included in various funding request categories.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Dale and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the federal transportation project funding requests for use in the ongoing multi-year TEA-21 reauthorization and the FY 2006 appropriations process according to the recommendations contained in the agenda report.

6. MTS/NCTD JOINT PRESENTATION ON TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE (INFORMATION)

Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, stated that they made presentation to Joint Committee on Regional Transit (JCRT). She said that the significant capital infrastructure needs to be protected and preserved. A question to be resolved is how are we going to serve that public asset as we move forward to expand the system.
Tom Lichterman from NCTD stated that NCTD has many capital needs that greatly exceed the capital resources available. He introduced Rich Walker, NCTD’s Manager of Maintenance of Way to present the report.

Mr. Walker provided a snapshot of their responsibility in the rail corridor which is between the Orange County line and downtown San Diego. He provided statistics about the operation. NCTD’s responsibility includes safety of operations, operational reliability, regulatory compliance, and life cycle maintenance. He also provided information on rail infrastructure and its key components including age, type, past maintenance, condition, and loading. He also reviewed the maintenance status of the wood cross ties, turnouts, road crossings, the signal system, and bridges and culverts. The “State of Good Repair” consists of identifying the life cycle costs, prioritizing projects, and justifying the expenditures, which are about $14 million per year. He said that NCTD includes $1 million to $2 million in its annual budget, leaving about a $12 million shortfall in capital maintenance needs. The risks in not meeting the capital needs include: unreliable operating conditions, reduced operating speeds, the potential of noncompliance with regulatory agencies, and loss of ridership. The next steps are to define the “State of Good Repair,” obtain additional resources for adequate life cycle replacement, and seek out new funding resources.

Chair Kellejian asked if the wood ties are being replaced with concrete ones. Mr. Walker said that they are replacing what they have. He added that once you go to concrete ties you have to replace all of the wood ties, because you cannot mix wood and concrete ties.

Chair Cafagna asked if there was money being set aside for these capital needs. Mr. Lichterman replied that there is about $1 million - $2 million included each year in the budget. He noted that in addition to capital replacement costs there is the ongoing routine railroad maintenance of $4 million - $5 million per year. Ms. King clarified that to cover all of the capital maintenance needs they would need $12 million to $13 million annually.

Chair Cafagna asked what part of the TransNet infrastructure replacement component we can provide for this purpose. Mr. Gallegos stated that unfortunately, the TransNet Extension will only fund new projects. There are no dollars for replacement of existing infrastructure. As a region, we need to stay focused and do a better job of protecting the investment we have already made. Our best source of funding for this purpose is discretionary federal dollars.

Mr. Gallegos asked if the bridges needing replacement would fall under a seismic retrofit program. Mr. Walker replied that the only seismic evaluation that has occurred is when a bridge has been replaced. Mr. Gallegos said that SANDAG will work with NCTD to pursue seismic retrofit funding. He said that there are federal bridge replacement funds for making seismic compliance a priority.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if the Margarita Bridge in Camp Pendleton has any historical value. Mr. Walker replied negatively.
Councilmember Feller asked how long would it take to replace the bridge most needing replacement. Mr. Lichterman said that the design is underway and they hope to complete it this year. Construction is about a 12-month period.

Councilmember Monroe commented how we can expand when there is no money to maintain the system. Mr. Gallegos agreed that we will need to make better decisions about this on a regional basis. We need a plan to ensure we are keeping up with those investments and continue to move forward.

Mr. Jablonski provided a report on the MTS aging infrastructure and capital needs. He reviewed the light rail transit (LRT) infrastructure categories. He said that the impacts of an aging infrastructure include safety and service reliability, increased maintenance intervals and the level of effort, increased staffing and equipment, and adverse regulatory compliance impacts. He provided information about the current infrastructure status of both the LRT and bus systems. He stated that the estimated annual need is about $50 million per year.

Public Comment:

Clive Richard, a member of the public, referred to a report published by the federal Department of Transportation (DOT), “A Status of the National Highways, Bridges, and Transit,” which talks about maintaining conditions. The aging infrastructure problem is occurring throughout the country.

Chair Cafagna stated that as we move forward on new projects, we need to do a better job of preserving money for capital replacements in the future. We need to change our policies from this point forward.

Action: This report was presented for information.

7. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDING UPDATE (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Chair Kellejian postponed this item to the next meeting.

Kellejian convened the meeting for a comfort break at 10:50 a.m. The meeting was reconvened into the joint Transportation Committee/Regional Planning Committee meeting.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for February 4, 2005.
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SANDAG Transportation Committee
February 4, 2005 - Agenda Item #1 (Approve)
The joint meeting of the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees was called to order by Regional Planning Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeifer (North County Inland) at 11:17 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

Chair Holt Pfeifer indicated that this meeting is a good moment in SANDAG history in that it is the first joint meeting of the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees since the adoption of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). She added that because SANDAG is moving into RCP implementation, she anticipates that there will be additional joint meetings in the future.

Chair Holt Pfeifer requested that members of both Committees introduce themselves.

REPORTS

A. CREATION OF A NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (RECOMMEND)

Chair Holt Pfeifer commented that there was a lot of interest from the public wanting to participate on the new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group. She stated that Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) will lead this discussion.

Councilmember Madaffer noted that in November 2004, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees recommended to the SANDAG Board that a new Stakeholders Working Group be appointed to advise the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees, SANDAG staff, and the Board on matters pertaining to the Regional Transportation Plan update and the RCP strategic initiatives.

A selection committee, which included members from both the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees, was appointed to review the applications. Selection committee members included: Supervisor Pam Slater-Price, Councilmembers Jim Madaffer, Maggie Houlihan, Phil Monroe, Jack Dale, and Mayor Lori Holt Pfeifer. Additional committee members included Fred Leudtke, representing the City/County Transportation Advisory Committee and Nancy Bragado, representing the Regional Planning Technical Working Group.

The Selection Committee met twice and made selections based upon a set of criteria including skills and abilities, experience with regional planning issues, and a demonstrated commitment to serve. The Committee wanted to ensure that a broad array of interests were represented, and that the working group had balanced geographical representation from around the region. The Committee recommended a slate of 26 members and asked that both Committees recommend that the SANDAG Board appoint the proposed slate. In addition, the Selection Committee requested that a member from either the Transportation or the Regional Planning Committee serve as chair of the new working group.
After the Board appoints the proposed members to the working group, staff will send letters to all applicants notifying them of the final decision. Letters also will be sent to the new members with information about the meeting schedule, staff contacts, and the agenda for the first meeting.

**MOTION**

Councilmember Peters (City of San Diego) made the motion that the proposed slate be approved. Transportation Committee Chairman Councilmember Kellejian (North County Coastal) seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION**

Councilmember Peters requested that background information on proposed members be distributed.

Councilmember Madaffer agreed that the slate of names and a bio sheet should be forwarded to the full SANDAG Board for its information.

Councilmember Feller (North County Coastal) pointed out that this a large list of names. He asked is this a typical size working group?

Chair Holt Pfeiler responded that it was a difficult task to get the group down to this small size. Over 100 applications were received.

Mayor Madrid (East County) requested that staff prepare a matrix of where the proposed members come from, from a geographical perspective. He stated that all areas of the region should be represented on this working group.

Councilmember Madaffer mentioned that those comments were made at the Selection Committee meeting. This list brings a fresh perspective to SANDAG and is representative of both specialty areas as well as a regional balance. There are 3 people from the North County Coastal area; 5 people from the North County Inland area; 4 people from the East County area; 3 people from the South County area; and 11 people from the Central San Diego area.

Councilmember Monroe noted that each candidate listed their individual area of interest, which the Selection Committee also tried take into consideration. The Committee eventually got the list down to 40 people and struggled to get the list down to 26.

Mayor Smith (North County Inland) asked if this group would serve as a planning commission to the full Board.

Staff responded that this is a stakeholder group that would complement the existing working groups. The group would provide input into the update of the RTP and the implementation of the RCP. This group would provide much needed input to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees.
Supervisor Horn stated that he only recognizes 4 names on the list, and none of them represent the unincorporated area.

Chair Holt Pfeiler reiterated that all geographical regions are represented on this working group, including several members representing the unincorporated areas.

Councilmember Rindone also expressed concern regarding regional balance on the working group. He asked that if there was a need to have any selected participants replaced that they be replaced from the same geographical area. He added that he knows of other eager and fresh names that were submitted but were not selected.

Chair Holt Pfeiler pointed out that there will be strict attendance requirements for the working group that will be enforced, and that the replacement suggestion will be considered.

Supervisor Slater-Price mentioned that there weren't a lot of choices for candidates from South County or North County Coastal. She was surprised at the limited number of people from those areas that applied for the working group.

Action: Councilmember Peters (City of San Diego) made the motion to approve the proposed slate of names for the new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group and Councilmember Kellejian (North County Coastal) seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously.

B. PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM UPDATE (DISCUSSION)

Mayor Holt Pfeiler noted that this effort is one of the first opportunities since the adoption of the RCP to better connect transportation, transit, and land use.

Staff provided the Committees with an update on the $17 million Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. An ad hoc working group, which includes members of the Transportation Committee, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), has been meeting to develop program administrative requirements and project selection criteria. The primary goal of the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program is to implement a set of demonstration projects that, when complete, will serve as examples for smart growth development consistent with the RCP. The pilot program will provide valuable experience in selecting and implementing capital improvement projects that are intended to have an impact on land development and transportation choices in the project area. Lessons learned from the pilot program will be used to help develop the longer-term Smart Growth Incentive Program funded through the TransNet Extension.

Staff noted that the ad hoc working group has held three meetings to date. The working group agreed on a draft list of evaluation criteria and divided the criteria into two categories:

1. Screening criteria that determine basic program eligibility; and
2. Project evaluation criteria that determine funding priority.
The purpose of the criteria is to ensure that candidate projects meet the Transportation Enhancements (TE) funding requirements and can be implemented in a short time frame (i.e., are “ready to go” projects). The specific criteria also are intended to help select projects that are well-designed, encourage multiple transportation modes, and otherwise support the smart growth development goals of the RCP.

Once a consensus has been developed on the criteria and their relative weighting, the ad hoc working group will develop recommendations regarding the project selection process. A recommendation for approval of this pilot program is expected in February/March 2005 with a call for projects anticipated in March/April 2005. Staff will come back before both Committees in March with an update.

Councilmember Monroe emphasized that this is a pilot project where the funding is available now and should be spent quickly. That is the reason that ready to go projects were high on the list of priority projects. He recommended approval of this item.

Chair Holt Pfeiler brought attention to a letter from Tom Scott of the San Diego Housing Federation, which indicated that there is no inclusion of affordable housing in this program. The letter also expressed his disappointment that he wasn’t appointed to the new Stakeholders Working Group.

Councilmember Emery (North County Inland) agreed with the letter from Mr. Scott that affordable housing needs to be included as a part of the criteria for funding. It is important that specific reference to affordable housing be added to the criteria.

Mayor Cafagna (North County Coastal) also agreed.

Councilmember Kellejian stated that there were several meetings held in the past regarding smart growth, and smaller cities or built out cities agreed that part of the program should recognize existing contributions to smart growth. He asked if that direction was taken into consideration with the current criteria. Staff indicated that the ad hoc working group will be considering both existing and planned smart growth projects.

Councilmember Kellejian questioned where in the criteria would that be located? Staff responded that criteria would be included in the group of smart growth land use characteristics.

Councilmember Kellejian asked for an explanation of a “human-scale built environment.” Staff explained that there is a lot that goes into a human-scale urban design: it basically means that it is a scale that is oriented toward the pedestrian, and that structures are built to the sidewalk and oriented toward street frontages versus large parking lots.

Councilmember McCoy noted that she didn’t see any definition of housing affordability in the criteria. It is a question that should be addressed. She noted that she also didn’t see any criteria that addressed affordability.
Mayor Holt Pfeiler mentioned that the working group can have that discussion and bring it back to the Committees.

Councilmember Peters asked if the criteria would preclude spending monies in areas that were built out and would not be changing. Will the criteria for funding insist that changes be made?

Staff responded that it could either be that an area is increasing its densities and needs additional funding for infrastructure enhancements, or is already an intense area and is in the process of upgrading infrastructure and requires additional funding.

Supervisor Horn asked if any project that needs voter approval will be ineligible as a “ready to go” project.

Staff pointed out that there are different levels of project readiness.

Chair Holt Pfeiler stated that ready to go means just that. If an election needs to happen prior to a project being built, then it would not be considered ready to go.

Councilmember Monroe asked if there is a limit to the amount of funding that a project could apply for.

Staff responded that currently, there is no funding limit request, but that the ad hoc working group had been considering whether funding for each project should be capped at $2 million or some other limit.

Councilmember Monroe commented that one of the challenges will be how to pare down the projects so as to maximize the available funding.

Councilmember Kellejian asked if there is a use it or lose it rule that will apply to this funding. He mentioned that there need to be criteria developed for that.

Staff indicated that the Transportation Committee has an existing use-it-or-lose-it policy for TE funds.

Councilmember Ritter (NCTD) stated that projects that could only receive $2 million would be more like a peanut butter approach. Wouldn’t it be good to do a few really good "wow" projects?

Staff responded that in researching this issue, an average cost of a project is approximately $1 to 2 million. That could include a total of eight good projects.

Mayor Madrid asked if the funding distribution criteria are geographically based.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones (Lemon Grove) expressed concern with the wording regarding the matching funds bonus. Criteria should be based on the quality of a project. He hopes that the smaller projects will be eligible to qualify for some of the project funding.
Chair Holt Pfeiler noted that this should be enough information for staff to move forward.

Staff reiterated that this information will be taken back to the ad hoc working group for discussion, then to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and CTAC, and then will come back before the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees before going to the Board for approval.

**Action:** The Committee discussed this item and received it for information.

C. **SHOWCASE LOCAL EXAMPLES OF SMART GROWTH: SMART GROWTH IN LA MESA (INFORMATION)**

Dave Witt, Assistant City Manager for the City of La Mesa, made a presentation to the Committees about local smart growth planning and development activities taking place in the City of La Mesa. He pointed out that the City of La Mesa recently finished conducting a General Plan update. A primary objective of the update was to look at older commercial corridors that had shifted to larger retail outlets and were deteriorating. The update focused on future options for these areas, including possibilities to accommodate new growth and replace the deteriorating commercial uses with higher-intensity residential and mixed land uses.

The city developed a new land use category - the “mixed use urban” designation. The mixed use urban designation allows for a mix of commercial and residential development densities up to 40 dwelling units per acre. The mixed use urban designation was applied to the major transit corridors within the city.

The City hired a team of architects, planners, and real-estate experts to identify potential areas with opportunities for mixed use development through a feasibility study. The city then involved property owners, business owners, and prospective developers. The result was a set of design guidelines that support smart growth principles. The key to making the change to smart growth was capitalizing on the community’s desire to improve the blighted commercial areas.

Mr. Witt noted that a significant conclusion of their work is that requiring a commercial component in every “mixed use urban” project is unrealistic and prevents profitable development. The City left all zoning in place, and added a Mixed Use Overlay Zone to the Mixed Use Urban designation, allowing developers the flexibility to build either mixed use with retail or simply higher density multifamily housing. The city currently has six projects in the development process. The design review process includes a Design Review Board to ensure an appropriate pedestrian realm.

Mr. Witt highlighted the key findings, which were that none of this could have been done without the citizens in the community and the support of the elected officials. He concluded that only time will tell if this effort will be a success.

Mayor Madrid commented that was an excellent overview of a project that has taken approximately 21 years. He suggested that La Mesa be used as an example in the future when referring to building smart growth and transit oriented development projects. He
added that there are approximately 1,500 units currently under construction in the city and they anticipate an additional 2,500 transit oriented development units in the near future.

Chair Holt Pfeiler asked if the community of La Mesa supported the plan update.

Mayor Madrid responded that the community embraced it.

Councilmember Feller asked if there are any height restrictions in the new zone.

Mr. Witt responded that the zoning has the flexibility to increase heights but would have to go through a discretionary review. The bottom line is the parking. To increase height you would have to consider if enough parking could be built to sustain the units being built.

Mayor Cafagna asked if the units would be considered for sale or rent. He also asked why there isn’t an affordable housing component considered.

Mr. Witt indicated that there wasn’t a bias regarding for sale or rent. One part of the City’s overall program is to include affordable housing, which has been considered at other locations.

Councilmember Stocks stated that the City of La Mesa should be commended for its smart growth projects. He asked how the city has planned for the increase in traffic with the proposed increase in housing densities.

Mr. Witt responded that the transportation networks have been built as if the projects were commercial projects. Since commercial projects generate more traffic than residential projects, traffic increases are not foreseen.

Action: The Committee received this item for information.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Regional Planning Committee Chair Holt Pfeiler adjourned the joint meeting at 12:19 p.m.
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SANDAG Transportation Committee  
February 4, 2005 - Agenda Item #1 (Approve)
IMPACT OF RECENT WINTER STORMS ON THE COASTAL RAIL CORRIDOR AND STATUS OF
RESTORING INTERCITY AND COMMUTER RAIL SERVICE

Introduction

Winter rain storms in early January 2005 have caused serious damage to the coastal rail corridor between San Diego and San Luis Obispo leading to temporary suspension of passenger and freight service on segments of the line. This corridor is one of the most heavily traveled passenger rail corridors in the country. Amtrak operates Pacific Surfliner intercity passenger service, its second busiest corridor in the nation. NCTD operates Coaster commuter rail service in the Oceanside to San Diego market and the Southern California Regional Rail Authority operates Metrolink commuter rail services between Oceanside and Ventura County. Each service experienced record ridership in 2004. The corridor carries 7 million passengers each year. Following is a summary of the damage and impacts. Photos and details of the damage and rail service status will be presented at the Transportation Committee meeting.

Recommendation

This report is presented to the Transportation Committee for information.

Discussion

Minor damage was experienced along the San Diego County segment of the corridor. This included a minor slide in the Miramar Hill area and flooding of the tracks in Penasquitos Lagoon, south of Del Mar. Each resulted in temporary slowing of passenger services through the affected areas.

On January 11, 2005, a slide occurred in south Orange County, just south of the San Clemente pier. This slide resulted in the cancellation of Amtrak and Metrolink services through the remainder of the week.

Damage has been much more extensive in Ventura and Santa Barbara counties. A series of slides, flooded areas, and a sinkhole has resulted in the cancellation of Amtrak’s service north of Los Angeles, including Pacific Surfliner service to San Luis Obispo and the Coast Starlight to Seattle. The damaged track is owned by the Union Pacific (UP) freight railroad, and resulted in one of UP’s three freight lines being temporarily out of service and unable to serve the Los Angeles and Long Beach areas.
While damage to the San Diego coastal rail corridor was relatively minimal, closures to the northern segment of the corridor directly impact San Diego. The largest markets for passengers from Los Angeles are San Diego, Oceanside, and Solana Beach. Other trips are increasing in importance, including business between Solana Beach and Irvine. The number one destination for passengers from San Luis Obispo is San Diego. With the corridor predominantly single track and shared between intercity, commuter, and freight, such closures not only provide inconveniences to passengers but they impact the local economy.

Throughout this period, the high level of cooperation between agencies has been evident. This includes sharing information and equipment, picking up each others’ passengers, and working together to clear affected areas. As a result, UP expects repairs to the northern corridor to be completed and full passenger rail service restored by mid-February.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957; lcu@sandag.org
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3. Develop transit agency budgets incorporating service proposals, as appropriate

4. Implement service, including conducting public hearings on service proposal details (routings, schedules, spans of service, etc.)

The direction received from the Transportation Committee would focus SANDAG on Steps 1 and 2 (establishing the policy framework, and developing and evaluating service proposals), with SANDAG adoption of transit agency budgets in Step 3, as well. The transit agencies share development and evaluation of service proposals in Step 2, and would be the primary lead in Steps 3 and 4. These roles and responsibilities would be incorporated into the annual regional short-range transit planning process and Regional Short-Range Transit Plan update, for which SANDAG is the lead agency.

A more detailed description of the proposed regional transit service planning and implementation process is included in Attachment 2. The flow chart shows how service change proposals would either be incorporated into the Regional Short-Range Transit Plan for priority and funding, or proceed directly to implementation for minor changes. The key differences from the process defined in the adopted Policy No. 18 are:

- The transit agencies would conduct the service change public hearings
- Prior to a public hearing on service implementation at the transit agencies, the SANDAG Transportation Committee would take action to determine that the service proposals are consistent with regional policies, goals and objectives, or make a finding of overriding considerations if service proposals are inconsistent with regional policies.

SANDAG’s role in conducting a consistency determination is intended to ensure that the transit system is planned and implemented in a way that supports the Regional Comprehensive Plan, Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Short-Range Transit Plan, considers funding opportunities and constraints, is an effective use of regional resources, and promotes a regional transit system throughout the county. SANDAG will evaluate annually through the short-range transit planning process how well the Regional Short-Range Transit Plan goals and objectives are being met by the transit system, and will conduct ongoing monitoring of transit system performance through the Quarterly Transit Operations Reports and the Annual Performance Improvement Program to assess system productivity and efficiency.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Toni Bates, 619-699-6950; tba@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3002300
REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING

This policy specifies the transit service planning responsibilities of the consolidated agency and the transit agencies, and outlines a framework for transit service planning. Figure 1.1 includes flow charts, based on the framework, that document the processes for transit planning and the delivery of services for new services and adjustments to existing services.

This policy will allow the transit system to quickly and efficiently respond to changes in travel demand and operating/fiscal environment, while ensuring that the system is adjusted and developed consistent with longer range regional transportation and land use goals as incorporated into the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan, and the Regional Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP). As a result, transit service revisions that relate directly to implementation of regional goals (regionally significant service changes) are generally those that:

- Support regional travel demand corridors that cross transit agency jurisdictional boundaries;
- Significantly affect inter-jurisdictional trip making (i.e., are inconsistent with the guidelines contained in the SRTP; for example, would be found to potentially have a detrimental impact on geographic connections, timed transfers, and the frequency/service span consistency of such services); and
- Require additional regional operating funds above the overall transit agency-adopted budget and projected budget capacity.

1. Agency Responsibilities - Consolidated agency and transit agency responsibilities are described below and further specified in Figure 1.2. There is an inherent overlap of responsibilities between the consolidated agency and transit agencies in conducting transit service planning, as exhibited in Figure 1.2. Therefore, all transit service planning responsibilities should be conducted, whenever possible, in coordination and consultation between the consolidated agency and transit agencies.

1.1 Consolidated Agency Responsibilities - carried out in collaboration with the transit agencies:

1.1.1 Preparation of long-range transit plans as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
1.1.2 Annual preparation of a five-year SRTP that: (1) defines the existing transit system; (2) evaluates existing services and programs; (3) identifies service gaps and deficiencies; (4) establishes parameters for short-range (0-5 years) new service development, as well as regionally significant and all other service adjustments; (5) defines a methodology for evaluating proposals for new service; (6) identifies and prioritizes regional and subarea transit
planning studies; and (7) evaluates and prioritizes new services for implementation, including the adoption of an annual Regional Service Implementation Plan. The consolidated agency will initially maintain the existing service concepts upon which the service is based in order to preserve and improve mobility. FY 2003 budgeted revenue hours/miles will be considered as minimum levels of service for each Transit Board and will assume net service levels to be added upon completion of the Oceanside to Escondido and Mission Valley East rail projects. If future funding shortfalls occur, necessitating cutbacks in service, then there will be a regionwide process of examination of service levels, protecting a “lifeline” system of services.

1.1.3 Conduct regional and subarea planning studies as prioritized in the SRTP, RTP (Regional Transportation Plan), and RCP (Regional Comprehensive Plan).

1.1.4 Develop proposals for regionally significant service adjustments in response to changes in regional travel demand, to address regional service gaps and deficiencies, and to implement plans and programs identified in long-range Regional Transportation and Regional Comprehensive Plans.

1.1.5 Develop proposals for new services to be included in the Regional Service Implementation Plan.

1.1.6 Ensure that all new services and service adjustments are consistent with the SRTP.

1.1.7 Coordinate with transit agencies to provide community outreach and conduct market research.

1.1.8 Conduct regional performance monitoring to provide input into the SRTP and other short-range transit studies. The regional performance monitoring will be based on the type of service and type of service area. Any net service reduction in a specific transit agency area resulting from the service evaluation process that takes that Board below its FY 03 service level (pursuant to Section 1.1.2) will be reprogrammed to that transit agency service area for other improvements up to the FY 03 base level of service.

1.1.9 Provide technical assistance to transit operators for local route planning.

1.1.10 Develop a public input process and hold required public hearings for service changes. The consolidated agency should ensure that the public input process for public hearings on service changes would be conducted in a manner to facilitate public input from the affected area.

1.1.11 Develop a Regional Fare Policy that incorporates a uniform fare structure, a transfer policy, and agreement for revenue sharing of regional tickets, tokens, and passes, while also allowing the consolidated agency to adopt specialized fare procedures for travel within each operator’s service area.
Additionally, adopt the Comprehensive Fare Ordinance setting forth all fares for all operators, including their special fares.

1.2 **Transit Agencies Responsibilities** - carried out in collaboration with the consolidated agency:

1.2.1 Develop service and schedule adjustments to ensure system optimization and to respond to immediate operational issues (e.g., detours, overcrowding, on-time performance, and minor out-of-direction routing changes).

1.2.2 Conduct local transit studies and analyses within the transit agency’s service area in response to changes in local travel demand, to address service gaps and deficiencies, to develop service reductions/efficiencies, to address operating budget deficits, and to implement plans developed in the SRTP.

1.2.3 Develop proposals for new services to be included in the Regional Service Implementation Plan (RSIP).

1.2.4 Develop proposals to reallocate unproductive resources to implement unfunded services identified as high priority in the RSIP or consistent with SRTP guidelines.

1.2.5 Coordinate with consolidated agency to provide community outreach and conduct market research.

1.2.6 Develop operating plans for special event transit service and service contingencies.

1.2.7 Monitor existing operations and services to provide input into service analysis and short-range transit studies.

1.2.8 Conduct bus stop location planning.

1.2.9 Service implementation, including scheduling, run-cutting, operations, contract services, service management, and labor contract administration.

1.2.10 Provide input on long- and short-range transit plans, and regional performance monitoring.

2. **Transit Service Planning Framework** - This framework allows the transit system to quickly and efficiently respond to changes in travel demand and operating/fiscal environment, while ensuring that the system is adjusted and developed consistent with longer range regional transportation and land use goals.

Step 1: Guidance

An SRTP, consistent with SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), will be drafted annually by SANDAG, in consultation with the
transit agencies. The SRTP will provide guidance for service planning during the upcoming year and will balance the immediate needs of optimizing the transit system in response to operational and financial constraints, with the mid-/long-range system development goals established in the long-range plans.

**Step 2: Develop Service Adjustments**

Throughout the year, transit agency and SANDAG staff develop proposals, in accordance with the SRTP, to adjust existing services and develop new ones. These service adjustments help to optimize existing services, reflect changes to the operating and fiscal environment, respond to customer comments and requests, and begin to implement and support services envisioned in the long-range plans. Service adjustments can be a result of such things as schedule analysis, trip and route level evaluation, and subregional and regional transit studies. Regionally significant service adjustments should be developed as collaborative efforts between SANDAG and transit agency staff.

**Step 3: Evaluation and Approval**

Prior to approval for implementation, all service adjustments should be:

- Consistent with the SRTP;
- Presented for public hearing in the impacted service area if required by SANDAG, appropriate transit agency, or by Federal Transit Administration (FTA) policies and regulations; and
- Fully funded either through a reallocation of resources or as part of the budget process.

Regionally significant service adjustments should be endorsed by the appropriate transit agency and approved by SANDAG’s Transportation Committee prior to implementation, while all other service adjustments may be approved for implementation at the sole discretion of the transit agencies.

**Step 4: Implementation**

As a general practice, service changes should be implemented during a regularly scheduled service change date (scheduled for winter, fall, and summer). Implementation should be preceded by community outreach, a marketing campaign, and public notices, as appropriate. Service implementation is the responsibility of the transit agencies.
Step 5: Monitoring

Performance monitoring will be conducted on an ongoing basis to evaluate services as well as newly implemented service adjustments. SANDAG will monitor the transit system performance on a systemwide and operator level on an annual and quarterly basis, and at the route level on an annual basis. Transit agencies will monitor their operations performance on an annual, quarterly, and monthly basis, as appropriate. Performance measures will evaluate productivity, cost-effectiveness, and quality of service. Performance results will be used as a basis for developing the SRTP, and other planning studies and analysis.

3. **Policy Review** – This policy shall be reviewed by SANDAG, in collaboration with the transit agencies after one year, in the fall 2005.

TB/dds

Attachments: Figure 1.1 – Proposed Service Planning Process
            Figure 1.2 – Roles and Responsibilities for Service Planning Activities
FIGURE 1.1
PROPOSED SERVICE PLANNING PROCESS (NEW SERVICES)

**Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Action Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March - July</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Develop Part I of annual SRTP – Service Planning Guidance, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing Conditions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate existing services and programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Agency, SANDAG</td>
<td>• Evaluate existing services and programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify service gaps and deficiencies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Agency</td>
<td>• Establish parameters for short range (0-5 years) service development and adjustment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>• Regional consistency checklist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August-Sept.</td>
<td>Transit Agency, SANDAG</td>
<td>Develop new service proposals for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September - December</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Develop Part II of annual SRTP – Regional Service Implementation Plan, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New service evaluation methodology;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Agency</td>
<td>• Prioritized list of service proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - June</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Budget/funding process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify available funding or funding deficits;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Agency</td>
<td>• Public hearing on service changes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>• Adopt Regional Service Implementation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Januray - June</td>
<td>Transit Agency</td>
<td>Operating Budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepare to reflect funded services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug/Sept, Jan, May/June</td>
<td>Transit Agency</td>
<td>Implementation of new service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SANDAG, Transit Agency</td>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual route monitoring;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quarterly operations evaluation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TDA Performance Improvement Program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit agency performance reporting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED SERVICE PLANNING PROCESS (ADJUSTMENTS TO EXISTING SERVICES)

Schedule

March - July

Develop Part I of annual SRTP - Service Planning Guidance, including:
- Existing Conditions;
- Evaluate existing services and programs;
- Identify service gaps and deficiencies;
- Establish parameters for short-range (0-5 years) service development and adjustment;
- Regional consistency checklist.

Lead Agency

SANDAG

Ongoing

Develop minor service adjustments.

Minor Adjustments

Regionally Significant Adjustment

Develop regionally significant service adjustments.

SANDAG

Ensure consistency with SRTP.

Transit Agency

SANDAG, Transit Agency

Ongoing

Transit Agency public hearing/approval.

Transit Agency approval, SANDAG public hearing, approval.

Aug/Sept, Jan, May/June

Implementation of service change.

Transit Agency

Ongoing

Performance Monitoring
- Annual route monitoring;
- Quarterly operations evaluation;
- TDA Performance Improvement Program;
- Transit agency performance reporting.

SANDAG, Transit Agency
FIGURE 1.2
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR SERVICE PLANNING ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSIT AGENCY</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations Planning</td>
<td>Service Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY AND GUIDANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LONG-RANGE SERVICE DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MID-RANGE SERVICE DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT/Rail System Development*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit First Now! (traffic engineering, traffic operations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORT RANGE SERVICE RESTRUCTURING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder Bus Studies/BRT Supporting Networks**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea Studies (e.g. Downtown, NB/PBLJ, Univ. Ave)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Service Optimization (e.g. COA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY OUTREACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Plan Review - land use, regional plan conformity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Plan Review - community liaison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Liaison to Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Community Service Requests***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Operational Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERFORMANCE MONITORING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Route Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Service Proposal Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Operations Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to Transit Operators (ATO) Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Operations Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Transit Database (NTD) Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROUTE SPECIFIC ADJUSTMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Location Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Level Schedule Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Route Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Reductions - Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Reductions - Regionally Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runcutting/Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Bids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Implementation of Service Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Mid-Coast, Super Loop, Showcase, I-15, North County (Mission Ave or Escondido Blvd/Bear Valley Pkwy), and Otay Mesa to Downtown
**Includes Nobel Coaster Station, Mission Valley East, Sprinter, and supporting networks for BRT/Rail projects listed above
***Activities coordinated via the staff-level Planning, Operations, and Marketing Coordination Committee
PROPOSED
REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

SANDAG Annual RSRTP/BUDGET

May-July

Aug-Sept

Oct-Dec

Jan-Feb

Mar-Apr

RSRTP Service Planning Framework & Guidelines
- Needs & Deficiencies
- Parameters
- Regional Consistency Checklist
- Funding/Budget Status

New and Revised Service Proposals
- Transit Agencies
- SANDAG

Minor+/or Results in No Budget

Major +/- or Results in Budget

RSRTP Service Plan & Program Adoption (SANDAG)
- Draft
- Public Hearing
- Adoption

Transit Agency Budget Development

Transit Agency Budget Adoption by SANDAG
- Budget Public Hearing

SANDAG RSRTP Consistency Determination OR Finding of Overriding Considerations
- TC Action

Nov./Dec. for June Svc.
Feb./Mar. for Sept. Svc.

Service Implementation Process
- Transit Agencies conduct public hearings

SANDAG Report to TC
- Memo
- Re-concurrence
- Transit Agency Appeal

Service Implementation by Transit Agencies

Mar. for June Svc.
June for Sept. Svc.
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDING UPDATE

Introduction

The transportation program funding picture continues to be uncertain, and with the proposal to suspend Proposition 42 that is included in the recently released Fiscal Year (FY) 2005/06 draft state budget, the state of transportation programs at the state level is likely to get worse in FY 2005/06. Regionally, nearly $390 million in project funding are at risk through FY 2005/06, with a resulting job loss impact of approximately 8,850 jobs. To date, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) continues to defer allocations from the 2004 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP). The CTC staff has also excluded SANDAG region projects from its recommended potential Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) projects for the next cycle. Given that Proposition 42 is proposed to be suspended, the CTC is likely to delay taking action on additional GARVEE bonds. This report summarizes the FY 2005/06 state budget proposals for transportation and outlines the potential impacts to regional projects, including job loss and economic impacts.

Discussion

The FY 2004/05 state budget included certain assumptions regarding the availability of funds for transportation programs. Some of these assumptions have not materialized due to litigation which is unlikely to be resolved by the end of the current fiscal year. In addition, a projected state budget deficit last reported to be between $8 and $9 billion dollars will need to be addressed as part of the FY 2005/06 negotiations. The draft state budget proposes to suspend, once again, Proposition 42. As you may recall, Proposition 42, approved by the voters in 2002, designated the sales taxes collected on gasoline to be used for transportation projects. In recent years, transportation programs that had historically enjoyed constitutional protections have seen these eroded and the funds used to balance the budget. The sweeping aside of the Proposition 42 protections has become an annual budgetary exercise by the Legislature and Governor, having diverted billions of dollars of funds away from transportation programs over the past four years. The impact has become particularly acute as the proportion of funds that support the three main state transportation programs (STIP, TCRP and the State Highway Operations and Preservation Program (SHOPP)) has grown to 75% that are now, in effect, subject to annual budgetary negotiations.

Draft FY 2005/06 State Budget Summary

The Schwarzenegger administration released its draft budget on January 10, 2005. As part of the proposals to close the gap, the Governor proposes to suspend Proposition 42 yet again. A summary of the proposals is shown below.
• Proposition 42
  o Suspended for FY 2005/06 (approximately $1.3 billion).
  o Suspension would be treated as a loan.
  o Three-year total of Proposition 42 suspensions, including FY 2005/06, totals approximately $3.4 billion, to be repaid over fifteen years starting in 2007/08.
  o Fifteen-year repayment would have constitutional protection, but includes no inflationary factor.
  o Budget is silent on suspensions for 2006/07.

• Transportation Finance Reform and Issues
  o Governor will introduce a constitutional firewall for Proposition 42 funds, sealing all loopholes starting in FY 2007/08. This points to a potential suspension of Proposition 42 in FY 2006/07 as well.
  o Firewall does not include State Highway Account (SHA), which is the source of the STIP.
  o Potential subversion of Proposition 42 requirements by funneling SHA loans to the General Fund via the TCRP is not precluded in the proposed reforms.
  o Indian gaming revenue originally assumed for FY 2004/05 may be available in 2005/06 if litigation is resolved. No provisions for supplanting the repayment if the litigation loses, or if gaming revenues are lower than anticipated.

• Other details
  o Spillover to Public Transportation Account (PTA) is suspended.
  o Bay Bridge cost overruns are not included in the budget.
  o TEA-21 reauthorization remains a top priority.

_Fiscal Year 2004/05_

As part of the FY 2004/05 state budget, Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature agreed to suspend Proposition 42 and use the funds to help balance the budget rather than having them go to transportation accounts, as originally intended by the voters. Instead of a permanent take away, however, they agreed to treat the funds as a loan from the transportation accounts, payable back in FY 2007/08. The net effect for FY 2004/05 was a reduction of $1.2 billion in available funds for transportation.

The Governor also negotiated gaming compacts with a number of tribes across the state. The budget assumed approximately $1.2 billion would be available from a bond guaranteed by these future gaming compact revenues. These gaming compacts, however, have been challenged in court. At this time, it does not appear that the challenge will be resolved in time for a bond issuance this fiscal year. The $1.2 billion from the gaming bond are not new funds, they were initially intended to repay outstanding loans due in FY 2005/06. The $1.2 billion were to be distributed as follows:

• $457 million to the SHA
• $290 million for TCRP projects
• $275 million to the Public Transportation Account (PTA)
• $192 million to the local street and road maintenance program
Aside from the legal issues affecting the feasibility of the bond, the estimate of funds available from this bond has been reduced to about $800 million due to the underwriters’ perceived higher risk associated with the difficulty making tribal financial information part of the public record. The net effect to FY 2004/05 is that the various accounts will go without the anticipated bond revenues. The administration has all but admitted that the Tribal Gaming bond revenues will not be available in FY 2004/05 and are considered instead part of the FY 2005/06 budget.

On January 7, 2005, the Transportation Committee recommended increasing the funding for several regional projects, including the Mission Valley East Light Rail Transit project, the State Route 125 (SR 125) Gap, Connector project, and the Interstate 15 (I-15) Managed Lanes. The approximately $18 million increase will address the funding needs on some of these projects and at the same time insure that FY 2004/05 federal funds are not lost to the region. The Mission Valley East project will be fully funded. The I-15 Managed Lanes project, on the other hand, still has a potential shortfall due to the continued suspension of the TCRP program. Programming options for this and other potential future needs are discussed below.

**STIP and GARVEE**

The consequences of these cuts have been a continued suspension of STIP and TCRP allocations from the CTC in FY 2004/05. CTC staff has indicated that the commission will likely continue to defer allocations through the remainder of FY 2004/05, particularly as the state enters the Winter season when emergency projects tend to occur. Regionally, if STIP allocations are suspended for the remainder of the fiscal year, $334,000 in Planning, Programming, and Monitoring funds will be unavailable to the region. While this is a relatively modest amount, it is the result of having had previously programmed projects’ funds delayed by two years as part of the 2004 STIP.

The lack of funds in state transportation accounts is also precluding the CTC from moving forward with GARVEE bond recommendations. As you may recall, the region had submitted construction of SR 905 as well as acquisition of right of way for SR 52 for consideration of GARVEE bond revenues, but the CTC selected other projects for GARVEE bonds for the next feasible cycle. The commission will likely put on hold these additional GARVEE bonds due to a lack of state funds to match the bonded future federal revenues. Current CTC policy requires the nonfederal match to the GARVEE-bonded future federal funds to come from the STIP. Staff is working with CTC to change this policy and make other funds, including locally generated funds, eligible match funds to GARVEE-bonded future federal funds.

**TCRP**

The continued suspension in TCRP allocations (last allocation occurred December 2002), however, is continuing to have an impact in other regional projects, including the Sprinter, I-15 Managed Lanes, SR 52 and the Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit (LRT) extension to Balboa Avenue. Attachment 1 shows the complete list of the TCRP and STIP funded projects that could be impacted if funds are taken away by suspension of Proposition 42, and the associated job loss and economic impacts from this suspension. Potential options to keep these projects moving include:

A. Advance future TransNet extension funds to eligible projects, including the I-15 Managed Lanes, SR 52 and Mid-Coast LRT.
B. Advance future TransNet extension funds and leverage future federal funds through the GARVEE bond process as described earlier.

C. Issue bonds locally that are backed by future federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. North County District (NCTD) and SANDAG have already agreed to implement this approach to facilitate the award of the construction contract for the Sprinter. The region agreed as part of the 2004 STIP adoption to set aside future CMAQ or other regional funds in case the state did not honor its $80 million TCRP funds commitment. The region could implement similar bond issuance for other projects under a similar funding plan. Reauthorization of TEA-21 is needed to have more accurate estimates of future federal funds.

SHOPP

Caltrans has also had its SHOPP program impacted. It is anticipated that only safety and perhaps bridge preservation projects will be allocated this year, leaving over $59 million in other rehabilitation and operations projects that are ready to go without an allocation this fiscal year.

Fiscal Year 2005/06

The state of transportation programs in California was described by the CTC early this year as being in crisis and on the verge of collapse. The outlook for FY 2005/06 depends on the resolution of four principal unknowns:

1) Approval of a revised plan for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, which has contributed to the $3.2 billion cost increase in the seismic retrofit program;

2) Federal reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21);

3) Resolution of the legality of the tribal gaming compacts; and

4) Approval or suspension of Proposition 42 as part of the 2005/06 state budget.

The most critical element in the near to mid term is approval of Proposition 42. Of the $5.4 billion programmed in the 2004 STIP, fully $3.3 billion come from Proposition 42 sources, including repayments of prior loans. An additional $700 million comes from other sales taxes.

As negotiations for the FY 2005/06 state budget get underway, the prospect of yet another suspension of Proposition 42 is bringing concern of additional project delays and associated costs to regional transportation agencies. To raise awareness among the public, the Governor, and newly sworn-in legislators, a press conference was held by an alliance of regional transportation agencies, business and trade groups and labor unions in Sacramento on December 7 to highlight the impacts to already battered transportation programs from another suspension.
**STIP and GARVEE**

Continued suspension of STIP allocations in FY 2005/06 could delay the start of construction of SR 905 near the Mexican border. This project, critical to the efficient movement of goods and services across the border, is the largest programmed FY 2005/06 regional STIP project, and it is nearly ready to begin construction. The environmental document was approved in the Fall of 2004. $102.8 million in a combination of regional and interregional STIP funds are programmed. As an alternative to “pay as you go” STIP funding, the region had submitted this project for GARVEE bond financing, but the CTC did not select this project for the next cycle of GARVEE bonds. Regardless of not including this project in the GARVEE list, the CTC will most likely be unable to come up with the state STIP funds in the near term that current policy requires to match the GARVEE bonded future federal funds.

Other STIP funded projects in FY 2005/06 that are in jeopardy from a suspended Proposition 42 include design of the Mid-Coast LRT extension to Balboa Avenue, a freeway operations project, the Rideshare program, and SANDAG’s planning and program monitoring efforts. These other projects total approximately $7.6 million, for a total of $110.4 million in FY 2005/06 STIP funds at risk. The associated potential job losses and economic impacts are shown on Table 1 below.

Potential options to address the lack of STIP funds include:

A. An option that staff is pursuing is to change the CTC policy to allow local funds to act as the nonfederal match. SR 905 qualifies for $25 million in TransNet extension funds that could be used for this purpose. SR 52 could also qualify, although the CTC has previously been reluctant to recommend issuance of GARVEE bonds for acquisition of right-of-way.

B. Potential funding sources include programming future federal RSTP and CMAQ funds.

C. Another option that has been used in the past has been to advance local funds and obtain a replacement or a reimbursement agreement from the CTC known as an AB 3090. Project sponsors need to exercise caution when pursuing AB 3090 replacements as the CTC will not commit to a certain date to program the replacement project. On the other hand, the commission has indicated that AB 3090 reimbursements will be more problematic to approve since other projects may have to be delayed in order to provide the reimbursement. Either way, the CTC has already approved $455 million in AB 3090 arrangements statewide and may be reluctant to enter into more of these arrangements.
Table 1. Funds at Risk through FY 2005/06 and Associated Potential Economic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds at Risk through FY 2005/06</th>
<th>Amount at Risk ($millions)</th>
<th>Job Losses ($millions)</th>
<th>Income Loss ($millions)</th>
<th>State and Local Tax Loss ($millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TCRP funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A. Allocated but unexpended TCRP funds</td>
<td>$46.0</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>$33.3</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B. TCRP funds not allocated and needed in FY 2005/06</td>
<td>$149.7</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>$108.6</td>
<td>$15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. STIP funds</td>
<td>$110.4</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>$80.4</td>
<td>$11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SHOPP funds – operations and rehabilitation</td>
<td>$83.4</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>$61.0</td>
<td>$8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total funds at risk through FY 2005/06</td>
<td>$389.5</td>
<td>8,854</td>
<td>$283.3</td>
<td>$39.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCRP

CTC staff has indicated that if Proposition 42 is suspended again as proposed in the FY 2005/06 state budget, the commission will be unable to resume STIP or TCRP allocations in the coming fiscal year. The impact to the region could be significant. Approximately $195.7 million in TCRP funds are at risk. Of these funds, $149.7 million correspond to allocations that have not yet been made that are needed in FY 2005/06 to keep projects moving on their current schedule or to pay back loans obtained to keep the projects moving forward. These include $80 million for the Sprinter, which required revenues from a bond to initiate construction of the project and $20 million for acquisition of right of way for SR 52 in Santee.

The remaining $46 million correspond to TCRP funds previously allocated where the state may potentially suspend reimbursement on ongoing construction or procurement contracts or design activities. The proposed state budget is silent on the funding level to the TCR Fund to allow reimbursements to continue to project sponsors. This latter prospect is considered less likely due to the impact on ongoing construction contracts, though it was proposed as recently as in the negotiations for the current budget cycle. Given the uncertainty, it is recommended that project sponsors invoice eligible TCRP funds as soon as possible. The region’s largest ongoing TCRP-funded project is the I-5/I-805 “Merge” project, where approximately $14.5 million remain unexpended. Table 1 above summarizes the TCRP funds at risk and the associated potential job losses and economic impacts related to a suspension of the TCRP program in FY 2005/06.

Funding options to keep the construction contracts for the projects that may be financed with TCRP allocations include:

A. Program future federal RSTP and CMAQ funds.
B. Advance TransNet extension funds to eligible projects.
C. Reallocate funds from other projects to these ongoing construction contracts.

At this time, staff is not proposing specific programming actions, pending resolution of this issue in Sacramento.
Caltrans’ State Highway Operations and Preservation Program (SHOPP) is also experiencing deferral of funding allocations. Projects potentially at risk of not getting an allocation include all operational improvement projects as well as pavement rehabilitation projects. The only projects that are likely to receive allocations are safety and selected bridge preservation projects. The total at risk in FY 2005/06 is $24 million. Job loss and economic impact information for the SHOPP program through FY 2005/06 is shown on Table 1 above.

Beyond Fiscal Year 2005/06

The financial picture of the transportation accounts is expected to be improved by the flow of ethanol fuel taxes, the collection and distribution of which were recently fixed by Congress. According to Caltrans, approximately $2.1 billion in fuel taxes are anticipated to return to California between now and FY 2008/09, beginning in earnest in FY 2006/07. This source of funds will make the programs less vulnerable to the suspension of Proposition 42.

Regardless of the new inflow of ethanol fuel tax revenues however, unless Proposition 42 is left alone in FY 2005/06 and loans are paid back when due, four consecutive years of funding suspensions, loans out of transportation accounts and deferrals will have taken a heavy toll on transportation programs. If the problems that are causing recurring state budget deficits are not resolved in the near term, there is a likelihood that Proposition 42 will continue to be suspended on an annual basis, at least in the foreseeable future. The proposal to extend constitutional protections to Proposition 42 beginning in FY 2007/08 points to the intent to use Proposition 42 funds for non-transportation purposes again in FY 2006/07.

If Proposition 42 is suspended indefinitely beyond FY 2005/06, an additional $133.2 million in TCRP funds may remain unavailable to regional projects, including the SR 94/SR 125 Interchange Connectors project. The STIP would also be severely impacted as well over half of the source of funds is now Proposition 42 and other fuel sales taxes.

An impact to the San Diego region from additional suspensions of Proposition 42 is that TCRP and particularly STIP funds constitute a principal component of the TransNet extension 50% match. Absent a restructuring of the way transportation programs are funded, there will not be sufficient funds in the next few years to provide the necessary matching funds for the early implementation projects. An initial higher proportion of TransNet funds may become necessary for implementation to the detriment of future TransNet projects due to fewer resources available resulting from higher initial bonding costs.

Next Steps

In the next few months, staff will continue to do the following:

1. Work with CTC staff to change its policy to allow local funds to be used as the nonfederal match for GARVEE-bonded future federal funds.

2. Request that the CTC reconsider projects such as SR 905 and SR 52 that have local funds available for the nonmatch purposes to be included in the GARVEE list.
3. Continue to monitor proposals for the FY 2005/06 state budget and to inform the Transportation Committee on the potential impacts to local transportation projects and programs.

4. Pending the outcome of budget negotiations, specific programming and reallocation proposals will be prepared and presented to the Transportation Committee.

RENEE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: José A. Nuncio, (619) 699-1908, jnu@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCRP</th>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>Transit or Hwy.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>STIP: Allocation Needs in FY 2005-06 ($000's)</th>
<th>TCRP: Allocation Needs in FY 2005-06 ($000's)</th>
<th>Funds at Risk ($000's)</th>
<th>Total at Risk ($000's)</th>
<th>Potential Job Loss ($000's)</th>
<th>Potential Income Loss ($000's)</th>
<th>Potential State &amp; Local Tax Loss ($000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sprinter</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>58,501</td>
<td>7,787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>i-5/i-805 Merge</td>
<td>14,563</td>
<td>14,563</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>10,649</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>i-15 Managed Lanes Freeway Elements</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>10,154</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Village Access Improvements</td>
<td>9,909</td>
<td>9,909</td>
<td>7,766</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>MTDG Bus Acquisition</td>
<td>7,766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oceanside Transit Center</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and Program Monitoring</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Priority 1</strong></td>
<td>35,492</td>
<td>87,490</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>125,106</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>91,025</td>
<td>12,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR 905 Freeway and Interchanges</td>
<td>9,904</td>
<td>102,756</td>
<td>112,660</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>82,384</td>
<td>10,966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR 92 from SR 125 to SR 67</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,162</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>14,744</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit to UTC - Environmental and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>9,564</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>i-15 Managed Lanes Transit Elements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>9,982</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD Bus Acquisition</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>8,156</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>5,572</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encinitas Rail Grade Separations - Letters of No Prejudice Reimbursement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR 56 Landscaping</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freeway Operational Improvement Project</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Matching Funds</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans Operations and Rehabilitation Projects (SHOPP Funds)</td>
<td>83,400</td>
<td>83,400</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>60,987</td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Priority 2</strong></td>
<td>10,522</td>
<td>62,228</td>
<td>108,256</td>
<td>264,406</td>
<td>6,028</td>
<td>192,263</td>
<td>26,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL THROUGH FY 2005/06 (PRIORITIES 1 &amp; 2)</strong></td>
<td>46,014</td>
<td>149,718</td>
<td>110,380</td>
<td>389,512</td>
<td>8,584</td>
<td>283,288</td>
<td>39,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR 94 Widening</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>i-Virginia Avenue Realignment</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR 94/SR 125 Ultimate W to N &amp; S to E Connectors</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Double Track Modifications, Grade Separations</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Priority 3</strong></td>
<td>4,014</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,014</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4,398</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR 56 (Middle) Freeway Construction</td>
<td>3,788</td>
<td>3,788</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR 94/SR 125 Interim W to N Connector</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coaster Commuter Rail Train Set</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Ferry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Priority 4</strong></td>
<td>4,416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,416</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3,223</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Potential Highway Losses</strong></td>
<td>36,112</td>
<td>38,330</td>
<td>104,150</td>
<td>261,992</td>
<td>5,449</td>
<td>191,584</td>
<td>25,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Potential Transit Losses</strong></td>
<td>18,332</td>
<td>113,388</td>
<td>6,230</td>
<td>137,950</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>99,325</td>
<td>14,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Potential Losses</strong></td>
<td>54,444</td>
<td>151,718</td>
<td>110,380</td>
<td>399,942</td>
<td>9,074</td>
<td>290,909</td>
<td>40,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
2. Year of expenditure has not been determined for certain components of project or is beyond FY 2005/06
3. STIP: State Transportation Improvement Program
4. TCRP: Traffic Congestion Relief Program
5. H: Highway Project
6. T: Transit Project
7. SHOPP: State Highway Operations and Preservation Program
8. TCRP: Traffic Congestion Relief Program
9. Potential Job Loss: estimated number of jobs that could be lost due to the project being affected.
10. Potential Income Loss: estimated reduction in income due to the project being affected.
11. Potential State & Local Tax Loss: estimated reduction in taxes due to the project being affected.

**Priority 1 - Projects under construction or in operation**

**Priority 2 - Projects ready to go through FY 2005/06**

**Priority 3 - Projects ready to go to construction beyond FY 2005/06**

**Priority 4 - Projects completed or nearly completed**

**Total Potential Highway Losses**

**Total Potential Transit Losses**

**Total Potential Losses**
Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Projects Affected by Potential Budget Cuts

January 2005

TCRP and STIP Project Descriptions

**Priority 1**
Projects under construction or in operation
1. Sprinter
2. I-5/I-805 Merge
3. I-15 Managed Lanes Freeway Elements
4. East Village Access Improvements
5. MTS Bus Acquisition
6. Oceanside Transit Center

**Priority 2**
Projects ready to go through FY 2005/06
7.C. SR 905 Freeway and Interchanges
8. SR 52 from SR 125 to SR 67
9.D. Mid-Coast LRT
10. I-15 Managed Lanes Transit Elements
11. NCTD Bus Acquisition
12. I-5/Lomas Santa Fe Road Interchange
13. SR 56 Landscaping
14. Encinitas Rail Grade Separations
15. Freeway Operational Improvement

**Priority 3**
Ready for construction beyond FY 2005/06
15. SR 94 Widening
16. I-5/Virginia Avenue Realignment
17. SR 94/SR 125 Ultimate W to N & S to E Connectors
18. Double Track Modifications, Grade Separations

**Priority 4**
Completed or nearly completed
19. SR 56 Freeway
20. SR 94/SR 125 Interim W to N Connector
21. Coaster Commuter Rail Train Set
22. San Diego Ferry

Projects Not in Specific Location

- A. Rideshare
- B. Planning & Program Monitoring
- F. Federal Matching Funds