1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Danielle Kochman (SANDAG) introduced Darryl Williams as the Community Working Group (CWG) Chair.

2. Review March 5th Meeting Summary
   a. There were no comments or revisions to the March 5th Meeting Summary.

3. I-805 HOV/Express Lanes Schedule and BRT Overview (Danielle Kochman, SANDAG)
   a. The I-805 Express Lanes are scheduled to open in 2020, and the goal is to have the I-805 BRT/ 47th Street Trolley Station open by 2020.

4. Refined Project Schedule and Scope
   a. The project schedule includes Planning through 2013, followed by Environmental, Design and Construction. The Project Planning Schedule is anticipated to be about 16 months.
   b. During this meeting, the Project Development Team (PDT) will present the goals and objectives of SANDAG, MTS, Caltrans and the City of San Diego, and introduce the discussion of the community's goals and objectives for this project.
   c. Prior to the next CWG Meeting (anticipated in September), the consultant team, led by IBI Group, will gather data and analyze freeway and rail engineering, existing and planned land uses and transit services. The analysis will include evaluation of a BRT station at the existing 47th Street Trolley Station, in the median of the freeway, and off of the freeway at new locations East or West of I-805.
   d. The roles of the consultant team are as follows: CH2MHill will conduct Freeway Engineering, DEA will conduct Rail Engineering, IBI Group and KTUA will do Transit Service Analysis, Rea & Parker Research will conduct Rider Surveys, and BAE will evaluate existing and planned land use possibilities in terms of economic development.
   e. Following the analysis, the PDT will work with the CWG to create initial station alternatives. These alternatives will be evaluated based on the Goals, Objectives and Criteria to create a short-list and further detailed evaluation.

5. Goals, Objectives and Criteria
   a. Goals were defined as broad statements of expected outcomes and objectives were defined as specific actions or attributes to achieve goals, with criteria being measurable factors that determine how well objectives are met.
b. Examples:

i. Transportation: A community goal is to “improve regional mobility and travel opportunities.” A supporting objective is to provide an “efficient connection between I-805 BRT Service and the Orange Trolley Line.” A criterion to evaluate would be the “distance between the BRT and Trolley Platforms.”

ii. Economic Development/Land Use: A community goal is to “enhance transit oriented development opportunities.” A supporting objective is to “expand mixed-use adjacent to the station.” A criterion to evaluate would be the “number of square feet of mixed-use development.”

iii. Safety and Security: A community goal is to “create a secure environment, actual and perceived.” A supporting objective is to have “no screening of sightlines by landscaping or furniture.” A criterion to evaluate would be the “length of obscured sightlines along the access path.”

c. SANDAG/MTS Goals and Objectives were presented as follows:

i. Community Access to 805 BRT services
   1. To provide community with access/transfers to 805 BRT service
   2. To provide bike and pedestrian access to the transit station

ii. Regional Connection
   1. To provide a connection between BRT, LRT and local buses

iii. Feasibility
   1. To create an alternative that is financially viable
   2. To create an alternative that is physically viable (engineering)

iv. Passenger Safety/Security
   1. To provide clear sightlines and avoid dark/shadowed spaces
   2. To provide buffers around transit station for pedestrian safety
   3. To provide effective connectivity between transit routes

v. Operational Efficiency/Flexibility
   1. To accommodate all types of buses and/or multiple buses
   2. To minimize out-of-direction delays for local buses

vi. Positively influence economic development

vii. Ease of Maintenance

d. Caltrans Goals and Objectives were presented as follows:

   1. Non-Compliance of the highway design standards shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, supported by a cost to benefit analysis to justify the design exception. Design Exceptions for Mandatory and Advisory
Standards of the HDM shall be approved by Caltrans District 11, Caltrans Headquarters, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

ii. To provide a proposed alternative that considers constructability, staging, schedule, traffic operations, freeway traffic safety, freeway level of service, transit operations, frequency, ridership, reliability, delay, overall throughput (highway and transit integration), geotechnical constraints, environmental impacts, drainage, noise abatement, cost, station environment, transfer ease, fare collection, ambience, security, noise and visual aesthetics.

iii. To provide a design that is compatible with the HOV/Managed Lane Network of the April 2003 Mobility 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, the 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan, and the 2050 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan.

e. City of San Diego Goals and Objectives were presented as follows:
   i. To provide a design that is compatible with future developments.
   ii. To provide safety, accessibility, walkability, and connectivity with other transportation services.

6. Discussion of Community Goals and Objectives
   a. A number of community goals and objectives were developed and discussed by community members and are listed below:
      i. To expand the opportunity for regional transit travel
      ii. To promote job growth in the local community
      iii. To allow easier access for community travel
      iv. To promote economic development opportunities, as it relates to property values and community enhancement
      v. To enhance and support the stability and influence of the family
      vi. To better connect the communities east and west of the I-805
      vii. To enhance safety and security near and at the station
      viii. To create a station that is designed as a destination, and will be seen as a community asset
      ix. To bring in the eight cultures of the community by including travel information in multiple languages and incorporating nature into the design
      x. To create a design that minimizes impacts
      xi. To provide services with limited stops
      xii. To take advantage of nearby rail
      xiii. To incorporate a broad-scope perspective for this project—Big picture focus

7. Initial Screening and Detailed Evaluation Criteria
   a. IBI Group gave an introduction to the evaluation criteria and how they will be used.
      i. Initial Screening Criteria: the initial alternatives will be screened based on the ability to meet project goals and objectives, physical feasibility, effect on transit
operations, order of magnitude capital cost, and ability to support smart growth opportunities.

b. Detailed evaluation criteria: the short-listed alternatives will be evaluated based on the effect on transit ridership, effect on passenger travel time, effect on transit operations, service to employment centers, non-motorized access opportunities, community benefits and impacts, effect on pedestrian environment, ability to support local land use plans, and the ability to support smart growth.

8. Discussion

a. Michael Brunker (YMCA) noted that the project should have a big picture focus, which is what happened with the development of the Jacobs Center. The opportunity is the bus project, but the real attraction is the fact that the trolley is going east to west with 30,000 people a day. The bus line will never carry those people. The physical work is to get the bus here, but it sets an opportunity to develop the station area and use the Orange line ridership.

b. Nan suggested using water and art to strengthen funding opportunities. She suggested applying for grant money through the San Diego Foundation and other entities, because grant money trends are going towards either art or nature. If money is going into the arts, this project could also be promoted as an art project.

c. Darryl Williams asked how the schedule will work with the 805 construction. Barrow Emerson (SANDAG) referred to item 3A in the previous minutes, and stated that this project would move into construction after the first express lanes are built.

d. Darryl Williams asked about CH2MHill’s experience with Caltrans. Barrow confirmed that CH2MHill worked with SANDAG and Caltrans for a number of years and is very familiar with the agencies’ work.

e. Patrick Ambrosio noted that he participated in a Euclid station survey, and asked if the same data will be collected or if the PDT would have access to this data. The PDT believed this was a study conducted by ACT and will try to retrieve the data.

f. Nan wanted to confirm that the buses and station will be handicap accessible. Yes, the station will be ADA compliant, and the services should be low floor vehicles.

g. It was asked if the BRT Stations at University and El Cajon are built, and if they have services like restrooms, and opportunities for refreshments and small businesses. The opportunity to have small stores would provide some jobs in the local community, and that France and Mexico City provide examples to look at. SANDAG noted that there will be facilities like this when the Mid-City stations open. The City of San Diego and Caltrans have built the bridges for retail weight, so future development options are possible.

h. A question was directed to SANDAG about the funding and financial viability. SANDAG responded that the project will allow a good service with a cost that is reasonable. As the project continues, SANDAG will be looking for other sources of funding for construction. Financial Viability also has to do with competitiveness.

i. A question was directed to SANDAG about when the Master Plan was developed, and if there is any discussion about the feasibility as it relates to this project. SANDAG
responded with when the concept for the I-805 was first laid out with managed HOV lanes, they created a concept for one here. The approach cost an excess of $200-300 million. This station was removed from the corridor project because there was not enough funding. This project will go back and look at older options, while also looking for better ways for the same functions.

j. Patrick Ambrosio raised the issue of funding to positively influence economic development. He mentioned a project through the National Endowment of the Arts that is being processed at the same time through the City’s Arts and Cultural Development department, working in the areas from Market Street to the I-805. This could be incorporated into the City of San Diego goals. The CWG should look into different opportunities for cross-funding.

k. It was asked which section of the project would not be completed if there is not enough funding. SANDAG would have to go outside of the County to supplement the grants, and they would do the most important parts of the project.

l. There was a question about how long the sales tax funding would last. The busses are funded for 40 years. It was suggested that local people could do bus maintenance as a way to generate training and employment.

m. Darryl Williams asked about opportunities for local contractors. SANDAG mentioned the existence of the UBDE “bench” for small and under-utilized firms.

n. Patrick Ambrosio asked if survey results will be presented to the group. The PDT should be able to do this.

o. Michael Brunker asked if there is any impact evaluation from City Heights. Patrick Ambrosio was involved in that project and said there had been positive feedback from the community and the community seemed happy with the outcome. It was noted that the planning process won some awards, and the community helped “cost-engineer” the project so it fit into the budget and the community had a say on the items to keep in and remove.

p. Macario Marinez, speaking through a language interpreter, noted that this was the first time he had attended, and there are some excellent ideas with the project being a focal point to enhance the area. He was involved in the City Heights project which seems to be working well, and while it may be unavoidable to have to move some people through right of way acquisition; in the end it will benefit more people.

9. Next Steps
   a. The PDT will look at the community goals and objectives that were developed today and organize them into a list of potential criteria to evaluate the alternatives. For the first initial screening, there will be technical community discussions, which are expected to result in a short-list of four alternatives for further evaluation.