



**San Bernardino Associated Governments**

1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92410  
Phone: (909) 884-8276 Fax: (909) 885-4407  
Web: [www.sanbag.ca.gov](http://www.sanbag.ca.gov)



- 
- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission •San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
  - San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency •Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
- 

**AGENDA**  
**Mountain/Desert Policy Committee**

**January 15, 2016**

**9:30 AM**

**Location**

*Town of Apple Valley*

14975 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, CA 92307

**Mountain/Desert Policy Committee Membership**

**Chair**

*Robert Lovingood  
Board of Supervisors*

*Julie McIntyre, Mayor  
City of Barstow*

*Joel Klink, Council Member  
City of Twentynine Palms*

**Vice Chair**

*Bill Jahn, Mayor Pro Tem  
City of Big Bear Lake*

*Mike Leonard, Council Member  
City of Hesperia*

*George Huntington, Mayor  
Town of Yucca Valley*

*Rich Kerr, Mayor  
City of Adelanto*

*Ed Paget, Mayor  
City of Needles*

*James Ramos  
Board of Supervisors*

*Curt Emick, Council Member  
Town of Apple Valley*

*Ryan McEachron, Council Member  
City of Victorville*

*Janice Rutherford  
Board of Supervisors*

**San Bernardino Associated Governments  
County Transportation Commission  
County Transportation Authority  
County Congestion Management Agency  
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies**

**AGENDA**

**Mountain/Desert Policy Committee**

**January 15, 2016**

**9:30 AM**

**Location**

**Town of Apple Valley**

**14975 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, CA 92307**

To obtain additional information on any items, please contact the staff person listed under each item. You are encouraged to obtain any clarifying information prior to the meeting to allow the Board to move expeditiously in its deliberations. Additional “*Meeting Procedures*” and agenda explanations are attached to the end of this agenda.

**CALL TO ORDER**

(Meeting Chaired by Robert A. Lovingood)

- i. Pledge of Allegiance
- ii. Attendance
- iii. Announcements
- iv. Agenda Notices/Modifications – Alicia Johnson

**Possible Conflict of Interest Issues**

Note agenda item contractors, subcontractors and agents which may require member abstentions due to conflict of interest and financial interests. Board Member abstentions shall be stated under this item for recordation on the appropriate item.

**1. Information Relative to Possible Conflict of Interest**

Note agenda items and contractors/subcontractors, which may require member abstentions due to possible conflicts of interest.

**This item is prepared for review by SANBAG Board and Committee members.**

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Items listed on the Consent Calendar are expected to be routine and non-controversial. The Consent Calendar will be acted upon as a single motion. Items on the Consent Calendar may be removed for discussion by Board Members.

### **Consent - Project Delivery**

**2. Construction Contract Change Orders to on-going SANBAG construction contracts in the Mountain/Desert Region with Security Paving Company, Inc. and Skanska USA Civil West**

Receive and file change order report.

**Presenter: Garry Coho**

**This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.**

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Discussion - Regional/Subregional Planning**

**3. 2015 Update to the Development Mitigation Nexus Study**

That the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency (CMA), approve the 2015 Update to the Development Mitigation Nexus Study Project Lists and Cost Estimates.

**Presenter: Timothy Byrne**

**This item is also scheduled for review by the Board of Directors Metro Valley Study Session on January 14, 2016. Information in this agenda item was provided to members the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee.**

**4. Draft 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)**

That the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee:

A. Receive information on SANBAG staff observations regarding the Draft 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) released in December 2015 by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

B. Provide direction to staff regarding potential SANBAG comments on the RTP/SCS and PEIR, due to SCAG on February 1, 2016.

**Presenter: Steve Smith**

**This item is also scheduled for review by the Board of Directors Metro Valley Study Session on January 14, 2016. Information in this agenda item was reviewed by the Planning and Development Technical Forum on December 16, 2015.**

## **Discussion - Transportation Programming and Fund Administration**

### **5. 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program**

That the Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

A. Approve the 2017 San Bernardino County Transportation Improvement Program, as shown in Attachment 1 (under separate cover from agenda), to be submitted to Southern California Association of Governments for inclusion in the 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program.

B. Authorize staff to amend the 2017 San Bernardino County Transportation Improvement Program as necessary to meet State, Federal, and responsible agency programming requirements.

C. Adopt Resolution No. 16-020, certifying that the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission and other project sponsors have resources available and committed for the first two years of the FTIP and reasonably available for the last four years to fund the projects in the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 through 2021/2022 Transportation Improvement Program, and affirming its commitment to implement all projects in the program.

**Presenter: James Mejia**

**This item is scheduled for review by the Board of Directors Metro Valley Study Session on January 14, 2016. This item and the resolution have been reviewed by General Counsel.**

### **6. Major Local Highway Program Subarea Project List for the North Desert Subarea**

That the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority:

Approve the 2016 Summary of Major Local Highway Program Funding Needs for the North Desert Subarea of the Mountain/Desert.

**Presenter: Ellen Pollema**

**This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.**

### **7. Advance Expenditure Agreement for the State Route 62 in the City of Twentynine Palms**

That the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority:

A. Allocate \$100,000 of Measure I Morongo Basin Subarea Major Local Highway Program Funds to the City of Twentynine Palms for the State Route 62 between Encelia Avenue and Larrea Avenue project.

B. Approve Advance Expenditure Agreement 16-1001422 with the City of Twentynine Palms for future reimbursement of \$100,000 in Measure I Morongo Basin Subarea Major Local Highway Program Funds for the State Route 62 between Encelia Avenue and Larrea Avenue project.

**Presenter: Ellen Pollema**

**This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. General Counsel has reviewed this item and the draft agreement.**

## **Comments from Board Members**

Brief Comments from Board Members

## **Public Comment**

Brief Comments by the General Public

## **ADJOURNMENT**

## **Additional Information**

Attendance  
SANBAG Entities  
Acronym List  
Mission Statement

**The next Mountain/Desert Policy Committee Meeting will be February 19, 2016**

Complete packages of the SANBAG agenda are available for public review at the SANBAG offices and our website: [www.sanbag.ca.gov](http://www.sanbag.ca.gov). Staff reports for items may be made available upon request. For additional information call (909) 884-8276.

## Meeting Procedures and Rules of Conduct

**Meeting Procedures** - The Ralph M. Brown Act is the state law which guarantees the public's right to attend and participate in meetings of local legislative bodies. These rules have been adopted by the Board of Directors in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code 54950 et seq., and shall apply at all meetings of the Board of Directors and Policy Committees.

**Accessibility** - The SANBAG meeting facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. If assistive listening devices or other auxiliary aids or services are needed in order to participate in the public meeting, requests should be made through the Clerk of the Board at least three (3) business days prior to the Board meeting. The Clerk's telephone number is (909) 884-8276 and office is located at 1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Bernardino, CA.

**Agendas** – All agendas are posted at 1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 1st Floor, San Bernardino at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. Staff reports related to agenda items may be reviewed at the SANBAG offices located at 1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Bernardino and our website: [www.sanbag.ca.gov](http://www.sanbag.ca.gov).

**Agenda Actions** – Items listed on both the “Consent Calendar” and “Discussion” contain recommended actions. The Board of Directors will generally consider items in the order listed on the agenda. However, items may be considered in any order. New agenda items can be added and action taken by two-thirds vote of the Board of Directors or unanimous vote of members present as provided in the Ralph M. Brown Act Government Code Sec. 54954.2(b).

**Closed Session Agenda Items** – Consideration of closed session items excludes members of the public. These items include issues related to personnel, pending litigation, labor negotiations and real estate negotiations. Prior to each closed session, the Chair will announce the subject matter of the closed session. If action is taken in closed session, the Chair may report the action to the public at the conclusion of the closed session.

**Public Testimony on an Item** – Members of the public are afforded an opportunity to speak on any listed item. Individuals wishing to address the Board of Directors or Policy Committee Members should complete a “Request to Speak” form, provided at the rear of the meeting room, and present it to the Clerk prior to the Board's consideration of the item. A "Request to Speak" form must be completed for each item an individual wishes to speak on. When recognized by the Chair, speakers should be prepared to step forward and announce their name and address for the record. In the interest of facilitating the business of the Board, speakers are limited to three (3) minutes on each item. Additionally, a twelve (12) minute limitation is established for the total amount of time any one individual may address the Board at any one meeting. The Chair or a majority of the Board may establish a different time limit as appropriate, and parties to agenda items shall not be subject to the time limitations. Members of the public requesting information be distributed to the Board of Directors must provide 40 copies of such information in advance of the meeting, except for noticed public hearings. Information provided as public testimony is not read into the record by the Clerk.

The Consent Calendar is considered a single item, thus the three (3) minute rule applies. Consent Calendar items can be pulled at Board member request and will be brought up individually at the specified time in the agenda allowing further public comment on those items.

**Agenda Times** – The Board is concerned that discussion take place in a timely and efficient manner. Agendas may be prepared with estimated times for categorical areas and certain topics to be discussed. These times may vary according to the length of presentation and amount of resulting discussion on agenda items.

**Public Comment** – At the end of the agenda, an opportunity is also provided for members of the public to speak on any subject within the Board’s authority. Matters raised under “Public Comment” may not be acted upon at that meeting. “Public Testimony on any Item” still applies.

**Disruptive or Prohibited Conduct** – If any meeting of the Board is willfully disrupted by a person or by a group of persons so as to render the orderly conduct of the meeting impossible, the Chair may recess the meeting or order the person, group or groups of person willfully disrupting the meeting to leave the meeting or to be removed from the meeting. Disruptive or prohibited conduct includes without limitation addressing the Board without first being recognized, not addressing the subject before the Board, repetitiously addressing the same subject, failing to relinquish the podium when requested to do so, bringing into the meeting any type of object that could be used as a weapon, including without limitation sticks affixed to signs, or otherwise preventing the Board from conducting its meeting in an orderly manner. Your cooperation is appreciated!

**SANBAG General Practices for Conducting Meetings  
of  
Board of Directors and Policy Committees**

**Attendance.**

- The Chair of the Board or a Policy Committee (Chair) has the option of taking attendance by Roll Call or Self-Introductions. If attendance is taken by Roll Call, the Clerk of the Board will call out by jurisdiction or supervisorial district. The Member or Alternate will respond by stating his/her name. If attendance is by Self-Introduction, the Member or Alternate will state his/her name and jurisdiction or supervisorial district.
- A Member/Alternate, who arrives after attendance is taken, shall announce his/her name prior to voting on any item.
- A Member/Alternate, who wishes to leave the meeting after attendance is taken but before remaining items are voted on, shall announce his/her name and that he/she is leaving the meeting.

**Basic Agenda Item Discussion.**

- The Chair announces the agenda item number and states the subject.
- The Chair calls upon the appropriate staff member or Board Member to report on the item.
- The Chair asks members of the Board/Committee if they have any questions or comments on the item. General discussion ensues.
- The Chair calls for public comment based on “Request to Speak” forms which may be submitted.
- Following public comment, the Chair announces that public comment is closed and asks if there is any further discussion by members of the Board/Committee.
- The Chair calls for a motion from members of the Board/Committee.
- Upon a motion, the Chair announces the name of the member who makes the motion. Motions require a second by a member of the Board/Committee. Upon a second, the Chair announces the name of the Member who made the second, and the vote is taken.
- The “aye” votes in favor of the motion shall be made collectively. Any Member who wishes to oppose or abstain from voting on the motion, shall individually and orally state the Member’s “nay” vote or abstention. Members present who do not individually and orally state their “nay” vote or abstention shall be deemed, and reported to the public, to have voted “aye” on the motion.

**The Vote as specified in the SANBAG Bylaws.**

- Each Member of the Board of Directors shall have one vote. In the absence of the official representative, the alternate shall be entitled to vote. (Board of Directors only.)
- Voting may be either by voice or roll call vote. A roll call vote shall be conducted upon the demand of five official representatives present, or at the discretion of the presiding officer.

**Amendment or Substitute Motion.**

- Occasionally a Board Member offers a substitute motion before the vote on a previous motion. In instances where there is a motion and a second, the maker of the original motion is asked if he/she would like to amend the motion to include the substitution or withdraw the motion on the floor. If the maker of the original motion does not want to amend or withdraw, the substitute motion is not addressed until after a vote on the first motion.
- Occasionally, a motion dies for lack of a second.

**Call for the Question.**

- At times, a Member of the Board/Committee may “Call for the Question.”
- Upon a “Call for the Question,” the Chair may order that the debate stop or may allow for limited further comment to provide clarity on the proceedings.
- Alternatively and at the Chair’s discretion, the Chair may call for a vote of the Board/Committee to determine whether or not debate is stopped.
- The Chair re-states the motion before the Board/Committee and calls for the vote on the item.

**The Chair.**

- At all times, meetings are conducted in accordance with the Chair’s direction.
- These general practices provide guidelines for orderly conduct.
- From time-to-time circumstances require deviation from general practice.
- Deviation from general practice is at the discretion of the Chair.

**Courtesy and Decorum.**

- These general practices provide for business of the Board/Committee to be conducted efficiently, fairly and with full participation.
- It is the responsibility of the Chair and Members to maintain common courtesy and decorum.

*Adopted By SANBAG Board of Directors January 2008  
Revised March 2014*

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission
- San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency
- Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

***Minute Action***

AGENDA ITEM: 1

***Date:*** January 15, 2016

***Subject:***  
 Information Relative to Possible Conflict of Interest

***Recommendation:***  
 Note agenda items and contractors/subcontractors, which may require member abstentions due to possible conflicts of interest.

***Background:***  
 In accordance with California Government Code 84308, members of the SANBAG Board may not participate in any action concerning a contract where they have received a campaign contribution of more than \$250 in the prior twelve months from an entity or individual, except for the initial award of a competitively bid public works contract. This agenda contains recommendations for action relative to the following contractors:

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>Principals &amp; Agents</b>	<b>Subcontractors</b>
		<i>None at this time</i>	

***Financial Impact:***  
 This item has no direct impact on the SANBAG budget.

***Reviewed By:***  
 This item is prepared for review by SANBAG Board and Committee members.

***Responsible Staff:***  
 Andrea Zureick, Director of Fund Administration

Approved  
 Mountain-Desert Committee  
 Date: January 15, 2016  
 Witnessed By:

*Entity: CMA, COG, CTA, CTC, SAFE*

- 
- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission
  - San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
  - San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency
  - Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
- 

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 2

**Date:** *January 15, 2016*

**Subject:**

Construction Contract Change Orders to on-going SANBAG construction contracts in the Mountain/Desert Region with Security Paving Company, Inc. and Skanska USA Civil West

**Recommendation:**

Receive and file change order report.

**Background:**

Of SANBAG's two on-going Construction Contracts in the Mountain/Desert region, there have been no Construction Change Orders (CCO's) approved since the last reporting to the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee.

**Financial Impact:**

This item imposes no financial impact, as all CCO's are within previously approved contingency amounts under Task No. 0881 and No. 0890.

**Reviewed By:**

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

**Responsible Staff:**

Garry Cohoe, Director of Project Delivery

---

Approved  
Mountain-Desert Committee  
Date: January 15, 2016

Witnessed By:

*Entity: CMA*

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 3

**Date:** *January 15, 2016*

**Subject:**

2015 Update to the Development Mitigation Nexus Study

**Recommendation:**

That the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency (CMA), approve the 2015 Update to the Development Mitigation Nexus Study Project Lists and Cost Estimates.

**Background:**

State law requires updating of the SANBAG Congestion Management Program (CMP) every two years. The Development Mitigation Nexus Study (Appendix K of the CMP) is also updated every two years as part of the CMP update. The Nexus Study is being updated prior to the full CMP update so that jurisdictions have this information available for their transportation fee program updates according to the normal update cycles identified in the Nexus Study. Appendix J of the CMP outlines the provisions and requirements of the Development Mitigation Nexus Study, particularly the development and maintenance of the Nexus Study project lists and cost estimates. Appendix J was first adopted by the SANBAG Board and incorporated into the CMP in 2005.

The Development Mitigation Program update has been underway since June 2015. Staff discussed the update with the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) and distributed a formal request for information to City Managers and the County Executive Officer on June 29, 2015. Jurisdictions were asked to update arterial and interchange project lists, including the addition or deletion of projects, modifications to project limits and changes to project costs. SANBAG staff updated the interchange and arterial project tables in the Development Mitigation Nexus Study. A draft 2015 update of Table 3 (Interchange Improvements and 2015 Costs, Including a Comparison to 2013 Nexus Study Costs) and Nexus Study Attachment 1 (Arterial Projects by jurisdiction) were distributed to Valley and Victor Valley TTAC representatives in October 2015.

In addition, Table 6, Railroad Grade Separation Projects on the Nexus Study Network, was updated to incorporate current project cost information. Nexus Study Attachment 1 contains the recommended arterial project 2015 updates to the SANBAG Nexus Study. Modifications included adding or deleting projects, modifying project scope (including project limits), adjusting project costs and updating the associated tables for each local jurisdiction.

The most important tables in the Nexus Study update are Tables 7 and 8, which document the development share of total costs that need to be met or exceeded with the development impact fee (DIF) programs that are updated by the cities and the County. The costs in Table 7 are for the cities and the costs in Table 8 are for the County spheres of influence. The overall mitigation cost

*Entity: CMA*

Mountain-Desert Committee Agenda Item

January 15, 2016

Page 2

increase is approximately three percent when compared to the 2013 Nexus Study. The 2013 change from 2011 was approximately a four percent decrease. However, the change varies from one jurisdiction to another.

The updated Tables 3, 6, 7 and 8 of the Development Mitigation Nexus Study have been included as an attachment to this item. The complete updated Development Mitigation Nexus Study can be found on the SANBAG CMP webpage at <http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/planning2/congestion-mgmt.html>.

Following approval of the updated Nexus Study, a request will be sent to Valley and Victor Valley jurisdictions to update their fee programs according to the schedule in Table 9 of the Nexus Study. An option will be provided for those in the January update cycle to update their fee programs by either January 2016 or January 2017. Thus, jurisdictions in this cycle may defer any changes for one year following adoption of the 2015 Nexus Study update.

On January 7, 2015 the SANBAG Board of Directors approved the Valley and Victor Valley DIF Update. The item required that jurisdictions update their DIF programs consistent with the mitigation amounts referenced in Tables 7 and 8 of the 2013 Nexus Study. In addition, the Board also eliminated the escalation requirement on project costs and DIF fees during even numbered years. This action streamlined DIF updates to be consistent with the biennial Nexus Study project list and project cost updates. The text in the Nexus Study has been revised to be consistent with this previous Board action.

***Financial Impact:***

This item has no impact on the adopted Fiscal Year 2015/2016 SANBAG Budget.

***Reviewed By:***

This item is also scheduled for review by the Board of Directors Metro Valley Study Session on January 14, 2016. Information in this agenda item was provided to members the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee.

***Responsible Staff:***

Timothy Byrne, Chief of Planning

---

Approved  
Mountain-Desert Committee  
Date: January 15, 2016

Witnessed By:



## San Bernardino Associated Governments

1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Fl, San Bernardino, CA 92410  
 Phone: (909) 884-8276 Fax: (909) 885-4407  
 Web: www.sanbag.ca.gov




---

•San Bernardino County Transportation Commission •San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
 •San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency •Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

---

# Development Mitigation Nexus Study Update to Tables 3, 6, 7 and 8

## Appendix K of the SANBAG Congestion Management Program

prepared by the  
 San Bernardino Associated Governments  
 (SANBAG)

**December 2015**

**SANBAG Development Mitigation Nexus Study**  
**December 2015**  
**Page 12 of 25**

**Table 3**  
**Interchange Improvements and 2015 Costs,**  
**Including a Comparison to 2013 Nexus Study Costs**

<b>Interchange</b>	<b>2013 Nexus Study Cost (\$Millions)</b>	<b>Lead Agency</b>	<b>2015 Nexus Study Cost Update (\$Millions)</b>	<b>Federal Earmark/ State Buy-Down (\$Millions)</b>	<b>Source of Cost Estimate*</b>	<b>Year Estimate Prepared</b>
SR-60 at:						
Ramona	\$30	Chino	\$30		SANBAG	2011
Central	\$30	SANBAG	\$21		SANBAG	2015
Mountain	\$15	Ontario/Chino	\$15		Ontario DIF & SANBAG	9/2012
Euclid	\$6	Caltrans	\$6		Ontario DIF & SANBAG	9/2012
- Phase 1 (Widen WB exit)	\$2	Ontario	\$2			
- Phase 2 (Widen EB exit)	\$4	Ontario	\$4			
- Phase 3 (Widen EB/ WB on-ramps)						
Grove	\$51	Ontario	\$51		Ontario DIF & SANBAG	9/2012
Vineyard	\$51	Ontario	\$51		Ontario DIF & SANBAG	9/2012
Archibald	\$8	SANBAG	\$12.939		SANBAG Feasibility Study	2014
I-10 at:						
Monte Vista	\$21.9	Montclair	\$32		SANBAG	2015
Euclid	\$9	Upland	\$9		SANBAG	2015
Grove/4 <sup>th</sup>	\$128	Ontario	\$128	\$2.4 (Demo) \$1.425 (IMD)	Ontario	2011
Vineyard	\$84	Ontario	\$84		SANBAG	2011
Cherry	\$80.7	SANBAG	\$80.7	\$1.225 (IMD)	SANBAG	2013
Beech	\$114	Fontana	\$114		Fontana	2011
Citrus	\$58.5	SANBAG	\$58.5		SANBAG	2013
Alder	\$99	Fontana	\$99		Fontana	2011
Cedar	\$60.4	County	\$60.4		SANBAG	2013
Riverside (Ph 1 Complete)						
- Phase 1 (Ramps)	\$27	SANBAG	\$27	\$2.25 (Demo)	PPR	2011
- Phase 2 (Bridge)	\$10	Rialto	\$10	\$2.85 (IMD)	Rialto	2009
Pepper						
- Pepper/Valley	\$8.34	Colton/ County	\$8.34	Ramps/Bridge: \$6.192 (Demo)	PAA	2011
- Ramps/Bridge	\$7.7		\$7.7	\$0.904 (IMD)	SANBAG	2013
Mt. Vernon	\$32	Colton	\$35		SANBAG	2015
Tippecanoe	\$78	SANBAG	\$78	\$33.9	SANBAG	2015
Mountain View	\$51	Loma Linda	\$24.5		SANBAG	2015
California	\$45	Loma Linda	\$45		SANBAG	2011
Alabama	\$41.6	County	\$9.5		County/10 Yr. Delivery Plan	2015
University	\$5.2	Redlands	\$5.2		SANBAG	2013
Wabash	\$40	County	\$40		County	2013
Live Oak (Complete)	\$19	SANBAG	\$19		PAA	2011
Wildwood	\$35	Yucaipa	\$35		Yucaipa	2011

Attachment: SANBAGNexusStudy15-DecDraftTb1Rev-3-6-7-8 (2401 : 2015 Update to the Development Mitigation Nexus Study)

**SANBAG Development Mitigation Nexus Study**  
**December 2015**  
**Page 13 of 25**

**Table 3, Continued**  
**Interchange Improvements and 2015 Costs,**  
**Including a Comparison to 2013 Nexus Study Costs**

<b>Interchange</b>	<b>2013 Nexus Study Cost (\$Millions)</b>	<b>Lead Agency</b>	<b>2015 Nexus Study Cost Update (\$Millions)</b>	<b>Federal Earmark/ State Buy-Down (\$Millions)</b>	<b>Source of Cost Estimate*</b>	<b>Year Estimate Prepared</b>
<b>I-15 at:</b>						
6 <sup>th</sup> /Arrow	\$91.3	Rancho	\$91.3		FTIP	2013
Baseline	\$58.4	Rancho	\$56.6	\$3.6 (Demo) \$3.754 (IMD) \$0.428 (Bridge) \$1.0 (SLPP-C)	SANBAG/ Rancho	2015
Duncan Canyon	\$35.8	Fontana	\$35.8	\$1.972 (SLPP-C)	Fontana	2013
Sierra	\$13	Rialto	\$13		Ph 1 – CT/County	2011
- Phase 1 (Widen SB exit)	\$2.3		\$2.3		Ph 2 - Rialto	
- Phase 2	\$10.7		\$10.7			
Ranchero	\$60	Hesperia	\$58.9	\$3.008 (IMD)	Hesperia	2015
Muscatel	\$71	Hesperia	\$71		Project DB	2011
Bear Valley	\$25	Victorville	\$25		Victorville	2009
La Mesa/Nisqualli (Complete)	\$40.5	Victorville	\$79.6		Victorville	2015
<b>I-215 at:</b>						
University	\$28	SB City	\$4.8	\$0.735 (Demo) \$5.0 (STP buy-down)	PSR	2015
Pepper/Linden	\$57	SB City	\$60		SB City	2015
Palm	\$11	SB City	\$11.6		SB City	2015
<b>SR-210 at:</b>						
Waterman	\$51	SB City	\$53.8		SB City	2015
Del Rosa	\$36	SB City	\$38		SB City	2015
Baseline	\$15.6	SANBAG	\$21.07		SANBAG	2015
5 <sup>th</sup>	\$8	Highland	\$8		Highland	2009

Notes: \* Cost estimates are from various sources.

PSR – Project Study Report

PPR – Project Programming Request provided by local jurisdiction or SANBAG

PAA – Project Advancement Agreement

FTIP – Federal Transportation Improvement Program

DIF – Development Impact Fee Program

Ecosys – Estimate incorporated into Ecosys project management tool from SANBAG and local input

No change means no additional information available since 2013 Nexus Study.

Attachment: SANBAGNexusStudy15-DecDraftTbRev-3-6-7-8 (2401 : 2015 Update to the Development Mitigation Nexus Study)

**Table 6. Railroad Grade Crossing Projects on Nexus Study Network**

Description	2015 Cost Estimate (\$1,000s)	Buy Down	Location	Ratio Train Growth to 2030	Ratio Trip Growth to 2030	2013 Cost Allocation To Development (\$1,000s)
Olive Street (Colton) on the San Bernardino Line	\$0		Colton	55%	43.6%	\$0
Valley Boulevard (Colton) on the San Bernardino Line	\$0		Colton	55%	43.6%	\$0
Laurel Street (Colton) - Replaces Valley Boulevard	\$60,647	(\$10,334)	Colton	55%	43.6%	\$9,861
Fogg Street (Colton) - Replaces Olive Street	\$24,673		Colton	55%	43.6%	\$4,836
Mount Vernon Avenue (Colton) grade separation widening on the Alhambra Line	\$9,494	(\$1,600)	Colton	55%	43.6%	\$1,547
Citrus Avenue (Fontana) At Santa Fe Railroad, Construct Undercrossing For Existing 4 Lanes	\$0		Fontana	55%	32.1%	\$0
Main Street (Grand Terrace) on the San Bernardino Line	\$29,050		Grand Terrace	55%	39.9%	\$5,220
Ranchero Road (Hesperia) - 7th Avenue To Danbury, realign and construct railroad undercrossing	\$32,015	(\$9,070)	Hesperia	55%	58.9%	\$6,084
Mauna Loa/Lemon (Hesperia) on the BNSF Line (costs from feasibility study)	\$59,980		Hesperia	55%	58.9%	\$15,906
Eucalyptus Road (Hesperia) on the BNSF Line	\$0		Hesperia	55%	58.9%	\$0
Beaumont Avenue (Loma Linda) on the Yuma Line	\$24,901		Loma Linda	55%	38.8%	\$4,352
Monte Vista Avenue (Montclair) at the UPRR Crossing	\$31,460	(\$2,090)	Montclair	55%	18.9%	\$2,502
Central Avenue (Montclair) grade separation widening on the Alhambra and Los Angeles Lines	\$0		Montclair	55%	18.9%	\$0
Archibald Avenue (Ontario) on the Los Angeles Line	\$59,486		Ontario	55%	44.4%	\$11,881
North Milliken Avenue (Ontario) on the Alhambra Line	\$40,621	(\$7,161)	Ontario	55%	44.4%	\$6,683
South Milliken Avenue (Ontario) on the Los Angeles Line	\$63,835	(\$2,482)	Ontario	55%	44.4%	\$12,254
Vineyard Avenue (Ontario) on the Alhambra Line	\$45,180	(\$2,074)	Ontario	55%	44.4%	\$8,609
Haven Avenue (Rancho Cucamonga) at Metrolink Crossing	\$21,069		Rancho	55%	28.7%	\$2,721
San Timoteo Road (Redlands) railroad crossing safety improvements on the Yuma Line	\$1,961		Redlands	55%	23.1%	\$204
Palm Avenue (San Bernardino) on the Cajon Line	\$23,667	(\$7,130)	San Bernardino	55%	32.4%	\$2,410
Rialto Avenue (San Bernardino) on the San Bernardino Line	\$25,803		San Bernardino	55%	32.4%	\$3,760
Hunts Lane (San Bernardino/Colton) on the Yuma Line	\$28,866	(\$9,499)	S. Bern./Colton	55%	38.0%	\$3,309
Glen Helen Parkway (San Bernardino County) on Cajon Line	\$30,978	(\$2,320)	County	55%	62.2%	\$8,021

**SANBAG Development Mitigation Nexus Study**  
**December 2015**  
**Page 22 of 25**

**Table 7. Summary of Fair Share Costs for Arterial, Interchange, and Railroad Grade Crossing Project Costs for Cities (through year 2030)**  
**Cost in Millions of 2015 dollars**

Jurisdiction	2015						
	Ratio of Trip Growth to 2030 Trips (Development Fair Share)	Total Arterial Cost	Development Share of Total Arterial Cost	Public Share of Total Arterial Cost	Development Share Of Interchange Cost	Development Share Of Railroad Grade Crossing Cost	Development Share of Total Cost
Adelanto	63.5%	\$222.08	\$141.02	\$81.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$141.02
Apple Valley	55.0%	\$242.00	\$133.20	\$108.81	\$10.23	\$0.00	\$143.43
Chino	35.2%	\$142.90	\$50.24	\$92.66	\$23.34	\$0.00	\$73.58
Chino Hills	13.7%	\$16.62	\$2.28	\$14.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2.28
Colton	43.6%	\$46.79	\$20.38	\$26.41	\$6.89	\$17.90	\$45.17
Fontana	32.1%	\$387.61	\$124.49	\$263.13	\$146.58	\$0.00	\$271.07
Grand Terrace	39.9%	\$35.23	\$14.07	\$21.16	\$0.00	\$5.22	\$19.29
Hesperia	58.9%	\$195.43	\$115.16	\$80.26	\$70.78	\$21.99	\$207.93
Highland	46.4%	\$129.77	\$60.23	\$69.54	\$15.61	\$0.00	\$75.84
Loma Linda	38.8%	\$80.50	\$31.26	\$49.24	\$22.16	\$4.35	\$57.77
Montclair	18.9%	\$10.00	\$1.89	\$8.11	\$6.47	\$2.50	\$10.87
Ontario	44.4%	\$205.13	\$91.04	\$114.09	\$134.38	\$39.43	\$264.86
Rancho Cucamonga	28.7%	\$103.78	\$29.78	\$74.00	\$61.81	\$2.72	\$94.31
Redlands	23.1%	\$72.05	\$16.65	\$55.40	\$7.98	\$0.20	\$24.83
Rialto	40.9%	\$108.06	\$44.15	\$63.91	\$15.94	\$0.00	\$60.09
San Bernardino	32.4%	\$164.01	\$53.11	\$110.90	\$59.50	\$7.82	\$120.44
Upland	39.4%	\$54.03	\$21.29	\$32.74	\$3.85	\$0.00	\$25.15
Victorville	49.0%	\$57.54	\$28.21	\$29.32	\$35.51	\$0.00	\$63.72
Yucaipa	30.9%	\$131.15	\$40.52	\$90.63	\$24.53	\$0.00	\$65.05
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$2,381.38</b>	<b>\$1,008.64</b>	<b>\$1,372.74</b>	<b>\$645.56</b>	<b>\$102.14</b>	<b>\$1,756.34</b>

**SANBAG Development Mitigation Nexus Study**  
**December 2015**  
**Page 23 of 25**

**Table 8. Summary of Fair Share Costs for Arterial, Interchange, and Railroad Grade Crossing Project Costs for Sphere Areas (through 2030)**  
**Costs in Millions of 2015 dollars**

Jurisdiction	2015						
	Ratio of Trip Growth to 2030 Trips (Fair Share %)	Total Arterial Cost	Development Share of Total Arterial Cost	Public Share of Total Arterial Cost	Development Share Of Interchange Cost	Development Share Of Railroad Grade Separation Cost	Development Share of Total Cost
Adelanto Sphere	63.0%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Apple Valley Sphere	57.2%	\$10.95	\$6.26	\$4.69	\$0.37	\$0.00	\$6.63
Chino Sphere	36.7%	\$28.84	\$10.57	\$18.26	\$1.69	\$0.00	\$12.27
Colton Sphere	37.2%	\$6.95	\$2.59	\$4.37	\$0.07	\$0.00	\$2.65
Devore/Glen Helen	62.2%	\$17.69	\$11.00	\$6.69	\$0.00	\$8.02	\$19.02
Fontana Sphere	41.7%	\$57.31	\$23.93	\$33.39	\$40.23	\$0.00	\$64.15
Hesperia Sphere	41.5%	\$28.36	\$11.78	\$16.58	\$3.98	\$0.00	\$15.76
Loma Linda Sphere	72.3%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5.33	\$0.00	\$5.33
Montclair Sphere	36.6%	\$11.76	\$4.30	\$7.45	\$2.91	\$0.00	\$7.21
Redlands Sphere	35.5%	\$21.13	\$7.50	\$13.63	\$12.53	\$0.00	\$20.03
Redlands Donut Hole	62.0%	\$1.50	\$0.93	\$0.57	\$8.48	\$0.00	\$9.41
Rialto Sphere	37.6%	\$40.85	\$15.38	\$25.47	\$28.12	\$0.00	\$43.50
San Bernardino Sphere	23.1%	\$13.43	\$3.11	\$10.32	\$3.19	\$0.00	\$6.30
Upland Sphere	38.7%	\$7.15	\$2.77	\$4.39	\$2.04	\$0.00	\$4.81
Victorville Sphere	17.8%	\$21.31	\$3.78	\$17.53	\$0.64	\$0.00	\$4.42
Yucaipa Sphere	39.5%	\$0.88	\$0.35	\$0.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.35
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$268.11</b>	<b>\$104.25</b>	<b>\$163.86</b>	<b>\$109.58</b>	<b>\$8.02</b>	<b>\$221.85</b>

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 4

**Date:** *January 15, 2016*

**Subject:**

Draft 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)

**Recommendation:**

That the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee:

A. Receive information on SANBAG staff observations regarding the Draft 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) released in December 2015 by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

B. Provide direction to staff regarding potential SANBAG comments on the RTP/SCS and PEIR, due to SCAG on February 1, 2016.

**Background:**

The draft 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and PEIR were released by SCAG for public comment on December 4, 2015. The formal comment period for both documents closes on February 1, 2016.

The RTP/SCS is a long-range visioning plan that balances future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental and public health goals. The RTP is a federal requirement, and the SCS is required by the State of California pursuant to Senate Bill 375. The RTP/SCS must be updated every four years. The RTP portion must be adopted by April 2016 to avoid a lapse in the Region's federal air quality conformity (conformity refers to the Region's federally required compliance with the State Implementation Plan for air quality).

The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS has been a monumental effort for SCAG staff and all its stakeholder agencies. SANBAG works with SCAG on multiple fronts to develop the RTP/SCS, with the two primary areas of interaction being in the forecasts of growth in population, households, and employment and in the transportation projects and sustainability strategies included in the Plan. The body of the RTP/SCS consists of almost 200 pages organized into the following chapters:

Executive Summary: Envisioning Our Region in 2040

1. Introduction
2. Where We Are Today
3. Challenges in a Changing Region
4. Creating a Plan for Our Future
5. The Road to Greater Mobility and Sustainable Growth
6. Paying for the Plan
7. A Plan that Creates Economic Opportunity: The Big Picture
8. Measuring Our Progress
9. Looking Ahead

*Entity: CTC*

In addition to the body of the Plan, the RTP contains approximately 20 appendices with more detailed technical information.

The PEIR contains approximately 1900 pages of material in the body of the report and appendices. The Executive Summary of the PEIR contains a long list of mitigation measures that must be reviewed regarding the potential obligations that could be incurred for regional and local agencies, including SANBAG. Thus, the RTP/SCS and PEIR represent not only a daunting effort for SCAG to have produced, but are also daunting for the stakeholder agencies to review. SANBAG staff has been working diligently with SCAG staff since the initiation of the 2016 RTP/SCS process, allowing staff to become familiar with the issues, but the review is a major effort, nonetheless. The 10-page Executive Summary is attached, providing an overview of the RTP/SCS. The link to the draft RTP/SCS documents is: <http://scagrtpscs.net/Pages/Draft2016RTPSCS.aspx#toc>. The link to the PEIR documents is: <http://scagrtpscs.net/Pages/Draft2016PEIR.aspx>

It is important to note that the development of the SCAG region's RTP/SCS takes place in the context of the largest and most geographically and demographically diverse metropolitan area in the United States. The six counties in the SCAG region have over twice the population (over 18 million) of the San Francisco Bay Area, over five times the population of the San Diego Region, and over seven times that of the Sacramento region. The South Coast Air Basin is in the "extreme" nonattainment category for air quality, carrying with it additional responsibility and expectations. The Mojave Desert Air Basin is in the "severe" nonattainment category. San Bernardino County is, in effect, "ground zero" for air quality concerns, being home to some of the most polluted areas in the U.S.

The SCAG region is a focal point for goods movement and industry. The region's ports handle more than five times the container volume as those of the Bay Area, with commensurate train and truck impacts. Southern California's manufacturing output exceeds that of all other parts of the state, combined, and represents almost six percent of the nation's manufacturing employment. Our six major commercial airports carry 91 million national and international passengers per year. The region now has over 500 miles of passenger rail lines, between commuter rail, heavy rail, and light rail, and almost 22,000 miles of highways and arterials. Although the geographic, demographic, and institutional scope of the region present enormous challenges, the continued growth of the region can also be viewed as some measure of success, given the number of people who have seen fit to live and work here and to enjoy many aspects of the Southern California lifestyle.

There are so many topics covered in the RTP/SCS that this agenda item can focus on only a few. Several topics are selected for highlighting and comment. Among these include the land use/transportation scenarios analyzed by SCAG, the financial plan, and the achievement of greenhouse gas reduction targets in response to SB 375.

### **SCAG's Preferred Scenario**

In the process of developing the RTP/SCS, SCAG analyzed several alternative growth and transportation scenarios. As described in the PEIR, these included:

1. The **2016 RTP/SCS** (i.e. the recommended Plan and preferred scenario) – is based on SCAG's "Policy Growth Forecast" and transportation projects submitted by the County

Transportation Commissions, working with local jurisdictions and other transportation agencies.

2. The **No Project Alternative** - includes those transportation projects that are included in the first year of the previously conforming transportation plan and/or transportation improvement program (TIP), or have completed environmental review by December 2014.

3. The **2012 RTP/SCS Updated with Local Input Alternative** - retains transportation investments and land use strategies of the adopted 2012 RTP/SCS, updated to reflect the most recent local input growth estimates in the region.

4. The **Intensified Land Use Alternative** - builds on the land use strategies in the 2016 RTP/SCS (preferred scenario) and goes further. This Alternative focuses on analyzing a more intensified land use pattern aimed at further reducing vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas and criteria pollutant emissions to improve mobility, sustainability, and economy. It includes more mixed-use and infill development, increased densities in high-quality transit areas (HQTAs), livable corridors, neighborhood mobility areas, new technology innovations and enhancement, and/or additional transit and active transportation strategies beyond the 2016 RTP/SCS.

SCAG's description of the preferred scenario is extracted from Chapter 4 of the RTP/SCS:

*The extensive public outreach coupled with detailed analysis of each scenario and coordination with technical and policy committees led to our selection of a preferred scenario for the 2016 RTP/SCS based upon SCAG's "Policy Growth Forecast." This preferred scenario also incorporated inputs from local jurisdictions, including the land use and transportation strategies, investments and policies reflected in the 2012 RTP/SCS.*

*The preferred scenario envisions future regional growth that is well coordinated with the transportation system improvements of the approved 2012 RTP/SCS, as well as anticipated new transportation projects planned by the region's CTCs and transit providers. It also incorporates best practices for increasing transportation choices; reducing our dependence on personal automobiles; allowing future growth in walkable, mixed-use communities and in High-Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs); and further improving air quality.*

*Regional investments in making transit trips quicker and easier are expanded to increase transit ridership. New land use concepts such as "Livable Corridors" and "Neighborhood Mobility Areas" are also introduced. These are described in more detail later in the Plan. In the preferred scenario for the 2016 RTP/SCS, new residential growth from 2012 to 2040 is split between multifamily housing (69 percent) and detached single-family homes (31 percent). The preferred scenario is the result of an investment plan that is assumed to be financially constrained.*

*To help our regional partners envision how the preferred scenario fosters development on the ground, SCAG built upon its earlier outreach and solicited feedback from local jurisdictions on the distribution of new households and employment at the neighborhood level, through 2040. Jurisdictions were asked to provide input on the growth scenario, including information on specific planned development projects with entitlements, other planned projects, or recently completed developments. Accordingly, the following core principles provided the framework for the preferred scenario:*

- ***Principle #1:** The preferred scenario will be adopted at the jurisdictional level, thus directly reflecting the population, household and employment growth projections derived from the local input process and previously reviewed and approved by local jurisdictions.*

*The preferred scenario maintains these projected jurisdictional growth totals, meaning future growth is not reallocated from one local jurisdiction to another.*

- *Principle #2: The preferred scenario at the Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) level is controlled to be within the density ranges of local general plans or input received from local jurisdictions.*
- *Principle #3: For the purpose of determining consistency for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) streamlining, lead agencies such as local jurisdictions have the sole discretion in determining a local project's consistency with the 2016 RTP/SCS.*
- *Principle #4: TAZ level data or any data at a geography smaller than the jurisdictional level has been utilized to conduct required modeling analyses and is therefore advisory only and non-binding given that sub-jurisdictional forecasts are not adopted as part of the 2016 RTP/SCS. TAZ level data may be used by jurisdictions in local planning as it deems appropriate. There is no obligation by a jurisdiction to change its land use policies, General Plan, or regulations to be consistent with the 2016 RTP/SCS.*
- *Principle #5: SCAG will maintain communication with agencies who use SCAG sub-jurisdictional level data to ensure that the "advisory & non-binding" nature of the data is appropriately maintained.*

*The preferred scenario improves the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the region and enhances public health and other co-benefits from large transportation investments and improvements in technology – particularly those that focus on transit and first/last mile strategies.*

*Furthermore, the preferred scenario offers a vision for how we want our region to grow over the next quarter century and it gives us a clear-eyed view of what we want to achieve. Guided by goals and policies, built through sober analysis and refined with extensive public input, developing the preferred scenario set the stage for the hard work of building a comprehensive plan of land use and transportation strategies, programs and projects designed to confront our many challenges and move our region toward the vision embodied in the preferred scenario.*

*Chapter 5 reviews those strategies, programs and projects that collectively will propel the region toward realizing the outcomes seen in the preferred scenario – including more livable, healthy and economically strong communities and a more sustainable future.*

## **Transportation Projects**

One of the primary inputs from SANBAG to SCAG has been on the transportation projects to be included in the RTP/SCS. A complete listing of projects is included in the RTP/SCS Project List appendix. The listing is too extensive to provide here, but the RTP/SCS list is consistent with the list SANBAG developed for the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) under the CTP "Aggressive Scenario." The CTP was reviewed by the SANBAG Board prior to submittal to SCAG. The CTP and a summary of the project list may be found at:

[http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/planning2/plan\\_county-wide-transit.html](http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/planning2/plan_county-wide-transit.html)

## **Financial Plan**

One of the most critical elements of the RTP/SCS is the financial plan. The RTP is required to be financially constrained, meaning that project costs must be matched with "reasonably available" revenues.

The 2016 RTP/SCS acknowledges the considerable challenges associated with financing

transportation investments. The Plan highlights the importance of finding new and innovative ways to pay for transportation, including the ever-expanding backlog of investment needs just to maintain the existing system. The recently enacted FAST Act (Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act) is a \$281 billion, 5-year bill, with \$225.2 billion for highways, \$48.7 billion for mass transit, and \$7 billion for highway and motor carrier safety. FAST provides a 5.1 percent increase above Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 levels in FY 2016 for highways and an 8.8 percent increase for mass transit. In subsequent years, programs are anticipated to grow just above 2 percent annually. This will provide some federal funding stability in the near term, but gas tax revenue to support the Highway Trust Fund remains in decline. The additional funding from the Federal Stimulus Program and Proposition 1B state bond program has essentially been expended.

Table 7 (FY 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Revenues) and Table 8 (FY 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Expenditures) from the Transportation Finance appendix tell much of the financial story of the RTP/SCS and are provided as Attachment 2. Highlights of these tables will be reviewed at the committee meeting. The nature and timing of the innovative financing mechanisms are some of the core considerations in the RTP/SCS, and perhaps the most uncertain. The more challenging innovative financing strategies are not scheduled to be in effect until after the 2020 RTP/SCS is prepared. Thus, modifications to the financial plan in the next RTP/SCS are possible prior to their actual implementation. However, these measures require substantial groundwork if they are to become reality, and activity will need to occur prior to the expiration of the 2016 RTP. The innovative financing sources in the 2012 RTP/SCS were deemed by the Federal Highway Administration to be "reasonably expected to be available," and it is anticipated that this will also be the case for the 2016 RTP/SCS, as essentially the same set of innovative financing strategies are proposed.

### **SB 375 and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions**

SB 375 requires that SCAG and other Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) throughout the state develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions through integrated transportation, land use, housing and environmental planning.

Pursuant to SB 375, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) set per capita greenhouse gas emission reduction targets from passenger vehicles for each of the state's 18 MPOs. For the SCAG region, the targets are set at eight percent below 2005 per capita emissions levels by 2020 and 13 percent below 2005 per capita emissions levels by 2035. Although CARB has not adjusted SCAG's regional targets since the 2012 RTP/SCS, SCAG anticipates that the region's targets could change. Because the transportation sector is the largest contributor to California's greenhouse gas emissions (more than 36 percent), SCAG anticipates updated and more stringent regional greenhouse gas reduction targets may be forthcoming.

In the meantime, the 2016 RTP/SCS achieves per capita greenhouse gas emission reductions relative to 2005 of eight percent in 2020, 18 percent in 2035, and 22 percent in 2040 – exceeding the reductions that CARB currently requires. More detailed information and analysis regarding monitoring of air quality and greenhouse gas emissions in the SCAG region can be found in the Transportation Conformity Appendix of the RTP/SCS.

Mountain-Desert Committee Agenda Item

January 15, 2016

Page 6

**Next Steps**

Elected official workshops on the RTP/SCS will be held at 11:30 a.m. Wednesday, January 6, 2016 at SANBAG following the SANBAG Board meeting and on Friday, January 15 in Apple Valley following the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee meeting.

At this time it is unclear whether SANBAG staff will recommend making formal comments to SCAG on the RTP/SCS. Additional review of the documents is required prior to making that determination. Comments are due by February 1, 2016. Potential comments will be discussed at the committee meeting, and staff requests that the committee provide direction to staff on any of these or other comments to be considered for submittal to SCAG.

***Financial Impact:***

This item is consistent with the approved Fiscal Year 2015-2016 SANBAG Budget. The RTP does not have immediate financial implications to SANBAG, and SANBAG retains the decision-making authority concerning the implementation, funding, and timing of specific projects.

***Reviewed By:***

This item is also scheduled for review by the Board of Directors Metro Valley Study Session on January 14, 2016. Information in this agenda item was reviewed by the Planning and Development Technical Forum on December 16, 2015.

***Responsible Staff:***

Steve Smith, Director of Planning

---

Approved  
Mountain-Desert Committee  
Date: January 15, 2016

Witnessed By:

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



## HIGHLIGHTS

- OUR VISION 2
- OUR OVERARCHING STRATEGY 2
- CHALLENGES WE FACE 3
- OUR PROGRESS SINCE 2012 4
- SETTING THE STAGE FOR OUR PLAN 5
- FINANCING OUR FUTURE 8
- WHAT WE WILL ACCOMPLISH 8
- HOW WE WILL ENSURE SUCCESS 9
- LOOKING BEYOND 2040 9

Image courtesy of Samer Momani

# ENVISIONING OUR REGION IN 2040

Transport yourself 25 years into the future. What kind of Southern California do you envision? SCAG envisions a region that has grown by nearly four million people – sustainably. In communities across Southern California, people enjoy increased mobility, greater economic opportunity and a higher quality of life.

## OUR VISION

In our vision for the region in 2040, many communities are more compact and connected seamlessly by numerous public transit options, including expanded bus and rail service. People live closer to work, school, shopping and other destinations. Their neighborhoods are more walkable and safe for bicyclists. They have more options available besides driving alone, reducing the load on roads and highways. People live more active and healthy lifestyles as they bike, walk or take transit for short trips. Goods flow freely along roadways, highways, rail lines and by sea and air into and out of the region – fueling economic growth.

Southern California’s vast transportation network is preserved and maintained in a state of good repair, so that public tax dollars are not expended on costly repairs and extensive rehabilitation. The region’s roads and highways are well-managed so that they operate safely and efficiently, while demands on the regional network are managed effectively by offering people numerous alternatives for transportation.

Housing across the region is sufficient to meet the demands of a growing population with shifting priorities and desires, and there are more affordable homes for all segments of society. With more connected communities, more choices for travel and robust commerce, people enjoy more opportunities to advance educationally and economically. As growth and opportunity are distributed widely, people from diverse neighborhoods across the region share in the benefits of an enhanced quality of life.

With more alternatives to driving alone available, air quality is improved and the greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global climate change are reduced. Communities throughout Southern California are more prepared to confront and cope with the inevitable consequences of climate change, including droughts and wildfires, heat waves, rising seas and extreme weather. Meanwhile, natural lands and recreational areas that offer people a respite from the busier parts of the region are preserved and protected.

At mid-century, technology has transformed how we get around. Automated cars have emerged as a viable option for people and are being integrated into the overall transportation system. Shared mobility options that rely on instantaneous communication and paperless transactions have matured and new markets for mobility are created and strengthened.

Above all, people across the region possess more choices for getting around and with those choices come opportunities to live healthier, more economically secure and higher quality lives.

This vision for mid-century, which is built on input received from thousands of people across Southern California, is embodied in the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS, or Plan), a major planning document for our regional transportation and land use network. It balances the region’s future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental and public health goals. This long-range Plan, required by the state of California and the federal government, is updated by SCAG every four years as demographic, economic and policy circumstances change. The 2016 RTP/SCS is a living, evolving blueprint for our region’s future.

## OUR OVERARCHING STRATEGY

It is clear that the path toward realizing our vision will require a single unified strategy, one that *integrates planning for how we use our land with planning for how we get around.*

Here is what we mean: we can choose to build new sprawling communities that pave over undeveloped natural lands, necessitating the construction of new roads and highways – which will undoubtedly become quickly overcrowded and contribute to regional air pollution and ever increasing greenhouse gas emissions that drive climate change.

Or, we can grow more compact communities in existing urban areas, providing neighborhoods with efficient and plentiful public transit, abundant and safe opportunities to walk, bike and pursue other forms of active transportation and preserving the region’s remaining natural lands for people to enjoy. This second vision captures the essence of what people have said they want during SCAG outreach to communities across the region.

SCAG acknowledges that more compact communities are not for everyone, and that many residents of our region prefer to live in established suburban neighborhoods. The agency supports local control for local land use decisions, while striving for a regional vision of more sustainable growth.

Within the 2016 RTP/SCS, you will read about plans for “High Quality Transit Areas,” “Livable Corridors,” and “Neighborhood Mobility Areas.” These are a few of the key features of a thoughtfully planned, maturing region in which people benefit from increased mobility, more active lifestyles, increased economic opportunity and an overall higher quality of life. These features embody the idea of integrating planning for how we use land with planning for transportation.

As we pursue this unified strategy, it will be vital that we ensure that the benefits of our initiatives are widely distributed and that the burdens of development are not carried by any one group disproportionately. Social equity and environmental justice must be key considerations of our overall Plan.

## CHALLENGES WE FACE

We are living at a time of great change in Southern California. Our region must confront several challenges as we pursue the goals outlined in the 2016 RTP/SCS:

- **We are growing slower:** But our region is projected to grow to 22 million people by 2040 – an increase of nearly four million people.
- **Our overall population will be older:** The median age of our region’s overall population is expected to rise, with an increasing share of senior citizens. This demographic shift will have major impacts on transportation needs and on our transportation plans. A key challenge for the region will be to provide seniors with more transportation options for maintaining their independence as they age.
- **A smaller percentage of us will be working:** The share of younger people of working age is expected to fall. The ratio of people over the age of 65 to people of working age (15 to 64) is expected to increase. This means that our region could face a labor shortage and a subsequent reduction in tax revenues.
- **A large number of us want more urban lifestyles:** Today’s Millennials, born between 1980 and 2000, are expected to demand more compact communities and more access to transit – shifting regional priorities for the overall transportation system and the types of housing that is constructed. Baby Boomers are also expected to increasingly desire these kinds of communities.
- **Many of us will continue to live in the suburbs and drive alone:** Despite the emerging trends discussed above, many people in the region will continue to live in suburban neighborhoods and drive alone to work, school, shopping and other destinations - rather than using public transit and other transportation alternatives. The 2016 RTP/SCS will not change how everyone chooses to get around, but the Plan is designed to offer residents more choices so that we can experience regionwide benefits.
- **Housing prices are increasing:** Housing prices are rising steadily and affordability is declining. As communities are redeveloped to be more

compact with new transit options and revitalized urban amenities, existing residents may risk displacement.

- **Our transportation system requires rehabilitation and maintenance:** Southern California’s transportation system is becoming increasingly compromised by decades of underinvestment in maintaining and preserving our infrastructure. These investments have not kept pace with the demands placed on the system and the quality of many of our roads, highways, bridges, transit and bicycle and pedestrian facilities is continuing to deteriorate. If we continue on our current path of seriously underfunding system preservation, the cost of bringing our system back to a reasonable state of good repair will grow exponentially.
- **Transportation funding is scarce and insufficient:** Full funding for transportation improvements is currently not sustainable, given the projected needs. Projected revenues from the gas tax, the historic source of transportation funding, will not meet transportation investment needs – and gas tax revenues, in real terms, are actually in decline as tax rates (both state and federal) have not been adjusted in more than two decades while the number of more fuel efficient and alternative powered vehicles continues to grow.
- **Moving goods through the region faces growing pains:** The movement of goods will face numerous challenges as consumer demand for products increases and the region continues to grow as a major exchange point for global trade. Infrastructure for freight traffic will be strained, current efforts to reduce air pollution from goods movement sources will not be sufficient to meet national air quality standards, capacity at international ports will be over-burdened and warehouse space could fall short of demands.
- **Technology is transforming transportation:** Mobility innovations including electric cars, the availability of real-time traveler information, the expansion of car sharing and ridesourcing due to smart phones and other technological advances will require updated planning to smoothly integrate these new travel options into the overall transportation system.
- **Millions of people are in poor health:** Many people in our region suffer from poor health due to chronic diseases related to poor air quality and physical inactivity. Heart disease, stroke, cancer, chronic lower respiratory disease and diabetes are responsible for 72 percent of all deaths in our region. Millions of more people live with chronic diseases, such as asthma, every day.

- **Climate change demands that we adapt:** The consequences of climate change will continue to strain everyday life for millions of people. Droughts and wildfires, water shortages brought about by drought but also declining snowpack in our mountains, rising seas, extreme weather events and other impacts will require communities to make their neighborhoods more resilient to climate change.

## OUR PROGRESS SINCE 2012

Although our challenges are great, the region has made significant progress over the past few years.

### TRANSIT

Transit service continues to expand throughout the region and the level of service has exceeded pre-recessionary levels – mainly due to a growth in rail service. Significant progress has been made toward completing capital projects for transit, including the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Orange Line Extension and the Metro Expo Line. Meanwhile, five major Metro Rail projects are now under construction in Los Angeles County.

### PASSENGER RAIL

Passenger rail is expanding and improving service on several fronts. The Amtrak Pacific Surfliner is now being managed locally by the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Agency; Metrolink is nearing completion on the Perris Valley Line; Metrolink became the first commuter railroad in the nation to implement Positive Train Control and purchase fuel-efficient, low-emission Tier IV locomotives; and the California High-Speed Train system is under construction in the Central Valley, and scheduled to begin service to Burbank Bob Hope Airport in 2022 and reach Los Angeles Union Station in 2028. Several other capital projects are underway or have been completed, including the Anaheim Regional Intermodal Transportation Center (ARTIC) and the Burbank Bob Hope Airport Regional Intermodal Transportation Center, among others.

### HIGHWAYS

The expansion of highways has slowed considerably over the last decade because of land, financial and environmental constraints. Still, several projects have been completed since 2012 to improve access and close critical gaps and congestion chokepoints in the regional network. These include the Interstate 5 South Corridor Project in Los Angeles County, Interstate 10 westbound widening in Redlands and Yucaipa, and the Interstate 215 Bi-County Project in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, among others.

### REGIONAL HIGH-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE (HOV) AND EXPRESS LANE NETWORK

The demands on our region's highways continue to exceed available capacity during peak periods, but several projects to close HOV gaps have been completed. The result has been 27 more miles of regional HOV lanes on Interstates 5, 405, 10, 215 and 605, on State Route 57 and on the West County Connector Project within Orange County. The region is also developing a Regional Express Lane Network. Among the milestones: a one-year demonstration of Express Lanes in Los Angeles County along Interstate 10 and Interstate 110 was made permanent in 2014; and construction has begun on Express Lanes on State Route 91 extending eastward to Interstate 15 in Riverside County.

### ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

Our region is making steady progress in encouraging more people to embrace active transportation and more than \$650 million in Active Transportation Program investments are underway. Nearly 37 percent of all trips less than one mile and 18 percent of all trips less than three miles are made via active transportation. As a percentage share of all trips, bicycling has increased more than 70 percent since 2007 to 1.12 percent. More than 500 miles of new bikeways have been constructed in the region and safety and encouragement programs are helping people choose walking and biking as options.

### GOODS MOVEMENT

The region continues to make substantial progress toward completing several major capital initiatives to support freight transportation and reducing harmful emissions generated by goods movement sources. Progress since 2012 has

included: the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Program (CAAP) has led to diesel particulate matter dropping by 82 percent, oxides of nitrogen by 54 percent and oxides of sulfur by 90 percent; and the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Truck Program has led to an 80 percent reduction in port truck emissions. The region has also shown progress in advanced technology for goods movement, including a one-mile Overhead Catenary System (OCS) in the City of Carson. Construction of the Gerald Desmond Bridge has begun. Fourteen out of 71 planned grade separation projects throughout the region have been completed, and another 24 should be completed in 2016. Double tracking of the Union Pacific (UP) Alhambra Subdivision has been initiated. The Colton Crossing, which physically separated two Class I railroads with an elevated 1.4-mile-long overpass that lifts Union Pacific (UP) trains traveling east-west, was completed in August 2013.

### SUSTAINABILITY IMPLEMENTATION

Since 2012, SCAG’s Sustainability Planning Grant Program has funded 70 planning projects (totaling \$10 million) to help local jurisdictions link local land use plans with 2012 RTP/SCS goals. Local jurisdictions have updated outmoded general plans and zoning codes; completed specific plans for town centers and Transit Oriented Development (TOD); implemented sustainability policies; and adopted municipal climate action plans. Thirty of the 191 cities in the SCAG region reported updating their general plans since 2012 and another 42 cities have general plan updates pending. Fifty-four percent of all the adopted and pending general plans include planning for TOD, 55 percent plan to concentrate key destinations and 76 percent include policies encouraging infill development. To protect water quality, 91 percent of cities have adopted water-related policies and 85 percent have adopted measures to address water quality. To conserve energy, 86 percent of cities have implemented community energy efficiency policies, with 80 percent of those cities implementing municipal energy efficiency policies and 76 percent implementing renewable energy policies. Of the region’s 191 cities, 189 have completed sustainability components, with 184 cities implementing at least ten or more policies or programs and ten cities implementing 20 or more policies or programs. This last group includes Pasadena, Pomona and Santa Monica.

### AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The state is offering new opportunities to help regions promote affordable housing. In spring 2015, California’s Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities (AHSC) program awarded its first round of funding to applicants

after a competitive grant process. Of \$122 million available statewide, \$27.5 million was awarded to ten projects in the SCAG region. Eight-hundred forty-two affordable units, including 294 units designated for households with an income of 30 percent or less of the area median income, will be produced with this funding. Meanwhile, Senate Bill 628 (Beall) and Assembly Bill 2 (Alejo), provide jurisdictions an opportunity to establish a funding source to develop affordable housing and supportive infrastructure and amenities.

### PUBLIC HEALTH

The SCAG region has several ongoing efforts to promote public health. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Health and the Department of City Planning are developing a Health Atlas, which highlights health disparities among neighborhoods. In Riverside County, the Healthy Riverside County Initiative is working to have healthy cities resolutions adopted by a minimum of 15 cities. The County of San Bernardino has recently completed the Community Vital Signs Initiative, which envisions a “county where a commitment to optimizing health and wellness is embedded in all decisions by residents, organizations and government.”

### ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Since the adoption of the 2012 RTP/SCS, social equity and environmental justice have become increasingly significant priorities in regional plans. For example, plans to promote active transportation, improve public health, increase access to transit, preserve open space, cut air pollution and more are all evaluated for how well the benefits of these efforts are distributed among all demographic groups. The State of California’s Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) developed a new tool, CalEnviroScreen, which helps to identify areas in the state that have higher levels of environmental vulnerability due to historical rates of toxic exposure and certain social factors. Based on this tool, much of the region can stand to benefit from Cap-and-Trade grants that give priority to communities that are disproportionately impacted.

### SETTING THE STAGE FOR OUR PLAN

SCAG began developing the 2016 RTP/SCS by first reaching out to the local jurisdictions to hear directly from them about their growth plans. The next step was to develop scenarios of growth, each one representing a different vision for land use and transportation in 2040. More specifically, each scenario

was designed to explore and convey the impact of where the region would grow, to what extent the growth would be focused within existing cities and towns and how it would grow—the shape and style of the neighborhoods and transportation systems that would shape growth over the period. The refinement of these scenarios, through extensive public outreach and surveys, led to a “preferred scenario” that helped guide the strategies, programs and projects detailed in the Plan.

### MAJOR INITIATIVES

With the preferred scenario selected, the 2016 RTP/SCS, which includes \$556.5 billion in transportation investments, has proposed several major initiatives to strive toward our vision for 2040.

#### PRESERVING THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM WE ALREADY HAVE (FIXING IT FIRST)

The 2016 RTP/SCS calls for the investment of \$274.9 billion toward preserving our existing system. The allocation of these expenditures includes the transit and passenger rail system, the state highway system and regionally significant local streets and roads.

#### EXPANDING OUR REGIONAL TRANSIT SYSTEM TO GIVE PEOPLE MORE ALTERNATIVES TO DRIVING ALONE

The 2016 RTP/SCS includes \$56.1 billion for capital transit projects This includes significant expansion of the Metro subway and Light Rail Transit (LRT) system in Los Angeles County. Meanwhile, new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) routes will expand higher-speed bus service regionally; new streetcar services will link major destinations in Orange County; and new Metrolink extensions will further connect communities in the Inland Empire. Other extensive improvements are planned for local bus, rapid bus, BRT and express service throughout the region. To make transit a more attractive and viable option, the 2016 RTP/SCS also supports implementing and expanding transit signal priority; regional and inter-county fare agreements and media; increased bicycle carrying capacity on transit and rail vehicles; real-time passenger information systems to allow travelers to make more informed decisions; and implementing first/last mile strategies to extend the effective reach of transit.

#### EXPANDING PASSENGER RAIL

The 2016 RTP/SCS calls for an investment in passenger rail of \$38.6 billion for capital projects and \$15.7 billion for operations and maintenance. The

Plan calls for maintaining the commitments in the 2012 RTP/SCS, including Phase 1 of California High-Speed Train system and the High-Speed Train System Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which identifies a candidate project list to improve the Metrolink system and the LOSSAN rail corridor, thereby providing immediate, near-term benefits to the region while laying the groundwork for future integration with California’s High-Speed Train project. These capital projects will bring segments of the regional rail network up to the federally defined speed of 110 miles per hour or greater, and help lead to a blended system of rail services.

#### IMPROVING HIGHWAY AND ARTERIAL CAPACITY

The 2016 RTP/SCS calls for investing \$54.5 billion in capital improvements and \$102.5 billion in operations and maintenance of the state highway system and regionally significant local streets and roads throughout the region. This includes focusing on achieving maximum productivity by adding capacity primarily by closing gaps in the system and improving access; and other measures including the deployment of new technology. The Plan also continues to support a regional network of Express Lanes, building on the success of the State Route 91 Express Lanes in Orange County, as well as Interstate 10 and Interstate 110 Express Lanes in Los Angeles County.

#### MANAGING DEMANDS ON THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The 2016 RTP/SCS calls for investing \$6.9 billion toward Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies throughout the region. These strategies focus on reducing the number of drive-alone trips and overall vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through ridesharing, which includes carpooling, vanpooling and supportive policies for ridesourcing services such as Uber and Lyft; redistributing or eliminating vehicle trips from peak demand periods through incentives for telecommuting and alternative work schedules; and reducing the number of drive-alone trips through increased use of transit, rail, bicycling, walking and other alternative modes of travel.

#### OPTIMIZING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The 2016 RTP/SCS earmarks \$9.2 billion for Transportation System Management (TSM) improvements, including extensive advanced ramp metering, enhanced incident management, bottleneck removal to improve flow (e.g., auxiliary lanes), expansion and integration of the traffic signal synchronization network, data collection to monitor system performance, integrated and dynamic corridor congestion management and other Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements.

### PROMOTING WALKING, BIKING AND OTHER FORMS OF ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

The 2016 RTP/SCS plans for continued progress in developing our regional bikeway network, assumes all local active transportation plans will be implemented, and dedicates resources to maintain and repair thousands of miles of dilapidated sidewalks. The Plan also considers new strategies and approaches beyond those proposed in 2012. To promote short trips, these include improving sidewalk quality, local bike networks and neighborhood mobility areas. To promote longer regional trips, these include developing a regional greenway network, and continuing investments in the regional bikeway network and access to the California Coastal Trail. Active transportation will also be promoted by integrating it with the region’s transit system; increasing access to 224 rail, light rail and fixed guideway bus stations; promoting 16 regional corridors that support biking and walking; supporting bike share programs; and educating people about the benefits of active transportation for students, as well as promoting safety campaigns.

### STRENGTHENING THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION NETWORK FOR GOODS MOVEMENT

The 2016 RTP/SCS includes \$74.8 billion in goods movement strategies. Among these are establishing a system of truck-only lanes extending from the San Pedro Bay Ports to downtown Los Angeles along Interstate 710; connecting to the State Route 60 east-west segment and finally reaching Interstate 15 in San Bernardino County; working to relieve the top 50 truck bottlenecks; adding mainline tracks for the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) San Bernardino and Cajon Subdivisions and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) Alhambra and Mojave Subdivisions; expanding/modernizing intermodal facilities; building highway-rail grade separations; improving port area rail infrastructure; reducing environmental impacts by supporting the deployment of commercially available low-emission trucks and locomotives; and in the longer term advancing technologies to implement a zero- and near zero-emission freight system.

### LEVERAGING TECHNOLOGY

Advances in communications, computing and engineering – from shared mobility innovations to zero-emission vehicles – can lead to a more efficient transportation system with more mobility options for everyone. Technological innovations also can reduce the environmental impact of existing modes of transportation. For example, alternative fuel vehicles continue to become more accessible for retail consumers and for freight and fleet applications – and as they are increasingly used air pollution can be reduced. Communications technology, meanwhile, can improve the movement of passenger vehicles and

connected transit vehicles. As part of the 2016 RTP/SCS, SCAG has focused location-based strategies specifically on increasing the efficiency of Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles (PHEV) in the region. These are electric vehicles that are powered by a gasoline engine when their battery is depleted. The 2016 RTP/SCS proposes a regional charging network that will increase the number of PHEV miles driven on electric power, in addition to supporting the growth of the PEV market generally. In many instances, these chargers may double the electric range of PHEVs, reducing vehicle miles traveled that produce tail-pipe emissions.

### IMPROVING AIRPORT ACCESS

Recognizing the SCAG region is one of the busiest and most diverse commercial aviation regions in the world and that air travel is an important contributor to the region’s economic activity, the 2016 RTP/SCS includes strategies for reducing the impact of air passenger trips on ground transportation congestion. Such strategies include supporting the regionalization of air travel demand; continuing to support regional and inter-regional projects that facilitate airport ground access (e.g., High-Speed Train); supporting ongoing local planning efforts by airport operators, county transportation commissions and local jurisdictions; encouraging development and use of transit access to the region’s airports; encouraging the use of modes with high average vehicle occupancy; and discouraging the use of modes that require “deadhead” trips to/from airports (e.g., passengers being dropped off at the airport via personal vehicle).

### FOCUSING NEW GROWTH AROUND TRANSIT

The 2016 RTP/SCS plans for focusing new growth around transit, which is supported by the following policies: identifying regional strategic areas for infill and investment; structuring the plan on a three-tiered system of centers development; developing “Complete Communities”; developing nodes on a corridor; planning for additional housing and jobs near transit; planning for changing demand in types of housing; continuing to protect stable, existing single-family areas; ensuring adequate access to open space and preservation of habitat; and incorporating local input and feedback on future growth. These policies support the development of:

- **High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs):** areas within one-half mile of a fixed guideway transit stop or a bus transit corridor where buses pick up passengers at a frequency of every 15 minutes or less during peak commuting hours. While HQTAs account for only three percent of total land area in SCAG region, they are planned and projected to accommodate 46 percent of the region’s future household growth and 50 percent of the future employment growth.

- **Livable Corridors:** arterial roadways where jurisdictions may plan for a combination of the following elements: high-quality bus frequency; higher density residential and employment at key intersections; and increased active transportation through dedicated bikeways.
- **Neighborhood Mobility Areas (NMAs):** these areas represent the synthesis of various planning practices and are applicable in a wide range of settings. Strategies are intended to provide sustainable transportation options for residents of the region who lack convenient access to high-frequency transit but make many short trips within their urban neighborhoods. NMAs are conducive to active transportation and include a “Complete Streets” approach to roadway improvements to encourage replacing single- and multi-occupant automobile use with biking, walking, skateboarding, neighborhood electric vehicles and senior mobility devices.
- **Improving Air Quality and Reducing Greenhouse Gases:** It is through integrated planning for land use and transportation that the SCAG region, through the initiatives discussed in this section, will strive toward a more sustainable region. The SCAG region must achieve specific federal air quality standards. It also is required by state law to lower regional greenhouse gas emissions. California law requires the region to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions in the SCAG region by eight percent by 2020 – compared with 2005 levels – and by 13 percent by 2035. The strategies, programs and projects outlined in the 2016 RTP/SCS are projected to result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions in the SCAG region that exceeds these reduction targets.

### PRESERVING NATURAL LANDS

Many natural land areas near the edge of existing urbanized areas do not have plans for conservation and are vulnerable to development pressure. The 2016 RTP/SCS recommends redirecting growth from high value habitat areas to existing urbanized areas. This strategy avoids growth in sensitive habitat areas, builds upon the conservation framework, and complements an infill-based approach.

## FINANCING OUR FUTURE

To accomplish the ambitious goals of the 2016 RTP/SCS through 2040, SCAG forecasts expenditures of \$556.5 billion – of which \$274.9 billion is budgeted for operations and maintenance of the regional transportation system and

another \$250.9 billion is reserved for transportation capital improvements.

Forecasted revenues comprise both existing and several new funding sources that are reasonably expected to be available for the 2016 RTP/SCS, which together total \$556.5 billion. Reasonably available revenues include short-term adjustments to state and federal gas excise tax rates and the long-term replacement of gas taxes with mileage-based user fees (or equivalent fuel tax adjustment). These and other categories of funding sources were identified as reasonably available on the basis of their potential for revenue generation, historical precedence and the likelihood of their implementation within the time frame of the Plan.

## WHAT WE WILL ACCOMPLISH

Overall, the transportation investments in the 2016 RTP/SCS will provide a return of \$2.00 for every dollar invested. Compared with an alternative of not adopting the Plan, the 2016 RTP/SCS would accomplish the following:

- The Plan would result in an eight percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions per capita by 2020, an 18 percent reduction by 2035 and a 22 percent reduction by 2040 – compared with 2005 levels. This would exceed the state’s mandated reductions, which are eight percent by 2020 and 13 percent by 2035.
- Regional air quality would improve under the Plan, as cleaner fuels and new vehicle technologies help to significantly reduce many of the pollutants that contribute to smog and other airborne contaminants that may impact public health in the region.
- The combined percentage of work trips made by carpooling, active transportation and public transit would increase by about four percent, with a commensurate reduction in the share of commuters traveling by single occupant vehicle.
- The number of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita would be reduced by nearly ten percent and Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) per capita by 18 percent (for automobiles and light/medium duty trucks) as a result of more location efficient land use patterns and improved transit service.
- Daily travel by transit would increase by nearly one third, as a result of improved transit service and more transit-oriented development patterns.
- The Plan would reduce delay per capita by 45 percent, and heavy

duty truck delay on highways by nearly 40 percent. This means we would spend less time sitting in traffic and our goods would move more efficiently.

- About 375,000 additional new jobs annually would be created, due to the region’s increased competitiveness and improved economic performance that would result from congestion reduction and improvements in regional amenities due to implementation of the Plan.
- The Plan would reduce the amount of previously undeveloped (greenfield) lands converted to more urbanized use by 23 percent. By conserving open space and other rural lands, the Plan provides a solid foundation for more sustainable development in the SCAG region.
- The Plan would result in a reduction in our regional obesity rate of 2.5 percent, and a reduction in the share of our population that suffers with high blood pressure of three percent. It would also result in a reduction in the total annual health costs for respiratory disease of more than 13 percent.

## HOW WE WILL ENSURE SUCCESS

Our Plan includes several performance outcomes and measures that are used to gauge our progress toward meeting our goals. These include:

- Location Efficiency, which reflects the degree to which improved land use and transportation coordination strategies impact the movement of people and goods.
- Mobility and Accessibility, which reflects our ability to reach desired destinations with relative ease and within a reasonable time, using reasonably available transportation choices.
- Safety and Health, which recognize that the 2016 RTP/SCS has impacts beyond those that are exclusively transportation-related (e.g., pollution-related disease).
- Environmental Quality, which is measured in terms of criteria pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions.
- Economic Opportunity, which is measured in terms of additional jobs created and the net contribution to Gross Regional Product achieved through improved regional economic competitiveness – as a result of the transportation investments provided through the 2016 RTP/SCS.

- Investment Effectiveness, which indicates the degree to which the Plan’s expenditures generate benefits that transportation users can experience directly.
- Transportation System Sustainability, which reflects how well our transportation system is able to maintain its overall performance over time in an equitable manner with minimum damage to the environment and without compromising the ability of future generations to address their transportation needs.

The 2016 RTP/SCS is designed to ensure that the regional transportation system serves all segments of society. The Plan is subject to numerous performance measures to monitor its progress toward achieving social equity and environmental justice. These measures include accessibility to parks and natural lands, roadway noise impacts, air quality impacts and public health impacts, among many others.

## LOOKING BEYOND 2040

The 2016 RTP/SCS is based on a projected budget constrained by the local, state and federal revenues that SCAG anticipates receiving between now and 2040. The Strategic Plan discusses projects and strategies that SCAG would pursue if new funding were to become available. The Strategic Plan discussion includes long-term emission reduction strategies for rail and trucks; expanding the region’s high-speed and commuter rail systems; expanding active transportation; leveraging technological advances for transportation; addressing further regional reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and making the region more resilient to climate change – among other topics. We anticipate that these projects and strategies may inform the development of the next Plan, the 2020 RTP/SCS.

TABLE 7 FY 2016–2040 RTP/SCS Revenues (in Nominal Dollars, Billions)

Revenue Sources		FY 2016–FY2020	FY 2021–FY2025	FY 2026–FY2030	FY 2031–FY2035	FY 2036–FY2040	Total
LOCAL	Sales Tax	\$21.1	\$26.6	\$32.8	\$40.9	\$46.8	\$168.3
	• Local Option Sales Tax Measures	\$16.8	\$21.2	\$26.1	\$32.4	\$36.3	\$132.7
	• Transportation Development Act (TDA)—Local Transportation Fund	\$4.3	\$5.4	\$6.8	\$8.5	\$10.6	\$35.6
	Gas Excise Tax Subventions (to Cities and Counties)	\$1.0	\$1.1	\$1.1	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$5.6
	Transit Farebox Revenue	\$3.9	\$4.9	\$5.9	\$6.9	\$8.2	\$29.7
	Highway Tolls (in core revenue forecast)	\$2.0	\$2.6	\$3.3	\$4.2	\$5.2	\$17.2
	Mitigation Fees	\$1.7	\$1.9	\$2.1	\$2.3	\$2.1	\$10.1
	Other Local Sources	\$7.0	\$3.6	\$5.3	\$5.6	\$2.4	\$23.8
	<b>Local Total</b>	<b>\$36.7</b>	<b>\$40.5</b>	<b>\$50.5</b>	<b>\$61.0</b>	<b>\$65.9</b>	<b>\$254.7</b>
STATE	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	\$1.4	\$1.8	\$2.0	\$2.1	\$2.3	\$9.6
	• Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)	\$1.1	\$1.4	\$1.5	\$1.6	\$1.7	\$7.2
	• Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)	\$0.4	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.6	\$2.5
	State Highway Operation and Protection Plan (SHOPP)	\$4.3	\$5.0	\$5.4	\$5.8	\$6.2	\$26.7
	State Gasoline Sales Tax Swap	\$2.0	\$2.4	\$3.0	\$3.7	\$4.6	\$15.7
	State Transit Assistance Fund (STA)	\$0.9	\$1.0	\$1.2	\$1.3	\$1.4	\$5.8
	Cap-and-Trade Auction Proceeds	\$0.7	\$0.8	\$0.8	\$0.8	\$0.8	\$3.7
	Other State Sources	\$0.7	\$0.3	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$2.2
	<b>State Total</b>	<b>\$10.0</b>	<b>\$11.4</b>	<b>\$12.6</b>	<b>\$14.1</b>	<b>\$15.7</b>	<b>\$63.8</b>
FEDERAL	Federal Transit	\$4.0	\$4.1	\$4.2	\$4.7	\$4.3	\$21.5
	• Federal Transit Formula	\$2.9	\$3.1	\$3.3	\$3.6	\$3.9	\$16.8
	• Federal Transit Non-Formula	\$1.2	\$1.0	\$0.9	\$1.1	\$0.5	\$4.7
	Federal Highway & Other	\$3.1	\$3.1	\$3.3	\$3.3	\$3.3	\$16.2
	• Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$1.2	\$1.1	\$1.1	\$0.9	\$0.7	\$4.9
	• Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)	\$1.2	\$1.3	\$1.4	\$1.6	\$1.7	\$7.3
	• Other Federal Sources	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.8	\$0.9	\$0.9	\$4.0
	<b>Federal Total</b>	<b>\$7.2</b>	<b>\$7.3</b>	<b>\$7.5</b>	<b>\$8.0</b>	<b>\$7.7</b>	<b>\$37.7</b>
INNOVATIVE FINANCING & NEW REVENUE SOURCES	State and Federal Gas Excise Tax Adjustment	\$1.3	\$4.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$6.0
	Mileage-Based User Fee	\$0.0	\$5.5	\$31.9	\$39.6	\$47.9	\$124.8
	Highway Tolls (includes toll revenue bond proceeds)	\$0.2	\$9.0	\$4.2	\$4.6	\$5.5	\$23.5
	Private Equity Participation	\$1.1	\$0.1	\$2.1	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$3.4
	Freight Fee/National Freight Program	\$0.7	\$0.9	\$1.0	\$1.2	\$1.5	\$5.4
	State Bond Proceeds, Cap-and-Trade Auction Proceeds, & Other for California High-Speed Rail Program	\$6.0	\$10.0	\$8.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$34.0
	Value Capture Strategies	\$0.0	\$1.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1.2
	Local Option Sales Tax (Ventura County)	\$0.1	\$0.4	\$0.5	\$0.6	\$0.7	\$2.1
	<b>Innovative Financing &amp; New Revenue Sources Total</b>	<b>\$9.4</b>	<b>\$31.8</b>	<b>\$47.6</b>	<b>\$51.1</b>	<b>\$60.5</b>	<b>\$200.4</b>
<b>Revenue Total</b>	<b>\$63.3</b>	<b>\$91.1</b>	<b>\$118.2</b>	<b>\$134.2</b>	<b>\$149.8</b>	<b>\$556.5</b>	

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding

**TABLE 8** FY 2016–2040 RTP/SCS Expenditures (in Nominal Dollars, Billions)

RTP Costs	FY 2016-2020	FY 2021-2025	FY 2026-2030	FY 2031-2035	FY 2036-2040	Total
<b>Capital Projects:</b>	\$27.6	\$47.4	\$57.2	\$58.2	\$60.5	\$250.9
Arterials	\$3.3	\$2.2	\$2.4	\$5.0	\$5.5	\$18.4
Goods Movement (includes Grade Separations)	\$7.7	\$19.5	\$21.2	\$13.4	\$13.0	\$74.8
High-Occupancy Vehicle/High-Occupancy Toll Lanes	\$2.7	\$2.2	\$2.5	\$3.7	\$4.4	\$15.5
Mixed-Flow and Interchange Improvements	\$2.5	\$1.5	\$2.2	\$2.9	\$3.0	\$12.1
Toll Facilities	\$1.8	\$3.2	\$2.3	\$0.6	\$0.5	\$8.4
Transportation System Management (including ITS)	\$0.9	\$1.2	\$1.3	\$2.9	\$2.9	\$9.2
Transit	\$6.4	\$8.6	\$11.0	\$14.4	\$15.7	\$56.1
Passenger Rail	\$0.8	\$6.3	\$10.3	\$10.4	\$10.8	\$38.6
Active Transportation	\$0.8	\$1.7	\$1.7	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$8.1
Transportation Demand Management	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$1.6	\$2.3	\$2.6	\$6.9
Other (includes Environmental Mitigation, Landscaping, and Project Development Costs)	\$0.5	\$0.6	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.2	\$2.7
<b>Operations and Maintenance:</b>	\$30.8	\$38.0	\$54.8	\$69.1	\$82.3	\$274.9
State Highways	\$9.0	\$10.5	\$12.3	\$15.6	\$18.0	\$65.3
Transit	\$18.5	\$23.3	\$29.4	\$38.6	\$46.9	\$156.7
Passenger Rail	\$1.6	\$2.3	\$3.0	\$3.8	\$5.0	\$15.7
Regionally Significant Local Streets and Roads*	\$1.7	\$1.9	\$10.1	\$11.1	\$12.4	\$37.1
<b>Debt Service</b>	\$4.9	\$5.7	\$6.3	\$6.8	\$7.0	\$30.7
<b>Cost Total</b>	\$63.3	\$91.1	\$118.2	\$134.2	\$149.8	\$556.5

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding

\* Includes \$4.8 billion for active transportation in addition to capital project investment level of \$8.1 billion for a total of \$12.9 billion for active transportation improvements

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 5

**Date:** *January 15, 2016*

**Subject:**

2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program

**Recommendation:**

That the Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission:

- A. Approve the 2017 San Bernardino County Transportation Improvement Program, as shown in Attachment 1 (under separate cover from agenda), to be submitted to Southern California Association of Governments for inclusion in the 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program.
- B. Authorize staff to amend the 2017 San Bernardino County Transportation Improvement Program as necessary to meet State, Federal, and responsible agency programming requirements.
- C. Adopt Resolution No. 16-020, certifying that the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission and other project sponsors have resources available and committed for the first two years of the FTIP and reasonably available for the last four years to fund the projects in the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 through 2021/2022 Transportation Improvement Program, and affirming its commitment to implement all projects in the program.

**Background:**

Federal regulations require Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) as well as the state-designated transportation planning agency and multi-county designated transportation planning agency for the six-county Southern California region, to adopt a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the region. The TIP must be consistent with SCAG's long-range Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2012 RTP/SCS). The region's adopted TIP is then submitted to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for final approval and adoption into the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).

The FTIP is a listing of regionally significant and/or federally funded projects expected to be under development over the six-year period ending in federal Fiscal Year 2021/2022. It is updated every two years and amended frequently within that time period. San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), acting as the County Transportation Commission, is responsible for submitting all transportation projects that are regionally significant or federally funded to SCAG for inclusion into the FTIP. Federal regulations require SCAG to determine that projects submitted in the FTIP meet air quality conformity requirements in the federally designated non-attainment and maintenance areas and federal financial constraint

**Entity:** *CTC*

## Mountain-Desert Committee Agenda Item

January 15, 2016

Page 2

regulations. Fiscal constraint regulations require that funds shown in the first two years of the FTIP are available and committed, and funds shown in the last four years are reasonably available.

To develop the 2017 FTIP, SANBAG staff has been working with the local jurisdictions, transit agencies, and Caltrans District 8 to obtain project information that reflects the latest project commitments. Attachment 1 (under separate cover from agenda) lists all projects that are recommended for inclusion in the 2017 FTIP. Staff requests the approval of the Program to be submitted to SCAG. Additionally, staff requests authorization to amend the FTIP in the future as required to reflect changes to project scope, schedule, or funding sources.

To demonstrate SANBAG's FTIP submittal meets financial constraint requirements, an adopted resolution must be included in the submittal. Resolution No. 16-020 certifies San Bernardino County Transportation Commission and other project sponsors have the resources to fund the projects submitted for inclusion in the FTIP and affirms the commitment to implement all of the projects submitted in the program.

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed into law the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act). The FAST Act is a five-year federal transportation act in effect through 2020. Overall, the FAST Act largely maintains current program structures and funding shares between highways and transit with an overall increased funding by 11 percent over five years. Funding levels in the 2017 FTIP are consistent with levels under the prior authorization; therefore, changes may be required as new funding levels are being developed for the FAST Act. Staff will bring forward any changes requiring Board approval as more information becomes available.

**Financial Impact:**

This item is consistent with the adopted SANBAG Budget

**Reviewed By:**

This item is scheduled for review by the Board of Directors Metro Valley Study Session on January 14, 2016. This item and the resolution have been reviewed by General Counsel.

**Responsible Staff:**

James Mejia, Management Analyst II

---

Approved  
Mountain-Desert Committee  
Date: January 15, 2016

Witnessed By:

**RESOLUTION NO. 16-020**

**A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THAT THE SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND OTHER PROJECT SPONSORS HAVE RESOURCES TO FUND THE PROJECTS IN THE FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS 2016/2017 – 2021/2022 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND AFFIRMS THE COMMITMENT TO IMPLEMENT ALL OF THE PROJECTS IN THE PROGRAM**

**WHEREAS**, San Bernardino County is located with the metropolitan planning boundaries of the Southern California Association of Governments (hereinafter referred to as “SCAG”); and

**WHEREAS**, Federal regulations require SCAG to adopt a regional Transportation Improvement Program (“TIP”) for the metropolitan planning area; and

**WHEREAS**, Federal regulations also require that the regional TIP include a financial plan that demonstrates how the TIP can be implemented; and

**WHEREAS**, the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission (hereinafter referred to as “SANBAG”) is the agency responsible for short-range capital and service planning and programming for the San Bernardino County area within the SCAG region; and

**WHEREAS**, as the responsible agency for short-range transportation planning, SANBAG is responsible for the development of the San Bernardino County TIP, including all projects utilizing federal and state highway/road and transit funds; and

**WHEREAS**, SANBAG must determine, on an annual basis, the total amount of funds that could be available for transportation projects within its boundaries; and

**WHEREAS**, SANBAG has adopted the Federal Fiscal Years 2016/17-2021/22 San Bernardino County TIP with funding available and committed for Federal Fiscal Years 2016/2017 and 2017/2018, and reasonably available for Federal Fiscal Years 2018/2019 through 2021/2022.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission as follows:

**Section 1.** The Commission affirms its continuing commitment to the projects in the Federal Fiscal Years 2016/2017-2021/2022 San Bernardino County TIP.

**Section 2.** The Federal Fiscal Years 2016/2017-2021/2022 San Bernardino County TIP Financial Plan identifies the resources that are available and committed in the first two years and reasonably available to carry out the program in the last four years, and certifies that:

1. Projects in the Federal Fiscal Years 2016/2017-2021/2022 San Bernardino County TIP are consistent with the proposed 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) scheduled to be approved by the California Transportation Commission in April 2016; and
2. All of the projects in the San Bernardino County TIP have complete funding identified in the Program. Except the following 5 projects which will require additional funding in the 2016 STIP cycle.
  - 20151301 – Redlands Passenger Rail Program
  - 20159901 – I-15 Express Lanes
  - 20159902 – I-10 Express Lanes
  - SBD31850 – I-215 @ Barton Road Interchange
  - SBD59303 – Set asides/reservations for future SB45-Planning, Programming and Monitoring

These projects are the County's priorities for 2016 STIP funds. The San Bernardino County 2016 STIP Regional Improvement Program, as identified in the Financial Plan, will include sufficient funds to complete the projects. Therefore, as required by Federal regulations, SANBAG finds that full funding can reasonably be anticipated to be available for these projects within the time period contemplated for completion of the project.

3. SANBAG has the funding capacity in its county Surface Transportation Program ("STP") and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program ("CMAQ") apportionments to fund all of the projects programmed for those funds in the Federal Fiscal Years 2016/2017-2021/2022 San Bernardino County TIP; and
4. The local match for projects funded with federal STP and CMAQ program funds is identified in the San Bernardino County TIP; and
5. All of Federal Transit Administration-funded projects are programmed consistent with MAP-21 funding levels; and
6. SANBAG staff is authorized to amend the TIP based on current funding levels and funding priorities established by the SANBAG Board of Directors and other project sponsors.

**Section 3.** This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a meeting of the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission held on \_\_\_\_\_, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ryan McEachron, President

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vicki Watson,  
Clerk of the Board

Attachment: 2017 FTIP Resolution 16-020 [Revision 1] (2470 : 2017 FTIP)

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 6

**Date:** *January 15, 2016*

**Subject:**

Major Local Highway Program Subarea Project List for the North Desert Subarea

**Recommendation:**

That the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority:

Approve the 2016 Summary of Major Local Highway Program Funding Needs for the North Desert Subarea of the Mountain/Desert.

**Background:**

Strategic Plan Rural Mountain/Desert Subareas Major Local Highways Program (MLHP) Policy 40017, subsection MDMLH-3, states that a master list of projects eligible for MLHP funds shall be maintained and periodically updated by each subarea. The Board is to approve a master list of projects eligible for MLHP funding after a recommendation by the subarea representatives. Input is also to be considered from other public and private stakeholders, such as Caltrans, neighboring counties, transit agencies, federal agencies, business interests and other non-governmental organizations.

The master list represents eligible projects and does not represent a commitment by SANBAG to fund all or a portion of those projects. Also, the project scopes, schedules and funding requests may change over time and will be reflected in future reports to the Board. These projects will also be included in the Rural Mountain/Desert sections of the 2016 update to the Ten-Year Delivery Plan.

This item recommends approval of the 2016 Summary of Major Local Highway Program Funding Needs for the North Desert Subarea. The proposed master list of eligible projects for the North Desert subarea is included as Attachment 1. SANBAG staff has been working with local agency staff in all the Mountain/Desert subareas to develop master lists for their respective subareas, which will be presented for future approval. With reference to the list of projects for the North Desert subarea, representatives from the City of Barstow and the County of San Bernardino provided their list of projects and their funding needs. There has not been a Traffic Study conducted for the North Desert subarea to assist with determining priorities.

Barstow has prioritized all of their projects for the next 10 years. Their next three prioritized projects are estimated to start construction in Fiscal Years 2015 and 2016 and have firm estimates; no commitment has been made for Measure I funds at this time. Barstow priorities 5, 6 and 12 have components within unincorporated San Bernardino County and the City has provided costs for those segments. While they are prioritized by the City, the County has not yet

*Entity: CTA*

Mountain-Desert Committee Agenda Item

January 15, 2016

Page 2

determined whether they are also their priorities and further negotiations will take place between the two agencies.

San Bernardino County has prioritized their projects through 2019. The Fort Irwin Chip Seal Project is their next priority. The County will request a funding contribution from the National Training Center at Fort Irwin but whether it is available for this project is unknown at this time. Their next priority is to fund the reconstruction of the community of Trona's bike lanes which are heavily used by the community. The project has not competed well for bicycle/pedestrian funding such as State Active Transportation Program funding due to its rural setting and the fact that it doesn't connect to a regional network. The County has also requested the match for federal funding for their National Trails Highway (Route 66) bridge projects. The amount of MLHP funding is estimated for both Priority 1 and National Trails Highway Bridges Under 20'.

SANBAG staff will continue to regularly meet or have contact with agency staff to determine whether any projects need reprioritization or have a more urgent funding need than what had previously been reported. In those instances, staff will request a subarea meeting to allow the subarea representatives to review the requests prior to a funding agreement being brought to the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee for approval.

***Financial Impact:***

This item has no impact on the 2015/2016 SANBAG budget.

***Reviewed By:***

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee.

***Responsible Staff:***

Ellen Pollema, Management Analyst II

---

Approved  
Mountain-Desert Committee  
Date: January 15, 2016

Witnessed By:

TYPE FONT LEGEND:  
 Bold = Funding Agreement  
 Normal = Potential Future Project  
 Italics = Expenditure Plan Project

ATTACHMENT 1

NORTH DESERT SUBAREA											
MAJOR LOCAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM FUNDS NEEDS AND COMMITMENTS											
City	Project	Project Priority	Named in Expenditure Plan?	MLHP Eligible?	In 10-Yr. Delivery Plan?	Phase or Status	Est CON Start Date	Total Project Cost	SANBAG Public Share	Current Funding Request	MLHP Commitment
Barstow	Lenwood Road (Funding Agreement approved June 2011)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Completed	2015	\$ 30,916,067	N/A	\$ 25,384,941	\$ 1,250,000
Barstow	First Avenue Bridge (Funding Agreement approved Jan 2015)		No	Yes	No	PS&E	2020	\$ 42,732,800	N/A	\$ 4,927,092	\$ 4,927,092
Barstow	Mojave River Bridge (Funding Agreement approved Jan 2015)		No	Yes	No	PA&ED	2020	\$ 27,570,433	N/A	\$ 3,178,871	\$ 3,178,871
Barstow	15, Irwin Road from First Avenue to Old Hwy 58 and Old Hwy 58 from Irwin	1	Yes	Yes	No		2015	\$ 1,150,000	N/A	\$ 1,150,000	\$ -
Barstow	Windy Pass from Agarita Avenue to 247	2	Yes	Yes	No		2016	\$ 390,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	Armory Road west of Route 247	3	Yes	Yes	No		2016	\$ 528,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	West Main Street - Route 66 Lenwood to Country Club Drive	4	Yes	Yes	No		2016	\$ 450,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	High Point Extension to Avenue L BARSTOW SHARE OF COSTS SHOWN (w/SB County)	5	No	Yes	No		2018	\$ 1,600,000	N/A	\$ 1,600,000	\$ -
Barstow	High Point Extension from Avenue L to Veterans Parkway BARSTOW SHARE OF COSTS SHOWN (w/SB County)	6	No	Yes	No		2021	\$ 1,800,000	N/A	\$ 1,800,000	\$ -
Barstow	Virginia Way from Barstow Road to Roberta Street	7	No	Yes	No		2017	\$ 750,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	First Avenue from West Main St to Bridge (Reconstruction)	8	No	Yes	No		2019	\$ 250,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	Morton/I-15 Interchange	9	No	Yes	No		2024	\$ 45,000,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	Morton Street	10	No	Yes	No		2024	\$ 500,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	Rimrock Road Extension to East Main Street	11	Yes	Yes	No		2024	\$ 3,200,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	High Point Extension from Avenue L to Veterans Parkway BARSTOW SHARE OF COSTS SHOWN (w/SB County)	12	Yes	Yes	No		2023	\$ 350,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	Traffic Signal at West Main Street and Petite Drive	13	Yes	Yes	No		2017	\$ 350,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	First Avenue from West Main St to Bridge (Realignment)	14	No	Yes	No		2018	\$ 1,600,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	Traffic Signal at West Main Street and Country Club Drive	15	Yes	Yes	No		2016	\$ 550,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	Country Club Drive from W. Main to Gazzana	16	No	Yes	No		2016	\$ 1,848,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow	SR58 Widening and Improvements		Yes	Yes	No			Unknown			
Barstow	<b>Total</b>							\$ 161,535,300		\$ 38,040,904	\$ 9,355,963
	Percentage of Committed Subarea Funding**									59.89%	76.96%
County	Lenwood Road (Funding Agreement approved June 2011)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Completed	2015	\$ 30,916,067	N/A	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 1,250,000
County	Baker Blvd. (Funding Agreement approved June 2015)	1	No	No	No	PS&E	2019	\$ 13,325,228	N/A	\$ 1,550,228	\$ 1,550,228
County	Fort Irwin Road Chip Seal Project: Yermo Road to Ft. Irwin	2	No	No	No	PA&ED	2016	\$ 2,704,293	N/A	\$ 2,704,293	\$ -
County	Trona Bike Lanes	3	No	No	No	PA&ED	2018	\$ 927,000	N/A	\$ 927,000	\$ -
County	National Trails Highway Bridges (under 20') Bridges Nos. 54C0274, 54C0278, 54C0334, 54C0341, and 54C0342	4	No	No	No	PA&ED	2017	\$ 5,056,000	N/A	\$ 5,056,000	\$ -
County	National Trails Highway Bridge Reconstructions -Priority 1 Bridges	5	No	No	No	PA&ED	2019	\$ 19,306,000	N/A	\$ 2,214,000	\$ -
County	Rimrock Road from Barstow Road to Avenue O, Ave H from Rimrock to I-15, Irwin Road from First Avenue to Old Hwy 58 and Old Hwy 58 from Irwin to First Ave. SB COUNTY SHARE OF COSTS SHOWN (w/SB County)		Yes	Yes	No		2015	\$ 2,050,000	N/A	\$ 2,050,000	\$ -
County	High Point Extension to Avenue L SB COUNTY SHARE OF COSTS SHOWN (w/SB County)		No	Yes	No		2018	\$ 1,600,000	N/A	\$ 1,600,000	\$ -
County	High Point Extension from Avenue L to Veterans Parkway SB COUNTY SHARE OF COSTS SHOWN (w/SB County)		No	Yes	No		2021	\$ 1,800,000	N/A	\$ 1,800,000	\$ -
County	SR58 Widening and Improvements		Yes	Yes	No			Unknown			
County	US395 Widening and Improvements		Yes	Yes	No			Unknown			
County	Vista Road Grade Separation		Yes	Yes	No			Unknown			
County	<b>Total</b>							\$ 46,768,521		\$ 20,401,521	\$ 2,800,228
	Percentage of Committed Subarea Funding**									32.12%	23.04%
SANBAG	US395 Expressway & Kramer Junction		No	No	No	Ongoing	2019	\$ 460,000,000	N/A	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -
SANBAG	<b>Total</b>							\$ 460,000,000		\$ 5,000,000	\$ -
	Percentage of Committed Subarea Funding**									6386.67%	0.00%
VVTA	Regional Vanpool Program - North Desert		No	No	No	Ongoing		\$ 78,288	N/A	\$ 78,288	\$ -
VVTA	<b>Total</b>							\$ 78,288		\$ 78,288	\$ -
	Percentage of Committed Subarea Funding**									0.12%	0.00%
<b>TOTAL NORTH DESERT NEED &amp; REQUESTS 2010 THROUGH 2025</b>								\$ 161,613,588		\$ 63,520,713	\$ 12,156,191
<b>ESTIMATED NORTH DESERT MEASURE 1 REVENUE 2010 THROUGH 2025</b>										\$ 21,340,913	

Attachment: MLHP North Desert Needs 2016-Jan [Revision 1] (2341 : Major Local Highway Program Subarea Project List for the North Desert

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 7

**Date:** *January 15, 2016*

**Subject:**

Advance Expenditure Agreement for the State Route 62 in the City of Twentynine Palms

**Recommendation:**

That the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee recommend the Board, acting in its capacity as the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority:

A. Allocate \$100,000 of Measure I Morongo Basin Subarea Major Local Highway Program Funds to the City of Twentynine Palms for the State Route 62 between Encelia Avenue and Larrea Avenue project.

B. Approve Advance Expenditure Agreement 16-1001422 with the City of Twentynine Palms for future reimbursement of \$100,000 in Measure I Morongo Basin Subarea Major Local Highway Program Funds for the State Route 62 between Encelia Avenue and Larrea Avenue project.

**Background:**

The State Route 62 (SR62) between Encelia Avenue and Larrea Avenue Project has been awarded Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds for the construction phase in the amount of \$606,510. The City of Twentynine Palms has requested \$100,000 in Major Local Highway Program (MLHP) funds to supplement City funds that will be used as the 11.47% local match for the award and for construction management. The Morongo Basin subarea technical representatives approved the allocation of funds and the Advance Expenditure Agreement at a meeting on August 3, 2015.

The Construction Phase of the project is scheduled to begin in June 2016 and be completed by November 2016. Because of commitments to other projects in the MLHP, staff estimates there will not be sufficient cash flow in the program to reimburse the City as project costs are incurred. The Advance Expenditure Agreement will allow the City to incur costs for future reimbursement from the MLHP. The Morongo Basin subarea technical representatives approved the allocation of future funds and the Agreement at a meeting on August 3, 2015.

Currently, SR62 in the City of Twentynine Palms does not meet its designated ultimate street standards due to the lack of standard and consistent shoulders, median, curb and gutter, sidewalk and Right of Way. This project is the first segment of the phased improvements to address the inconsistencies and risks in the existing conditions. The project will install sidewalk infrastructure on the south side of the highway where no sidewalk exists. Pedestrian crossing signage and high-visibility crosswalk pavement markings will be installed at Encelia and Larrea Streets. The project will complement the SR62/Encelia Avenue Traffic Signal project which was previously allocated MLHP funding.

*Entity: CTA*

Mountain-Desert Committee Agenda Item  
January 15, 2016  
Page 2

***Financial Impact:***

This item has no impact on the adopted SANBAG Budget.

***Reviewed By:***

This item is not scheduled for review by any other policy committee or technical advisory committee. General Counsel has reviewed this item and the draft agreement.

***Responsible Staff:***

Ellen Pollema, Management Analyst II

---

Approved  
Mountain-Desert Committee  
Date: January 15, 2016

Witnessed By:

**Contract Summary Sheet**

**General Contract Information**

Contract No: 16-1001422 Amendment No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Vendor No.: 02201  
 Vendor/Customer Name: \_\_\_\_\_ City of Twentynine Palms Sole Source?  Yes  No  
 Description: Advance Expenditure Agreement for SR62/Encelia to Larrea Project  
 Start Date: 02/03/2016 Expiration Date: N/A Revised Expiration Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Has Contract Term Been Amended?  No  Yes - Please Explain \_\_\_\_\_  
 List Any Related Contracts Nos.: \_\_\_\_\_ None

Dollar Amount			
Original Contract	\$ 100,000.00	Original Contingency	\$ -
Revised Contract (Inclusive of Prior Amendments)	\$ -	Revised Contingency (Inclusive of Prior Amendments)	\$ -
Current Amendment	\$ -	Contingency Amendment	\$ -
TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE	\$ 100,000.00	TOTAL CONTINGENCY VALUE	\$ -
		TOTAL DOLLAR AUTHORITY (Contract Value and Contingency)	\$ 100,000.00

**Contract Authorization**

Executive Director Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Executive Director Action: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Board of Directors Date: 02/03/2016  
 Board of Directors Action: Approve contract 16-1001422

**Contract Management: Payable/Miscellaneous**

Invoice Warning: 20% Renewals: \_\_\_\_\_ Type:  Capital  PAA  Other  
 Retention: % Maximum Retention: \$ -  
 Services:  Construction  Intrgrnt/MOU/COOP  A & E Services  Other Professional Services  
 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Contract Management: Receivable**

E-76 and/or CTC Date \_\_\_\_\_ (Attach Copy)  Program Supplement No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Finance Letter  Reversion Date: \_\_\_\_\_  EA No.: \_\_\_\_\_

**All of the above MUST be submitted to FINANCE including originals, amendments and miscellaneous transaction changes**

**Additional Information**

Project Manager: Ellen Pollema

Attachment: Contract Summary Sheet [Revision 2] (2153 : Advance Expenditure Agreement for City of Twentynine Palms)

**ADVANCE EXPENDITURE AGREEMENT NO. 16-1001422**

**BETWEEN**

**SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

**AND**

**CITY OF TWENTYNINE PALMS**

**FOR**

**STATE ROUTE 62 BETWEEN ENCELIA AVENUE  
AND LARREA AVENUE PROJECT**

This Advance Expenditure Agreement (“AGREEMENT” or “AEA”) is made and entered into by and between the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (hereinafter referred to as “AUTHORITY”) and the CITY of Twentynine Palms (hereinafter referred to as “CITY”). AUTHORITY AND CITY shall be collectively known as “Party” or “Parties”.

The Effective Date of this AGREEMENT shall be the date upon which AUTHORITY executes this AGREEMENT.

RECITALS

A. The Measure I 2010-2040 (“Measure I”) Expenditure Plan and the Morongo Basin Subarea transportation planning partners have identified projects eligible for partial funding from Measure I 2010-2040 Morongo Basin Subarea Major Local Highway Program (MLHP) funds;

B. The State Route 62 between Encelia Avenue and Larrea Avenue Project in the City of Twentynine Palms (“PROJECT”) is one of the projects identified as eligible for such funding and is described more fully in Attachment A;

C. AUTHORITY has determined that the PROJECT is eligible to receive the Morongo Basin Subarea MLHP funds for the construction phase of the work (hereinafter referred to as “PHASE”);

D. City has requested an allocation of \$100,000 Morongo Basin Subarea MLHP funds that are not immediately available;

E. CITY wishes to begin the PROJECT prior to Measure I funds being available for this PROJECT; and

F. Since revenue from Measure I 2010-2040 is limited, AUTHORITY and CITY are entering into this AGREEMENT, which will allow CITY to use its own funds to implement the PROJECT in advance of an allocation of Measure I funds, with the understanding that AUTHORITY will reimburse CITY at a later date for AUTHORITY's share of eligible PROJECT expenditures incurred after January 1, 2016, in accordance with the Advance Expenditure Agreement (AEA) reimbursement policy in the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan Rural Mountain/Desert Subareas Advance Expenditure Processes Policy No. 40022 (POLICY), as applicable;

G. This AGREEMENT is to be carried out in accordance with the policies in the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan as adopted by AUTHORITY.

NOW, THEREFORE, AUTHORITY and CITY agree to the following:

### SECTION I

#### AUTHORITY AGREES:

1. To reimburse CITY for those eligible PROJECT expenses that are incurred by CITY for the PROJECT, as set forth in Attachment A to this Agreement and as governed by POLICY in the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan, in effect as of this AGREEMENT's Effective Date.
2. To reimburse CITY, subject to Article 1 of this Section I, in accordance with the POLICY and after CITY submits to AUTHORITY an original and an electronic copy of the signed invoices in the proper form covering those actual allowable PROJECT expenditures that were incurred by CITY.
3. When conducting an audit of the costs claimed under the provisions of this AGREEMENT, to rely to the maximum extent possible on any prior audit of CITY performed pursuant to the provisions of State and Federal laws. In the absence of such an audit, work of other auditors will be relied upon to the extent that work is acceptable to AUTHORITY when planning and conducting additional audits.

### SECTION II

#### CITY AGREES:

1. That only eligible PROJECT expenses, as set forth in Attachment A to this AGREEMENT, that conform to the SANBAG Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan Policies will be eligible for Measure I reimbursement. CITY agrees that it will only request reimbursement for eligible PROJECT activities and that reimbursement will occur based on timelines governed by the POLICY.

2. To submit to AUTHORITY an original and an electronic copy of signed invoices for reimbursement of eligible preconstruction PROJECT expenses no later than PROJECT acceptance. CITY further agrees and understands that AUTHORITY will not reimburse CITY for any PROJECT expenditures that are inconsistent with the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan. The Final Report of Expenditures must state that these PROJECT funds were used in conformance with this AGREEMENT and for those PROJECT activities described in Attachment A.
3. To repay to AUTHORITY any reimbursement for Measure I costs that are determined by subsequent audit to be unallowable within ninety (90) days of CITY receiving notice of audit findings, which time shall include an opportunity for CITY to respond to and/or resolve the finding. Should the finding not be otherwise resolved and CITY fail to reimburse moneys due AUTHORITY within ninety (90) days of audit finding, or within such other period as may be agreed between both parties hereto, the SANBAG Board reserves the right to withhold future payments due CITY from any source under AUTHORITY's control.
4. To provide a share of total eligible PROJECT expenses as defined in Attachment A.
5. To provide the CITY portion of funds for the PROJECT under this AGREEMENT.
6. To maintain all copies of all consultant/contractor invoices, source documents, books and records connected with performance under this AGREEMENT for a minimum of five (5) years from the date of the Final Report of Expenditures or until audit resolution is achieved, whichever is later.
7. To establish and maintain an accounting system and internal controls conforming to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) to support CITY's request for reimbursement, payment vouchers and invoices which segregate and accumulate costs of PROJECT work elements and produce monthly reports which clearly identify reimbursable costs, matching fund costs, indirect cost allocation, and other allowable expenditures by CITY.
8. To allow for the preparation of a PROJECT audit to be completed by CITY or by AUTHORITY, at AUTHORITY's option and expense, and to cooperate in the audit as described in Section I Article 3 upon completion of the PROJECT. The audit must find that all funds expended on the PROJECT were used in conformance with this AGREEMENT.
9. To include in all contracts between CITY and contractors for the PROJECT the requirement that AUTHORITY be named as an additional insured under

general liability insurance policies maintained by the contractor for the PROJECT.

### SECTION III

#### IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED:

1. To abide by all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations pertaining to the PROJECT, including policies in the applicable program in the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan, as amended, as of the Effective Date of this AGREEMENT.
2. AUTHORITY's financial responsibility for the PROJECT shall not exceed the AUTHORITY share listed in Attachment B unless amended by both Parties. Reimbursement for the PROJECT shall be limited to the AUTHORITY share of the estimated cost of the PROJECT for which funds have been allocated by the AUTHORITY Board, or to the AUTHORITY share of the actual cost, whichever is less.
3. This agreement can be amended when agreed upon by both Parties.
4. CITY will use its own funds to implement the PROJECT in advance of the additional \$100,000 allocation of Measure I funds, with the understanding that AUTHORITY will reimburse CITY for AUTHORITY share of eligible PROJECT expenditures at a later date in accordance with the POLICY.
5. Eligible PROJECT reimbursements shall include only those costs incurred by CITY for PROJECT activities that are described in this AGREEMENT and shall not include escalation or interest.
6. CITY shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless AUTHORITY, its officers and employees, from and against any and all actions, claims, injuries, damages, liabilities, demands, losses, judgments, penalties, expenses and costs including attorney's fees for staff attorneys and outside counsel (collectively "Liabilities") arising out of or in any way connected with anything done or omitted to be done by CITY, its officers, employees, agents, contractors, consultants, subcontractors and subconsultants of any level, in connection with the PROJECT or under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to CITY under this AGREEMENT. CITY's obligations under this Article apply to AUTHORITY's "passive" and "active" negligence, but do not apply to AUTHORITY's "sole negligence" or "willful misconduct" within the meaning of Civil Code Section 2782.
7. AUTHORITY shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless CITY, its officers and employees, from and against any and all actions, claims, injuries,

damages, liabilities, demands, losses, judgments, penalties, expenses and costs including attorney's fees for staff attorneys and outside counsel (collectively "Liabilities") arising out of or in any way connected with anything done or omitted to be done by AUTHORITY, its Board of Directors, employees, agents, contractors, consultants, subcontractors and subconsultants of any level, in connection with the PROJECT or under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to AUTHORITY under this AGREEMENT. AUTHORITY's obligations under this Article apply to CITY's "passive" and "active" negligence, but do not apply to CITY's "sole negligence" or "willful misconduct" within the meaning of Civil Code Section 2782.

8. CITY is an authorized self-insured public entity for purposes of Professional Liability, General Liability, Automobile Liability and Workers' Compensation and warrants that through its programs of self-insurance, it has adequate coverage or resources to protect against liabilities arising out of the performance of the terms, conditions or obligations of this AGREEMENT.
9. AUTHORITY is a public entity with Professional Liability, General Liability and Automobile Liability insurance policies of \$10,000,000 each and Workers' Compensation insurance coverage in the statutory limits, to protect against liabilities arising out of the performance of the terms, conditions or obligations of this AGREEMENT.
10. This AGREEMENT is expressly subordinate to any bonds, notes, certificates or other evidences of indebtedness involved in bond financings as are now outstanding or as may hereafter be issued by AUTHORITY.
11. This AGREEMENT will be considered terminated upon reimbursement of eligible costs by AUTHORITY. The AGREEMENT may also be terminated by AUTHORITY, in its sole discretion, in the event the PROJECT construction work described in Attachment A has not been initiated within twenty-four (24) months of the date of execution of this agreement.
12. Attachments A (Description and Project Milestones) and Attachment B (Summary of Estimated Costs) for PROJECT are attached to and incorporated into this Agreement.
13. The Recitals stated above are true and correct and are incorporated by this reference into the AGREEMENT.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have executed this AGREEMENT below.

----SIGNATURES ON NEXT PAGE----

**San Bernardino County  
Transportation Authority**

**City of Twentynine Palms**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Ryan McEachron, Chairman  
Board of Directors

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Frank Luckino  
City Manager

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND  
PROCEDURE:

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND  
PROCEDURE:

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Eileen Monaghan Teichert  
SANBAG General Counsel

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY Attorney

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

CONCURRED:

ATTEST:

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffery Hill,  
Procurement Manager

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

Attachment: AEA-29Palms [Revision 5] (2153 : Advance Expenditure Agreement for City of Twentynine Palms)

## Attachment A

### STATE ROUTE 62 BETWEEN ENCELIA AVENUE AND LARREA AVENUE PROJECT

#### Description of Project and Milestones

<b>Project Title</b>		
State Route 62 between Encelia Avenue and Larrea Avenue (approximately 0.6 miles).		
<b>Location, Project Limits, Description, Scope of Work, Legislative Description</b>		
Install sidewalk infrastructure on the south side of the highway and across a culvert where no sidewalk exists. Pedestrian crossing signage and high-visibility crosswalk pavement markings will be installed at Encelia and Larrea Avenues.		
<b>Component</b>	<b>Implementing Agency</b>	<b>Reimbursements</b>
PA&ED	City of Twentynine Palms	
PS&E	City of Twentynine Palms	
Right of Way	City of Twentynine Palms	
Construction	City of Twentynine Palms	
<b>Legislative Districts</b>		
<b>Assembly:</b>		<b>Senate:</b>
<b>Congressional:</b>		
<b>Purpose and Need</b>		
This is the first segment of the phased improvements to address the inconsistencies and risks in the existing conditions. Currently, SR 62, in the City of Twentynine Palms, does not meet its designated ultimate street standards due to the lack of standard and consistent shoulders, median, curb and gutter, sidewalk and Right of Way (ROW). In many places there is no shoulder, and where it does exist, the shoulder is less than six (6) feet (ft) wide.		
<b>Project Benefits</b>		
This HSIP project is the first critical step in addressing the most serious deficiencies where most pedestrians are traveling to the centralized commercial area.		
<b>Project Milestone</b>		<b>Proposed</b>
Project Study Report Approved		N/A
Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase		9/2012
Circulate Draft Environmental Document	<b>Document Type</b>	Negative Declaration
Draft Project Report		
End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone)		11/2013
Begin Design (PS&E) Phase		12/2013
End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone)		5/2015
Begin Right of Way Phase		N/A
End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone)		N/A
Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone)		6/2016
End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone)		9/2016
Begin Closeout Phase		10/2016
End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report)		11/2016

## ATTACHMENT B

### STATE ROUTE 62 BETWEEN ENCELIA AVENUE AND LARREA AVENUE PROJECT

#### Summary of Estimated Costs

Component	Total Cost	AUTHORITY Share* -- AEA for future MLHP Funds	Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Funds**	City Funds
Engineering***	\$378,000	\$0	\$0	\$378,000
Right of Way	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Construction	\$783,900	\$100,000	\$606,510	\$77,390
<b>Total</b>	\$1,161,900	\$100,000	\$606,510	\$455,390

\*AUTHORITY'S Share can be from sources under control of AUTHORITY including but not limited to Measure I Major Local Highways Program (MLHP), State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Surface Transportation Program (STP), or other funds without necessitating an amendment of this agreement.

\*\*Match for federal funds is 11.47%.

\*\*\*For purposes of this Attachment B, "Engineering" is defined to include both PA&ED and PS&E Phases.

**MOUNTAIN/DESERT POLICY COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD – 2015**

Name	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
<b>Rich Kerr</b> City of Adelanto	X***	X	X*	**	**		**	X*	**		**	X*
<b>Curt Emick</b> Town of Apple Valley			X*	**	**		**	X	**	X*	**	X
<b>Julie McIntyre</b> City of Barstow		X	X	**	**	X	**	X	**		**	
<b>Bill Jahn</b> City of Big Bear Lake	X	X	X	**	**	X	**		**	X	**	X
<b>Mike Leonard</b> City of Hesperia	X	X	X	**	**	X	**		**	X*	**	X
<b>Ed Paget</b> City of Needles		X	X	**	**	X	**	X	**		**	
<b>Joel Klink</b> City of Twentynine Palms	***		X	**	**	X	**	X	**		**	X
<b>Ryan McEachron</b> City of Victorville	X	X		**	**		**	X	**	X	**	X
<b>George Huntington</b> Town of Yucca Valley	X	X	X	**	**	X	**	X	**		**	X
<b>Robert Lovingood</b> County of San Bernardino	X	X	X	**	**		**	X	**	X	**	X
<b>Janice Rutherford</b> County of San Bernardino	X			**	**		**		**		**	
<b>James Ramos</b> County of San Bernardino				**	**		**		**		**	

\*Non-voting City Representative attended  
+ Measure I Committee representative

\*\*The Mountain/Desert Committee did not meet  
x\*Alternate Attended

\*\*\* New SANBAG Board Member

X = Member attended meeting.  
MDCatt14.doc

Empty box = Member did not attend meeting

Crossed out box = Not a Board Member at the time.

*San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) is a council of governments formed in 1973 by joint powers agreement of the cities and the County of San Bernardino. SANBAG is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of a mayor or designated council member from each of the twenty-four cities in San Bernardino County and the five members of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors.*

*In addition to SANBAG, the composition of the SANBAG Board of Directors also serves as the governing board for several separate legal entities listed below:*

***The San Bernardino County Transportation Commission**, which is responsible for short and long range transportation planning within San Bernardino County, including coordination and approval of all public mass transit service, approval of all capital development projects for public transit and highway projects, and determination of staging and scheduling of construction relative to all transportation improvement projects in the Transportation Improvement Program.*

***The San Bernardino County Transportation Authority**, which is responsible for administration of the voter-approved half-cent transportation transactions and use tax levied in the County of San Bernardino.*

***The Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies**, which is responsible for the administration and operation of a motorist aid system of call boxes on State freeways and highways within San Bernardino County.*

***The Congestion Management Agency**, which analyzes the performance level of the regional transportation system in a manner which ensures consideration of the impacts from new development and promotes air quality through implementation of strategies in the adopted air quality plans.*

*As a **Subregional Planning Agency**, SANBAG represents the San Bernardino County subregion and assists the Southern California Association of Governments in carrying out its functions as the metropolitan planning organization. SANBAG performs studies and develops consensus relative to regional growth forecasts, regional transportation plans, and mobile source components of the air quality plans.*

*Items which appear on the monthly Board of Directors agenda are subjects of one or more of the listed legal authorities. For ease of understanding and timeliness, the agenda items for all of these entities are consolidated on one agenda. Documents contained in the agenda package are clearly marked with the appropriate legal entity.*

This list provides information on acronyms commonly used by transportation planning professionals. This information is provided in an effort to assist SANBAG Board Members and partners as they participate in deliberations at SANBAG Board meetings. While a complete list of all acronyms which may arise at any given time is not possible, this list attempts to provide the most commonly-used terms. SANBAG staff makes every effort to minimize use of acronyms to ensure good communication and understanding of complex transportation processes.

AB	Assembly Bill
ACE	Alameda Corridor East
ACT	Association for Commuter Transportation
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADT	Average Daily Traffic
APTA	American Public Transportation Association
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
ATMIS	Advanced Transportation Management Information Systems
BAT	Barstow Area Transit
CALACT	California Association for Coordination Transportation
CALCOG	California Association of Councils of Governments
CALSAFE	California Committee for Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
CMIA	Corridor Mobility Improvement Account
CMP	Congestion Management Program
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
COG	Council of Governments
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CSAC	California State Association of Counties
CTA	California Transit Association
CTC	California Transportation Commission
CTC	County Transportation Commission
CTP	Comprehensive Transportation Plan
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise
DEMO	Federal Demonstration Funds
DOT	Department of Transportation
EA	Environmental Assessment
E&D	Elderly and Disabled
E&H	Elderly and Handicapped
EIR	Environmental Impact Report (California)
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement (Federal)
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FSP	Freeway Service Patrol
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FTIP	Federal Transportation Improvement Program
GFOA	Government Finance Officers Association
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HOV	High-Occupancy Vehicle
ICTC	Interstate Clean Transportation Corridor
IEEP	Inland Empire Economic Partnership
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
IIP/ITIP	Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
IVDA	Inland Valley Development Agency
JARC	Job Access Reverse Commute
LACMTA	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
LNG	Liquefied Natural Gas
LTF	Local Transportation Funds

MAGLEV	Magnetic Levitation
MARTA	Mountain Area Regional Transportation Authority
MBTA	Morongo Basin Transit Authority
MDAB	Mojave Desert Air Basin
MDAQMD	Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSRC	Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee
NAT	Needles Area Transit
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
OA	Obligation Authority
OCTA	Orange County Transportation Authority
PA&ED	Project Approval and Environmental Document
PASTACC	Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council
PDT	Project Development Team
PNRS	Projects of National and Regional Significance
PPM	Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds
PSE	Plans, Specifications and Estimates
PSR	Project Study Report
PTA	Public Transportation Account
PTC	Positive Train Control
PTMISEA	Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account
RCTC	Riverside County Transportation Commission
RDA	Redevelopment Agency
RFP	Request for Proposal
RIP	Regional Improvement Program
RSTIS	Regionally Significant Transportation Investment Study
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
SB	Senate Bill
SAFE	Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
SAFETEA-LU	Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCRRA	Southern California Regional Rail Authority
SHA	State Highway Account
SHOPP	State Highway Operations and Protection Program
SOV	Single-Occupant Vehicle
S RTP	Short Range Transit Plan
STAF	State Transit Assistance Funds
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
STP	Surface Transportation Program
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TCIF	Trade Corridor Improvement Fund
TCM	Transportation Control Measure
TCRP	Traffic Congestion Relief Program
TDA	Transportation Development Act
TEA	Transportation Enhancement Activities
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century
TMC	Transportation Management Center
TMEE	Traffic Management and Environmental Enhancement
TSM	Transportation Systems Management
TSSDRA	Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response Account
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VCTC	Ventura County Transportation Commission
VVTA	Victor Valley Transit Authority
WRCOG	Western Riverside Council of Governments

*San Bernardino Associated Governments*



**MISSION STATEMENT**

To enhance the quality of life for all residents, San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) will:

- Improve cooperative regional planning
- Develop an accessible, efficient, multi-modal transportation system
- Strengthen economic development efforts
- Exert leadership in creative problem solving

To successfully accomplish this mission, SANBAG will foster enhanced relationships among all of its stakeholders while adding to the value of local governments.

Approved June 2, 1993  
Reaffirmed March 6, 1996