Chairman Mickey Cafagna (Poway) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:14 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

   Jim Whalen, representing the Alliance for Habitat Conservation, commented that SANDAG is doing great work, and it is important that San Diego get its fair share of the bond measure. He supported this action.

   Chair Cafagna welcomed City of San Diego Mayor Jerry Sanders to the Board.

   Mayor Sanders distributed a letter indicating that in his inaugural State of the City Address, the message from citizens was clear with two primary concerns: (1) San Diego needs a significant investment in infrastructure, and (2) San Diegans want their Mayor fighting for San Diego’s fair share. He said that we need to develop lists of infrastructure needs in our region. He congratulated SANDAG for today’s effort. He also asked community leaders who helped pass the TransNet Extension to again convene to consider how they might lead a public education campaign on the statewide bond initiative. He will be meeting with the Governor, legislative leaders, and the local delegation in the weeks to come to ensure San Diego’s fair share. He looked forward to working with SANDAG to meet this imperative.

   Chair Cafagna also welcomed Harry Mathis, new Chair of the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Board, and Supervisor Bill Horn, the new Chair of the County Board of Supervisors. He introduced SANDAG’s new Chief Deputy Executive Director, Diane Eidam.

REPORTS (2 through 6)

2. ASCE 2005 SAN DIEGO INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT CARD (INFORMATION)

   Carmen Kasner, President of the San Diego Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), said that she was here to present the ASCE’s 2005 report card for the San Diego region. She provided introduction to this report and background on ASCE. She described the grading criteria for the report card. A “B” was determined to be an acceptable standard for infrastructure. They went through a two-step process: grading for existing adequacy and future adequacy.

Chair Cafagna asked if there were questions from Board members regarding this Report Card.

Mayor Art Madrid (La Mesa) said that he noticed that the recommendations did not address telecommuting. Unless we address those kinds of issues, we won’t be as successful as we could be.

First Vice Chair Mary Teresa Sessom asked why airports were not included in the section on Land and Sea Ports of Entry. Mr. Lutes said that ASCE volunteers helped to compose this Report Card, and they couldn’t find a volunteer to focus on that area.

Chair Cafagna asked about the next steps. Mr. Lutes responded that the purpose of the Report Card was to communicate with elected officials and the public to make them aware of the need to invest in our infrastructure. We should continue with this kind of a forum and find ways to increase the investment in our infrastructure.

Chair Cafagna introduced John Chalker, newly appointed member of the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Mr. Chalker is a resident of Point Loma and the first San Diegan to serve on the CTC since 1999. He said the CTC is responsible for allocating billions in funding for highway, passenger rail, and transit improvements throughout California and in partnership with agencies like SANDAG and Caltrans. Mr. Chalker is managing director and portfolio manager for LM Capital, a leading San Diego-based fixed income manager for institutional clients. He is also a founding member and former chairman of the Alliance in Support of Airport Progress in the 21st Century (ASAP21), an advocacy group seeking to replace Lindbergh Field. Chair Cafagna stated that SANDAG looks forward to working with Mr. Chalker as we partner to take on the challenges of improving our transportation system.

Mr. Chalker stated that he will do his best to make sure the San Diego region gets its fair share and that its high priority projects will be brought before the Commission.

3. OVERVIEW OF STATE INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING PROPOSAL (INFORMATION)

Chair Cafagna introduced Ms. Sunne Wright McPeak, Secretary of the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency.

Ms. McPeak said that she has been working with the Governor to build California infrastructure. The Governor gave a directive to department heads to look at the needs of the state. Even though there was a major budget deficit, he wanted to prepare for the time when we could start investing in infrastructure. He asked them not to constrain their suggestions by revenues. The outcome was to be able to reduce congestion below what it is
today and manage transportation to accommodate the expected growth in population and the economy. They looked at what investments would be needed over the next 10 to 20 years and at all strategies that could be used. The entire infrastructure program for the next decade is about $220 billion. Both revenues that could be identified or generated were provided, and the Governor sized the amount of general obligation (GO) bonds for each of the strategic infrastructure components. He has proposed a $68 billion general obligation bond package. Each of the major infrastructure components will have their own bond, and the bonds will go to the voters in five successive elections starting with this year.

They also would secure reforms in design/build, private/public partnerships, and revenue bond financing that could cover the $107 billion for transportation and air quality needs. The proposed approach in the GO bond for transportation is not to spell out specific projects but to identify a process and set categories for funding from these bonds. The Governor’s strategic growth plan for transportation includes: freeway, transit, operational improvements, intelligent transportation systems (ITS), and maintenance. The GO bonds mirror those categories.

Ms. McPeak said that by September 30, 2006, the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency would propose a performance matrix and a proposed list of projects eligible for GO bond funding to the CTC. The CTC would hold at least one hearing in the south and one in the north and would approve projects eligible for funding. These projects must be in adopted Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs). Our goal is to be open and transparent, focusing on outcomes, rather than having a political list of projects. This will be subject to discussion in the Legislature.

Ms. McPeak said that full funding of Proposition 42 has a tremendous impact on this strategic growth plan. The Governor is proposing legislation that would remove the ability for the state to borrow at all from this program. What this means is that the Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) projects also would get fully funded. There are a number of projects for San Diego in the TCRP program, and there is an existing outstanding obligation from the TCRP program. In addition to this, Proposition 42 provides for a 40/40/20 split (state/local government/transit) or $300 million annually. One thing important to note is that the state budget has full funding for Proposition 42 this year. On top of that is $920 million in an advanced repayment of an outstanding loan from Proposition 42 dollars. This will add money to the system and provide payment for local city streets and roads this year. The numbers of projects that impact San Diego County are pretty significant. About $200 million in TCRP projects will be allocated.

Ms. McPeak continued by saying that they have developed a set of actions and investments for the $107 billion, 10-year investment, and they have targeted investments for the next 20 years. The state will consult with SANDAG and other agencies after the GO bonds are passed to further refine the 10- and 20-year plans. On top of that, we are going to be talking to the CTC in the immediate future to discuss a $140 million plan for immediate congestion relief from Proposition 42 monies. About $20 million of that amount would be targeted in San Diego County.

Ms. McPeak said that a very important component of mobility for the strategic growth plan is to have more efficient land use patterns. We want to use land as efficiently as possible and provide choices to consumers on where they live and travel. We need land use and
housing reforms to get the most return on our investment out of the dollars we are willing to spend.

In this regard, Chair Cafagna noted that San Diego is one of the first counties to have passed a Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) tied to our Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and it includes smart growth incentives. We also are a “self-help county” because we passed our TransNet sales tax extension, engaged in an Early Action Program, and have in place a financing plan to provide dollars before the 2008 revenue stream. We want to make sure we have projects ready to go, and if there is a priority based on ready-to-go projects with matching funds, we would like this taken into consideration. However, we don’t want to be penalized by receiving less state funding because we are a self-help county.

Ms. McPeak said that they have taken that into account. To the extent you think we haven’t, give us that feedback. Last year, we were focused on getting money out the door and that meant doing those projects that were ready to go. We will be in the same situation today. Also, we are hopeful that we will have the gaming compact bond completed, which could provide more revenue. We are concerned that the balance in the Transportation Planning Account (TPA) is continuing to build because some projects are not ready for construction. As we looked at the GO bond funding, we attempted to identify corridors with the most congestion but that were also ready for the next phase of investment. Their actions would take into account self-help county actions and encourage other areas to become self-help counties.

Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) stated that one of the issues we have discussed at the Transportation Committee is the use of Grant Anticipated Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) bonds. We thought this might be a viable financing mechanism. He asked Ms. McPeak to address this.

Ms. McPeak agreed that they think GARVEE is a viable financing mechanism, and they worked with the CTC to get its policy adopted and obtained approval of the Department of Finance. Of the existing GARVEE authority approved by the CTC, there is $2.4 billion authority remaining. The CTC has adopted a conservative approach with 12-year bonding and no more than 15 percent of liabilities. In the $105 billion capital investment program, there may be additional authority for GARVEE bonding. We have tentatively reserved GARVEE bonding authority until the goods moment action plan is completed. Department of Transportation Director Will Kempton and Caltrans district directors will be identifying everything that is ready to go. We will take what we have from self-help county projects, assess where you are with the status of delivery, and synchronize this with the state transportation system.

Councilmember Joe Kellejian (Solana Beach) said that the State Senate approved the design/build approach for I-405, which is the most impacted highway in the nation. He feels strongly in favor of design-build for the efficiency of projects and asked how the Administration feels about design-build. Ms. McPeak responded that it is important, and you need to work hard with the legislators in that area. She noted that a design-build bill for I-405 would be signed today. The Administration wanted expanded design-build authority. The proposal is to have design-build authority for regional transportation and local transportation authority as well as the state. Councilmember Kellejian stated that as of Tuesday our San Diego legislative delegation was aware of our opinion on design-build.
Vice Mayor Ron Morrison (National City) said that there is a strategic growth push on cities to develop more housing and put it in the right places, but the right places are in redevelopment areas with a high concentration of existing infrastructure. However, with the existing redevelopment law, if we put housing in those areas, the cities get zero income and the money goes to the redevelopment agencies. We could add more housing, but only if there is a sharing of this money with local cities to provide the necessary services to support the additional housing. Otherwise, cities are reluctant to put in more housing.

Ms. McPeak said that the Administration has been working with various stakeholders on housing and land use reforms. We have acknowledged and stipulated the need for additional money to support the accommodation of housing and to subsidize low and very low income housing units. The League of California Cities has a task force looking at the potential sources of revenue that can come to local governments to accommodate additional housing. Full funding of Proposition 42 will be a huge shot in the arm annually for local government in the local streets and road category. Other ideas would leave more of the tax base locally as you increase density. Cities also could be innovative in terms of how a redevelopment agency is structured by identifying subventions and pass-through agreements to the city. You also could structure the subventions of the tax increment to accommodate some of the problems you have. We are all looking for money to bring plans up to date, improve infrastructure and services, and provide subsidies.

Vice Mayor Morrison agreed that allowing part of that income from housing in those zones would provide a source of revenue for cities.

Ms. McPeak had another appointment and left the meeting at 10:09 a.m.

Chair Cafagna introduced Mark Watts of Smith, Watts & Company.

Mr. Watts provided an overview of the state infrastructure proposals including where we are now, an overview of why the interest in state infrastructure investments is so high now, the Governor’s Strategic Growth Plan, Senator Perata’s Senate Bill (SB) 1024, Speaker Nunez’s proposal, the process for getting something done, a brief comparison of the two proposals with the Governor’s Plan, and some issues to consider.

Tom Scott, Executive Director, San Diego Housing Federation, said that Proposition 46, which was passed in 2002, was an affordable housing bond. We have $76 million from that bond. About 8.3 percent of the total allocated created 1,815 homes. Of those, 976 were first-time home buyers, and we leveraged $200 million in other investments. This year, the primary funds for construction will be exhausted. Senator Perata agreed to add money to his bond proposal for affordable housing construction. Speaker Nunez included language in his bill for financing programs. The Governor excluded affordable housing financing from his proposal. They are asking SANDAG and individual city council members to consider writing letters of support to the Legislature for affordable housing financing.

Eric Bruvold, San Diego Economic Development Corporation and member of San Diegans for Congestion Relief, said that he was excited about the opportunity for the bond issues in June and November 2006. They have had preliminary meetings to get this started.
Brad Barnum of the Associated General Contractors (AGC) is playing a key role. AGC wants to partner with SANDAG to ensure that San Diego gets its fair share of this funding.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that the 2030 Unconstrained Revenue scenario in the adopted RTP plus estimates for other regional infrastructure categories show that San Diego needs $84 billion. We have $35 billion in identified funding, primarily for transportation. Mr. Watts said that there are things in Sacramento that bind you, and you cannot separate regions and local communities from the state's plan.

Mayor Christy Guerin (Encinitas) asked how this bond money will be allocated. Mr. Watts responded that there will be two transportation programs: goods movement and major corridors in need of improvement. Caltrans would develop the slate of projects and then allow communities and regions to offer alternatives.

4. OVERVIEW OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (DISCUSSION)

a. **Report on Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Its Relationship to Statewide Infrastructure Funding Proposals**

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, discussed the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS) contained in the RCP. There were four steps in developing the IRIS: (1) conduct an infrastructure inventory and evaluation; (2) conduct a needs assessment; (3) evaluate financing and public policy options; and (4) recommend policies and implementation procedures. We have identified eight regional infrastructure areas: transportation; storm water management; parks and open space; education; water supply and delivery system; wastewater; solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal; and energy supply and delivery system. IRIS also identified appropriate regional funding sources, some of which have been pursued (e.g., TransNet).

Other needs have been identified in the RCP such as funding for local infrastructure, low-income and moderate-income housing, and local municipal services, particularly in dense residential areas; and funding for local and regional planning. He reviewed the overall needs assessment and introduced the panel participants: Paul Jablonski (MTS), Karen King (North County Transit District [NCTD]), Dan Wilkens (Port District), Mike Hix (SANDAG), Rob Rundle (SANDAG), Gail Goldberg (City of San Diego), and Chandra Wallar (County of San Diego).

b. **Panel Discussion on Specific Infrastructure Categories**

Mr. Jablonski reviewed MTS transit infrastructure needs in the areas of operations and capital. He stated that MTS is conducting a Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) to make its system more efficient and trim costs in order to meet the budget. He said that MTS has the lowest subsidy per passenger compared to about any other major transit system in the western United States. We will need to deal with a significant funding source for the new Mission Valley East line. Without revenue growth, our system will shrink. On the capital side, we are projecting the additional need of $34 million to keep the existing system moving. We need $60 million just to keep the current infrastructure maintained. The system is beginning to show signs of
stress due to deferred maintenance, and vehicles need to be replaced. We cannot keep a sustainable system at current funding levels. Transit is a critical component of our transportation system. We need to maintain our focus on the entire system and provide a balance between highway and transit investments.

Councilmember Madaffer asked how much money transit is receiving in the current TransNet structure. He thought that Los Angeles is getting one full cent of sales tax revenues. Mr. Jablonski said that in San Diego, transit is getting one-third of one-half percent through the existing TransNet measure.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if transit could be included in a new quality-of-life measure. Mr. Gallegos responded affirmatively.

Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, portrayed a story similar to MTS. There is no statewide maintenance program for transit as there is for highways. They are trying to be visionary and build a system for the future. Maintaining the existing system is a difficult challenge for the transit agencies. There are two primary areas: (1) safety, security, and operations; and (2) capacity. NCTD currently spends about $5 million on railroad infrastructure components, but this does not cover what is ultimately required. While we may think that double tracking is a capacity improvement, it really is a safety and operational improvement that must be made. Track, signal, and vehicle replacements also are needed. They cannot carry more people on the existing system without additional parking. Double tracking the entire coastal and SPRINTER corridor is needed as well. Any opportunity to bring more revenue into this area would be helpful.

Dan Wilkens, Port District, provided remarks on goods movement infrastructure needs. The Port District is working with SANDAG on mobility and congestion relief work. As goods move into our state, they are distributed over the same transportation networks that carry people and domestic commodities. In this regard, they have talked about congestion relief in the I-5 corridor through the prior Central I-15 Corridor Transportation Study. This has evolved into specific improvement projects in the current RTP. He reviewed several projects that will help relieve congestion and help with goods movement.

Mr. Wilkens noted that there is a growing concern among the large non-Port community that the process seems to be skewing toward those larger ports in the goods movement section to the detriment of the smaller ports. They are working with the San Diego legislative delegation to address this. Congestion management and relief and jobs and job-inducing behavior are side benefits.

Mike Hix, SANDAG, reviewed the 2030 non-RTP goods movement needs, summarized the rest of the 2030 transportation infrastructure needs, and the estimated costs. He said that there is $85 billion in infrastructure needs in the San Diego region. Of that amount, about $49 billion is unfunded.

Rob Rundle, SANDAG, reviewed the 2030 non-transportation needs including habitat conservation, beach sand replenishment, local infrastructure, and storm water. He noted that SANDAG adopted a regional strategy that identified the need
for beach sand replenishment. Implementing the recommendations in the shoreline preservation strategy would cost $9.3 million per year.

Gail Goldberg, City of San Diego, said that the City is developing a growth strategy. Future development will occur in our older neighborhoods in the central core with transportation corridors available to them. They looked at communities designed as “urbanized.” Each community plan has an infrastructure financing plan and identified funding for the projects. The identified needs city-wide is about $4 billion. Identified revenue sources are about $1 billion. However, she noted that these plans are old and this figure could be more than just the $3 billion difference.

Chandra Wallar, County of San Diego, stated that the storm water runoff in San Diego County is a very important component. Storm water quality is greatly impacted by existing and proposed roadways. Investing in shoreline and open space improvements can help. Water supplies and the cost of treating water are greatly benefited by storm water improvements. Improperly maintained storm water systems can impact water quality. User fees, gas tax, and private development provide revenue. Funding to complete certain improvements has not been identified, and overall funding is severely limited. Plans exist to improve these systems. She encouraged the Board to consider how storm water management and water quality can fit into the plan.

Kathy Keehan, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, stated that the Governor has earmarked funds for bicycle programs, and she asked for assistance in obtaining those funds.

5. INTERACTIVE POLLING EXERCISE ON INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITIES (DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Chair Cafagna stated that the following city managers were in attendance to help with this effort: Kathi Henry from El Cajon, Rick Gittings from San Marcos, Gary Brown from Imperial Beach, and Steve Jepsen from Oceanside.

Garry Bonelli, Communications Director (SANDAG), indicated that the information garnered by this interactive activity will be discussed at the SANDAG Board Retreat in February. This effort is an attempt to gauge where you might be collectively on the issue of infrastructure priorities. He introduced Chuck Anders, who would be assisting in this polling exercise. Following are the questions polled and the preliminary responses.

1. Several major infrastructure categories have been identified for possible inclusion in statewide infrastructure funding measures. Evaluate the relative importance of each category in paired comparisons.

   Response: Local Infrastructure (80.1 percent), Regional Transportation Facilities (70.5 percent), Education (52.6 percent), Housing (52.0 percent), Storm Water Management (40.1 percent), Habitat Preservation (27.7 percent), and Beach Sand Replenishment (24.8 percent).
2. Should the allocation of statewide funds be primarily formula-based or project-specific?

Response: Project Specific (57 percent) and Formula Based (43 percent).

3. There should be a match component to any statewide infrastructure funding measure.

Response: Strongly Agree (36 percent), Somewhat Agree (43 percent), Somewhat Disagree (11 percent), Strongly Disagree (11 percent), and Don’t Know/No Opinion (0 percent).

4. If there were a match component, what should the split be? 50 state/50 other match, 80 state/20 other match, or other.

Response: 50 State/50 Other (14 percent), 80 State/20 Other (79 percent), and Other (7 percent).

5. Funding for goods movement is included in several of the statewide proposals. If you had $100 to spend on improving goods movement in the region, how much would go toward each of the following categories?

Response: Multimodal Transportation Corridors that Support Goods Movement ($34), Rail Improvements and Intermodal Yards that Support Goods Movement ($24), Sea Port Facilities and Access ($22), and Land Port/Border-Related Facilities and Access ($20).

6. If you had $100 to spend on transportation, how much would go to add capacity, and how much would go to maintain our existing infrastructure?

Response: Add Capacity ($50) or Maintain Existing Infrastructure ($46). (Totals do not add up to $100 because some respondents did not fully distribute their $100 allocation.)

7. How important is it to ensure that funding for transit rehabilitation/restoration/replacement needs area is included in the statewide infrastructure proposals?

Response: Very Important (79 percent), Somewhat Important (14 percent), Not Very Important (7 percent), and Don’t Know/No Opinion (0 percent).

8. Beyond transportation, if you had another $100 to spend on other regional and local infrastructure improvements, how much would go to each of the following areas?

Response: Local Infrastructure ($36), Housing ($15), Storm Water Management ($14), Education ($13), Habitat Preservation ($12), Beach Sand Replenishment ($8), and Other ($0). (Totals do not add up to $100 because some respondents did not fully distribute their $100 allocation.)
9. How important is it to constitutionally protect Proposition 42 transportation revenues (funded by the existing sales tax on gasoline)?

Response: Very Important (96 percent), Somewhat Important (0 percent), Not Very Important (4 percent), and Don’t Know/No Opinion (0 percent).

Chair Cafagna called a five-minute break and reconvened the meeting into open session at 12:01 p.m.

6. NEXT STEPS

Mr. Gallegos asked if this kind of interactive method is something that we should use at the Board retreat. We will receive a full report on the analysis next week. On February 10, we are recommending that our legislative delegation be invited to attend our SANDAG Policy Board meeting. One of things we learned in Sacramento is that there is a conflict for a morning meeting; however, most of the legislators could attend if the meeting were held in the afternoon. He asked for the Board’s approval to move the February 10, 2006, Policy Board meeting to the afternoon. The Board agreed with this suggestion.

Vice Mayor Pia Harris-Ebert (San Marcos) asked what time this meeting would be in the afternoon. Mr. Gallegos replied that it would start at 1:30 p.m.

Vice Mayor Morrison suggested that the Executive Committee meeting be changed from 8 a.m. to 12 noon that day, if the Policy Board meeting is changed to the afternoon.

Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (Escondido) noted that members of our legislative delegation were impressed that we were working on this issue early on.

Mayor Madrid said that he and Councilmember Madaffer would be attending a League of California Cities (LCC) meeting that afternoon, but they could arrive late to the LCC meeting.

Mr. Gallegos said we know that Assemblymember Shirley Horton has a conflict with this date. However, she is interested in participating. He suggested that if we can get the remaining members of our state delegation to an afternoon meeting on February 10, then we would brief Assemblymember Horton separately.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that we should only make this time change if we get a commitment that the majority of San Diego legislators can attend.

Chair Cafagna agreed with that comment.

Councilmember Jack Dale (Santee) expressed concern that the infrastructure bonding proposal is not certain. Mr. Gallegos agreed and stated that it’s really important that we have specific projects to include in the Legislature’s proposal. We need to communicate that with our legislative delegation when we meet with them on February 10, and work with Sacramento to get our infrastructure needs into the bill language.
Councilmember Kellejian cautioned that, similar to Proposition A, we cannot be advocates for this bond measure, we can only provide information to educate the public.

Vice Mayor Morrison agreed that it is important for us to come up with a game plan and present it to our legislative delegation. It also is important to this region that our legislative delegation present a united front for the San Diego region.

Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego) stated that the state has to have our vote to pass the bond issue. He said that we need to be project specific in order to gain support.

Rick Gittings, San Marcos City Manager, echoed the Board’s comments about being project specific and having a regional focus. One thing to note is that in the ASCE Report Card there were two areas with significantly lower grades: local streets and roads, and storm water management.

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next regular Board of Directors Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 27, 2006.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:13 p.m.
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