



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
NOVEMBER 17, 2006**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 06-11-1A  
ACTION REQUESTED - APPROVE**

---

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS  
OCTOBER 13, 2006**

First Vice Chair Mary Sessom (Lemon Grove) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:19 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached. First Vice Chair Sessom announced that the next meeting will be quite lengthy and for Board members and Alternates to plan on a meeting that will last until 1 p.m.

**1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS**

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, asked about transit serving a new stadium location. He wondered if the Chargers will reimburse the taxpayers for the Qualcomm site. He would like to think that San Diego Mayor Sanders and the County Board of Supervisors can get the Qualcomm site to work again.

Don Stillwell, a member of the public, said there is a transit operational problem that needs action. We have a bus route and a trolley that parallel each other through Mission Valley, and the bus leaves Fashion Valley before the trolley gets to that station, requiring a 30-minute wait. The Metropolitan Transit System Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) modified bus routes, but it did not correct this deficiency. It is extremely important that the bus-to-trolley connections allow passengers to get to their destinations in a timely fashion.

Jim Schmidt, a member of the public, distributed a Forbes magazine article to the Board entitled, "The 400 Richest People in America," and an opinion article he wrote, titled "Wal-Mart Supercenter plan is a very real concern." He stated that four out of the top ten richest people in America are Walton family members, owners of Wal-Mart stores. On a recent trip to his hometown of Kewanee, Illinois, he saw the results of a Wal-Mart in that area on the businesses in the town. Many of them had closed their doors because they couldn't compete with the Wal-Mart. He said he is in favor of free enterprise, but not when it hurts small businesses and closes stores down.

First Vice Chair Sessom acknowledged and welcomed two new faces around the dais: Councilmember Frank Tierney (Coronado) and Councilmember Don Higginson (Poway).

**REPORTS (2 through 4)**

First Vice Chair Sessom noted that the order of the agenda reports would be switched, and No. 3 would be heard first.

3. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA AND REGIONAL TRANSIT CAPITAL AND REHABILITATION CRITERIA (DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Mike Hix, Principal Transportation Planner, stated that this is the third policy meeting regarding the 2007 update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The first meeting reaffirmed the goals of the RTP, and the second meeting discussed the Goods Movement Action Plan. This meeting will discuss the evaluation criteria and regional transit capital and rehabilitation criteria to objectively rank projects. The prioritized list of projects will help determine the allocation of projected funds through 2030 and how to provide additional transportation projects beyond our normal funding level.

As part of the 2030 RTP, MOBILITY 2030, SANDAG adopted a more aggressive funding scenario than the federally required Revenue Constrained Plan. This was called the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. He noted that the gap between revenues and costs has grown. The discussion today will focus on potential revenue sources. He introduced staff members Rachel Kennedy and Kim York to assist with this presentation.

Ms. Kennedy, Associate Transportation Planner, stated that there would be three categories for project prioritization in the 2007 RTP: transit service projects, highway projects, and rail grade separation projects. There are also criteria for the regional ranking for transit capital and rehabilitation projects. The project evaluation criteria will be used to rank transportation projects within the individual categories for inclusion in the RTP. She noted that an ad hoc working group known as the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Working Group (TPEC) was formed in December 2005, and reviewed the groups represented on TPEC. The criteria modal categories are transit service, highway, freeway connectors, high occupancy vehicle (HOV) connectors, and rail grade separations.

She reviewed the milestones for this process. This process will emphasize the following RTP goals: to strengthen the connection between land use and transportation, create criteria to be used in multiple project categories, eliminate duplicative criteria, and create a standardized 100-point scoring system. She reviewed the critical goal areas and weighting for each category.

Mayor Crystal Crawford (Del Mar) questioned the combining of habitat and residential factors. She said that combining them may lessen the overall importance of the criteria if overall fewer points are allotted to that category. She stated that this issue was raised by members of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) and asked how staff had responded to the comments of the SWG. Ms. Kennedy responded that staff modified the point system so that points are individually allotted for habitat and residential impacts.

Mayor Art Madrid (La Mesa) expressed concern with the points given in the rail grade separation criteria to "Benefits to Emergency Services." He recommended a higher weighting for this criterion. The City of La Mesa has five at-grade trolley crossings that can create huge traffic backups. He asked what kind of data was reviewed to arrive at the recommended weighting. Mr. Hix replied that a study was done by a separate committee about a year ago. He didn't have a direct answer about the methodology used to arrive at the recommended weighting of the Benefits to Emergency Services criterion.

Mayor Madrid said that ensuring that we have the least amount of delay at at-grade rail crossings should be recognized as a positive benefit for our communities.

Councilmember Madaffer (City of San Diego) asked what constitutes a high crash rate area and whether it is attributable to roadway condition or to driver behavior and lack of enforcement. Ms. Kennedy answered that this criterion is based on data from the state on accidents. Points are only given for highways that have a higher than normal accident rate. Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, noted that we rely on data that is provided by the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and Caltrans; however, we could go back and add some additional definition.

Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego) commented that there has been a significant increase in the number of deaths from car accidents on Highway 76 since casinos were opened along that area. He supported including the criterion that recognizes highway safety needs.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director, stated that they have data on the severity and the types of car accidents, and they will provide that information.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that the accident rate may be due to driver behavior rather than the design of the road facility, and that driver behavior should not be taken into consideration when evaluating highway project needs.

Councilmember Joe Kellejian (Solana Beach) commented that there is a grade separation at Lomas Santa Fe Avenue so that emergency services can get to the 2,400 Solana Beach residents who live west of the Solana Beach train station. He supported including the rail grade separation criterion for the Benefit to Emergency Services and recommended that staff consider whether it should be weighted higher. Mr. Gallegos noted that Item 8 on page 23 of the staff report discusses how points would be assigned for this criterion.

Councilmember Kellejian expressed concern about the wait time. Mr. Gallegos asked if he was advocating a higher number of points for that criterion. Councilmember Kellejian said that 3 percent is not enough for the Benefit to Emergency Services criterion.

Mr. Gallegos said that if you increase the points for one criterion, you'll need to subtract points from another to keep the total at 100 points.

Councilmember Kellejian pointed out that the problem is that the situation may be different in various jurisdictions.

Mayor Madrid agreed that this issue will differ with each community. La Mesa has five major at-grade rail crossings in the heart of the city. Emergency vehicles can preempt the traffic signal, but if there's a problem with trolley operations and the trains block the street crossings, then that can block access to emergency vehicles. The criterion weight should consider the impact on each jurisdiction and what is fair to everyone.

Councilmember Madaffer suggested that staff review the Funding Requests criterion listed on page 32 and consider giving it less than a 15 percent weight in order to increase the weight of the Benefit to Emergency Services criterion.

Mayor Crawford asked for more information about the high accident rate factor. She wondered if it is based on statewide crash rates for a similar facility. Mr. Orso-Delgado responded that we use the data from the state for similar facilities.

Mayor Crawford said that if we are trying to award money for infrastructure we should give more points to projects that correct potential design deficiencies rather than driver behavior. Mr. Orso-Delgado said that the data indicate whether traffic accidents are related to driver error or weather conditions and compares the accidents to ones that occur on a similar facility in other areas.

Mayor Crawford said that we should ensure that funding is provided for needed capital facilities and not to change driver behavior.

Mayor Crawford thought that perhaps there should be more discussion on how to divvy up the percentages among the various criteria. She wasn't sure how to consider the unique conditions in each jurisdiction, and suggested that we look at where certain criteria overlap.

Harry Mathis, Chairman, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), said that it seemed to him that certain grade separation considerations should be factored into the design of the project. It is desirable to have a point system to evaluate the relative ranking among individual projects.

Mr. Gallegos explained that there currently is a backlog of rail grade separation projects. These criteria would help guide the investments and deal with that backlog.

Mayor Christy Guerin (Encinitas) commented that what worries her is the extreme competition for the rail grade separation money. She noted that when the SPRINTER begins service, the four jurisdictions along the SPRINTER line also will be requesting grade separations. She said that we have to have criteria to prioritize grade separation projects today and stick to those criteria.

Councilmember Jerome Stocks, Chairman, North County Transit District (NCTD), agreed with Mayor Guerin on the grade separation criteria. He also agreed that emergency services should have a higher weight than whether bus services are affected. He also stated that Noise Reduction is an appropriate criterion, and that its weighting should not be reduced. He asked for more information on the Funding Request criterion.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (Chula Vista) noted that there are 57 stations in the MTS system, and most are not grade separated. Over the years, MTS has developed criteria for grade separations. One of the mechanisms has been the amount of delay when the crossing gates are down, causing backups into the communities. He asked staff to look at the MTS rail grade separation criteria as a source document.

Councilmember Kellejian agreed that wait time is one of the reasons to develop criteria that will be a standard for projects in the region. He noted that page 23 indicates the number of ADTs (average daily traffic counts) and the delay factor. All of that is in the criteria. The Funding Request criterion gives more points to projects that have local funding support. If a jurisdiction contributes money to a project, it leverages the federal and state money.

Councilmember Stocks pointed out that at every traffic intersection, a certain amount of delay is caused by traffic signals.

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, explained that the working group that developed these criteria included staff members from various jurisdictions. We could bring in a couple of the working group staff members to discuss the thought process in developing these criteria.

Councilmember Stocks suggested that the Funding Request table be indexed to inflation or construction costs.

Vice Mayor Morrison (National City) stated that we need to have criteria to be able to distinguish between projects. National City has three freeways and several rail modes operating through it. The recommended rail grade separation criteria are a good start. He noted that there is not a large pot of money for these kinds of projects.

Supervisor Horn suggested that local jurisdictions put emergency services on both sides of the tracks.

With regard to the highway corridor criteria for goods movement, Mr. Orso-Delgado asked whether HOV and Managed Lane facilities received points for serving goods movement. Mr. Hix said that SANDAG hasn't yet done the studies to see if we can use the Managed Lanes system for trucks. It might be premature to award points for goods movement for Managed Lanes projects.

Councilmember Judy Ritter (Vista) stated that Vista has two east-west corridors and a local sales tax measure on the ballot. She noted that Vista is not meeting its standard response time for providing emergency services. She thought more weight should be given for the Benefit to Emergency Services criterion.

Councilmember Rindone said that Chula Vista has intersections where there is gridlock for 1½ to 2 hours a day. Those are candidate projects that will rise to the top of the regional rail grade separation list.

Councilmember McCoy (Imperial Beach) commented that this process is reviewed with every RTP update. She was comfortable with what was being presented but wanted reassurance that the criteria can be readdressed. Mr. Gallegos replied that these are the Board's criteria, and the Board can decide to change them at any time. Mr. Hix added that those decisions can be made when the Board goes to allocate the funds through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

Mr. Leiter agreed that indexing the Funding Request criterion would make sense.

First Vice Chair Sessom reiterated the direction to staff, as part of the motion, to index the Funding Request table on page 32 of the agenda report and to define what constitutes a high crash rate.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Horn and a second by Councilmember McCoy, the SANDAG Board approved the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Project Evaluation Criteria and Regional Transit Capital and Rehabilitation Criteria, including direction to staff to index the Funding Request table on page 32 of the agenda report and to add an explanation of the High Crash Rate criterion. Yes – 15 (weighted vote, 97%). No – 1 (Vista) (weighted vote, 3%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – Carlsbad, Oceanside, and Santee.

## 2. REVENUE SOURCES FOR THE 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (DISCUSSION)

Susan Brown, Manager of Financial Programming and Project Control, provided an overview of the MOBILITY 2030 development and revenue assumptions, changes that have occurred since MOBILITY 2030 was developed, and potential funding sources for the 2007 RTP. There are three funding scenarios in MOBILITY 2030, including the Revenue Constrained Plan (\$30 billion), the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario (\$42 billion), and the Unconstrained Revenue scenario (\$67 billion). She explained the federal, state, private, and local funding sources available in the Revenue Constrained Plan. The funding sources in the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario include the *TransNet* Extension, gas tax increases or equivalent revenue sources, additional Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts funding, a Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) step increase, and federal demonstration project funds.

Ms. Brown reviewed the funding changes that have occurred since MOBILITY 2030 was approved: state revenues fell below the Revenue Constrained Plan levels, there have been unanticipated cost increases, and as a result, additional new revenues are needed to close the projected funding gap between the Revenue Constrained Plan and Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. Since our community has shown a propensity to support additional tolling facilities and local sales taxes, the federal government will allow us to include these revenue sources in the Revenue Constrained Plan; however, if these funding sources do not materialize prior to the next RTP update, individual transportation projects will need to be deleted from the next RTP.

Ms. Brown said that this information was presented to the SWG and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) for review and comments. That input helped us to develop Attachment 2, Summary Table of Additional Revenues for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan.

Ms. Brown stated that the new funding sources were categorized into four types: tolling and other user fee mechanisms, additional sales tax measures, local mechanisms for regional projects, and miscellaneous sources. She reviewed potential funding in each of the four categories. She also presented a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the potential funding sources.

Mr. Hix said that what we would like to do next is to get input from the Board on the types of revenue sources to include in the 2007 RTP.

Councilmember Kellejian asked what percentage sales tax increase was assumed. Ms. Brown responded that the low end of the range assumes a ½-cent increase, and the high end of the range assumes a 1-cent increase.

Mayor Madrid asked about whether funding from the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) program was evaluated. Ms. Brown said that we already receive \$500,000 a year from SAFE for the Freeway Service Patrol program. Mayor Madrid thought that we should ask for more funding, because SAFE has a large reserve fund.

First Vice Chair Sessom noted that there was one request to speak on this item.

David Krogh, a resident of Chula Vista, stated that we are a region with a cumulative transportation infrastructure deficit. He stated that new growth may not be paying for itself. We have a regional plan that talks about transportation financing. He thought a white paper should be added that analyzes the marginal costs of the transportation infrastructure need to support the 300,000 new residences in the region by 2030. He encouraged SANDAG to move forward on transportation financing and on instituting a regional transportation impact fee.

Supervisor Horn asked if the state has paid back all the Proposition 42 money that it had borrowed. Ms. Brown replied that a substantial portion of the funds has been paid back, but that some Proposition 42 loans are still outstanding.

Garry Bonelli, Communications Director, facilitated an interactive session to provide general preferences on the various proposed funding sources for the 2007 RTP.

Question 1: Should the region assume additional revenue sources in the 2007 Revenue Constrained Plan? The result was 47 percent yes and 53 percent no.

Mr. Bonelli asked why someone would indicate a "no" preference for this item.

Councilmember Kellejian said that we don't want to assume funding sources in the Revenue Constrained Plan that may not materialize.

Councilmember Stocks said that he wouldn't want to count his chickens before they hatched.

Mr. Bonelli summarized that the Revenue Constrained Plan should only include those revenues we know will be received.

Mayor Crawford said that one reason to be conservative on this is that costs continue to increase. There are too many variables. If we are conservative and end up having the money that we need, then that's a good thing. If we don't have enough money, we don't get to do the things that we need to do, and people end up very unhappy.

Mayor Madrid asked about the latest poll results for the November infrastructure ballot measures. Mr. Gallegos stated that there are different polls being conducted, and the most optimistic poll indicates an approval rating of 48 percent "yes" to 52 percent "no" for the transportation infrastructure bond measure (Proposition 1B).

Question 2: The Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario for the 2007 RTP should include more than the two toll-financed facilities included in MOBILITY 2030. The result was that 40 percent strongly agreed, 30 percent somewhat agreed, 5 percent somewhat disagreed, and 25 percent strongly disagreed with this statement.

Mr. Gallegos provided some examples of where this might work. State Route 11 (SR 11) to the new border crossing at East Otay Mesa, expanding Interstate 5 (I-5) north of Oceanside, and expanding I-15 north of Escondido to the county line are three examples of big investments, which are not yet funded.

Mr. Bonelli asked Supervisor Horn about why someone would support more toll roads in the region. Supervisor Horn proposed a third freeway behind Poway, and stated that it should be a toll road.

Councilmember Stocks commented that even the federal government is warming to the idea and understanding that alternatives are needed for the gas tax and the Highway Trust Fund. Costs have escalated, and the federal government has recognized that in order to complete projects and meaningfully improve traffic congestion, some sort of toll funding is needed in the future.

Councilmember Kellejian said he was reading in the report that the federal government has stated that we could include toll-funded projects in our Revenue Constrained Plan. They have never done that before. As long as the funds become a reality, there shouldn't be a problem. However, if the funds do not become a reality, then you have to take it back out of the next RTP update. Ms. Brown added that that is the difference between the Revenue Constrained Plan and the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario.

The Board just indicated that it did not support including potential toll-funded projects in the Revenue Constrained Plan, but including them in the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario is appropriate. Mr. Hix added that it is your vision of where you want to go and what you think can be achieved.

Councilmember Madaffer supported the issue of using tolls to finance goods movement infrastructure, such as the third border crossing and SR 11. Those are areas where we have opportunities to use toll revenue to provide facilities that are not a burden on existing users and that are paid for by users of the new facilities. It's a smart way to look at things.

Question 3: The Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario should include revenues from goods movement user fees. **The result was that 65 percent strongly agreed, 20 percent somewhat agreed, 5 percent somewhat disagreed, and 10 percent strongly disagreed.**

Councilmember Kellejian asked if there are other areas in California that charge fees for goods movement facilities. Ms. Brown answered that many areas are considering such projects, but that she wasn't aware of any new highway facilities charging a specific goods movement fee. Mr. Hix said the whole state is going in that direction, but there aren't any dedicated truck lanes now.

Mayor Crawford stated that Texas has the border crossings that are funded by tolls. Mr. Orso-Delgado added that, in Texas, it is the bridges that are funded by tolls, but they also are working on the Trans-Texas Corridor, which includes dedicated toll facilities specifically for goods movement.

Mr. Mathis said that goods movement fees are a tariff that will be ultimately passed on to the consumer.

Mayor Crawford said that it might actually reduce costs to the consumer if travel timesavings can be provided. She noted that travelers already incur costs resulting from lengthy delays at the border. We have the data from the economic analysis that looks at the loss and the cost to our economy from the lengthy border delays.

Mr. Mathis expressed support for goods movement fees if the revenues could be applied to particular projects and not just included in the overall mix of transportation revenue sources.

Mr. Orso-Delgado re-emphasized Mayor Crawford's point. One of the ideas of charging at the border is to use those revenues to provide a premium service that could be an alternative to the existing free crossing. Goods movement logistic experts will probably see that as a benefit and there could be overall time and cost savings to the region.

Mr. Mathis said that as long as the tolls are used to pay for the cost of the related facility and service, then it's a good idea.

Councilmember Stocks asked if it is reasonable for the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario to include revenues that do not currently exist. He asked if it is reasonable to add that number to this plan.

Mayor Crawford said that the border economic study indicated support from the logistics industry for premium border crossing facilities. If we had such a facility in place, the industry would be willing to pay. She said that staff could provide more information on this particular subject.

Mr. Bonelli summarized the polling results and indicated that staff would further explore this possibility.

Supervisor Horn agreed that staff should look at this, especially if the funds were dedicated for a specific purpose rather than for general revenue purposes.

Question 4: The Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario should include revenues from parking fees at transit facilities. **The result was that 26 percent strongly agreed, 16 percent somewhat agreed, 11 percent somewhat disagreed, 42 percent strongly disagreed, and 5 percent had no opinion.**

Supervisor Horn asked for an example of how parking fees would be charged at transit facilities. Ms. Brown said a fee of \$2 to \$4 was assumed. Mr. Gallegos added that the fee level also could be varied based on the time of day.

Councilmember Kellejian pointed out that there is a parking structure at the train station in San Juan Capistrano, and the fee charged is in about that same range.

Mr. Bonelli asked Councilmember Higginson why someone would strongly disagree with this. Councilmember Higginson replied that for folks that use transit this is an additional financial burden.

Mr. Mathis said there is a rather high administrative cost associated with collecting fees, so you'd need to set the fee at a certain point to offset the cost of collection. When you are dealing with choice riders, charging a parking fee may make them decide to stay in their cars.

Mayor Crawford said that when this item was discussed at SWG, there was a division. There were several people concerned about the potential negative effects on transit ridership and the additional cost burden to groups, like seniors, who use transit. Certain SWG members felt that if we start charging for parking at transit stations, it might affect access to transit. Other SWG members were in favor of this and thought it would encourage carpooling to transit stations and would reduce the subsidies that the general public is paying to provide parking at transit stations.

Councilmember Kellejian said that another issue to consider is when you have intercity rail like Amtrak; there are long-term parkers. An Amtrak rider is different than a COASTER rider, who usually is a daily commuter.

Councilmember Madaffer said he voted to support this, and he understands the cost to collect a fee, but in this day and age there's modernized technology like smart cards and transponders that can minimize the cost of fee collection. The cost to build parking structures is astronomical. He agreed that we don't want to create a disincentive to using transit, but there has to be a happy medium that we have to look at. What this vote really says is that it depends on the circumstances. This is a policy call that will have to be looked at on an individual basis. What might make sense at the Solana Beach train station (with COASTER and Amtrak passengers) may not make sense at the Grantville Trolley Station. The parking lot at the Grantville Trolley Station is packed every day because smart students have figured out that they can park for free at the trolley station and they don't have to pay San Diego State University (SDSU) parking fees. SDSU students can easily use all of those parking spaces at that trolley station, so perhaps we need to charge a fee there.

Councilmember Ritter said that not being able to find a parking spot also can be a disincentive to ride the COASTER.

Mayor Guerin thought that perhaps having a parking sticker for transit users at COASTER stations could help monitor who is using that parking lot.

Mr. Bonelli summarized that staff should look at a range of options related to this topic.

Question 5: The Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario should include local government revenues from rental car taxes to fund regional transportation facilities. **The result was 47 percent strongly agreed, 18 percent somewhat agreed, 6 percent somewhat disagreed, 24 percent strongly disagreed, and 6 percent had no opinion.**

Mr. Bonelli asked Vice Mayor Morrison why someone would disagree with this. Vice Mayor Morrison said someone may disagree because a rental car tax may be "anti-tourism;" rental car users have a certain demand on transportation facilities and should be paying part of their costs.

Question 6: Rank your support for the following local mechanisms to fund regional transportation facilities: a. Development Impact Fees, b. Tax Increment Financing, c. Benefit Assessment Districts, d. Parking Assessment Districts, and e. Real Estate Transfer Taxes. **The result was in the following order with the weighted averages shown in parentheses: Parking Assessment Districts (8.06), Tax Increment Financing (8.00), Benefit Assessment Districts (7.88), Development Impact Fees (6.94), and Real Estate Transfer Taxes (6.44).**

Question 7: Given the results of the previous question, the region should assume funding for regional transportation facilities from Parking Assessment Districts. **The result was 46 percent yes and 54 percent no.**

Mr. Hix stated that he was confused by these results. The number one ranked local mechanism from the previous question was not supported by the majority of respondents.

Mr. Gallegos stated that staff will review the priorities from the previous questions and determine how to make them work.

Question 8: The region should assume additional revenues through increased or indexed gas taxes. **The result was 19 percent strongly agreed, 31 percent somewhat agreed, 13 percent somewhat disagreed, 31 percent strongly disagreed, and 6 percent had no opinion.**

Question 9: The region should pursue additional mechanisms to increase transportation demand management (TDM) contributions. **The result was 65 percent strongly agreed and 35 percent somewhat agreed.**

Question 10: The region should assume additional revenues from joint development agreements. **The result was 44 percent strongly agreed, 38 percent somewhat agreed, 13 percent strongly disagreed, and 6 percent had no opinion.**

Question 11: The region should assume additional revenues for transportation-related air quality improvement projects and programs by increasing the vehicle license fee from the existing \$2 level. **The result was 18 percent – No-remain at \$2; 12 percent – Yes-increase to \$3; 29 percent – Yes-Increase to \$4; 18 percent – Yes-increase to \$5; and 24 percent – Yes-increase to \$6.**

Mr. Bonelli summarized and gave direction to staff to work with the San Diego County Board of Supervisors sitting as the Air Pollution Control Board on this matter.

Action: This item was presented for Information only.

4. REPORT ON PROCESS FOR ADDRESSING IMPACTS OF MAJOR PROJECTS AND PLANS ON THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM (DISCUSSION)

Rob Rundle, Principal Planner, reviewed existing SANDAG policy that supports the idea of reviewing major development projects and plans in relation to impacts on the regional transportation system. The Board's direction lies within existing SANDAG plans and policies including the RTP, Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and the Congestion Management Program (CMP). He said that the purpose of the CMP is to monitor transportation system performance, integrate transportation and land use planning, and develop short-range programs to better manage congestion. In addition to the SANDAG plans and policies, Caltrans is directed to work with local jurisdictions throughout their land use planning and decision-making processes consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Caltrans seeks to reduce vehicle trips associated with proposed new local development and recommends appropriate mitigation measures for dealing with the remaining transportation impacts of such development. SANDAG and Caltrans work together to evaluate proposed projects, and provide coordinated comments to local jurisdictions and agencies regarding their projects.

Mr. Rundle said that the first step in the CMP Enhanced CEQA Review process is to determine whether a proposed project requires review. He reviewed the guidelines for proposed new developments and provided examples of large development projects that meet the minimum CMP definition. He added that the guidelines apply to community plan and specific plans if those plans affect existing CMP-deficient roadway segments or the feasibility of completing

transit and rail improvements identified in the RTP. Mr. Rundle said that SANDAG is currently working on three projects and providing comments: Airport Authority Master Plan to 2015, the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) Downtown Community Plan update, and the Jamul Indian Casino Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for potential impacts to rural SR 94.

Action: This item was presented for Information only.

5. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Business meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for Friday, October 27, 2006, at 9 a.m. First Vice Chair Sessom announced that this next meeting will most likely last until 1 p.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:49 a.m.

DGunn/M/DGU

**ATTENDANCE  
 SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING  
 OCTOBER 13, 2006**

JURISDICTION/ ORGANIZATION	NAME	ATTENDING
City of Carlsbad	Matt Hall (Member)	No
City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone (Alternate)	Yes
City of Coronado	Frank Tierney (Alternate)	Yes
City of Del Mar	Crystal Crawford (Member)	Yes
City of El Cajon	Mark Lewis (Member)	Yes
City of Encinitas	Christy Guerin (Member)	Yes
City of Escondido	Lori Holt Pfeiler (Member)	Yes
City of Imperial Beach	Patricia McCoy (Member)	Yes
City of La Mesa	Art Madrid (Member)	Yes
City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom, Vice Chair (Member)	Yes
City of National City	Ron Morrison (Member)	Yes
City of Oceanside	Shari Mackin (Member)	No
City of Poway	Don Higginson (1st Alternate)	Yes
City of San Diego - A	Jerry Sanders (Member A)	No
City of San Diego - B	Jim Madaffer (Member B)	Yes
City of San Marcos	Pia Harris-Ebert (Member)	Yes
City of Santee	Jack Dale (Member)	No
City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Member)	Yes
City of Vista	Judy Ritter (Member)	Yes
County of San Diego	Bill Horn (Member)	Yes
Caltrans	Pedro Orso-Delgado (Alternate)	Yes
MTS	Harry Mathis (Member)	Yes
NCTD	Jerome Stocks (Member)	Yes
Imperial County	Victor Carrillo (Member)	No
US Dept. of Defense	CAPT Michael Giorgione (Member)	No
SD Unified Port District	Vacant	No
SD County Water Authority	Marilyn Dailey (Member)	Yes
Baja California/Mexico	Luis Cabrera Cuaron (Member)	No