TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF AUGUST 4, 2006

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 10:22 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF JULY 21, 2006, MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the July 21, 2006, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Don Stilwell, a resident of San Diego, distributed a map to the Transportation Committee members for its review. He expressed his concern regarding the #13 bus that is scheduled to be discontinued on September 5, 2006. The people that ride that bus in Grantville will then have to walk around the corner to catch the #14 bus up the hill. His problem is that for the past nine years, there were two #13 buses per hour going to Allied Gardens, which served the community very well. What’s being proposed is that there will be four buses per hour to Kaiser Hospital running every 15 minutes, and there will be two #14 buses running every 30 minutes to Allied Gardens. The problem is that with the #14 bus not having a stop at Grantville, people will be forced to take the #13 bus. He brought this to the Transportation Committee’s attention because having six buses per hour going to Grantville is not practical. He suggested that there be two buses per hour on the #13 bus and two buses per hour on the #14 bus. This would provide twice the amount of service that has been in place over the last nine years. By putting the #14 bus into Grantville, there would be an opportunity for bus riders to go to both Allied Gardens and to the Fashion/Mission Valley areas. He expressed concern that as of September 5, 2006, there will not be anyone to assist moving the children up the hill and to see the traffic congestion. He commented that he will continue to come to the Committee meetings to raise this issue.

REPORT (3)

3. OVERVIEW OF THE DRAFT REGIONAL GOODS MOVEMENT ACTION PLAN (DISCUSSION)

Michael Hix, Principal Planner, provided the Transportation Committee with an overview of the Draft Regional Goods Movement Action Plan. Approximately one year ago, SANDAG began work to develop a regional intermodal freight strategy as a major input to the 2007 Regional
Transportation Plan (RTP). Then, with the proposed statewide infrastructure bond coming up in November 2006, the long-range approach needed a more immediate action plan of near-term projects that could qualify for these funds. Today’s overview of the work that has been done to date regarding goods movement planning will set the stage for a more detailed discussion at the SANDAG Board’s Policy Meeting on September 8, 2006.

Global trade has triggered the more recent focus on goods movement planning. It has grown exponentially in the last decade. There has been a shift to a global economy; a shift in trade flows, with trade coming at the region instead of across the Pacific Ocean in the other direction; and an emergence of new gateways trying to handle the unprecedented growth in international trade. Together with the size of the growth and the direction of the trade flows, the freight systems have been strained and the Ports and the networks cannot provide infrastructure fast enough. The growth is expected to continue, especially in Southern California where it’s projected to increase over 400 percent on top of the doubling that occurred in the last decade. Given San Diego’s close proximity to Los Angeles and the plans for a major port in Baja California, the region cannot escape the potential impacts nor ignore the opportunities that global trade offers.

There has been a growing recognition of the trends at the national level—first reflected back in the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and strengthened in Safe, Effective, Transportation Efficiency Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) legislation. The vision is to build a freight system that ensures the efficient and reliable secure movement of goods and supports the nation’s economic growth while improving environmental quality. Added to that, there is language in SAFETEA-LU that requires all Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) such as SANDAG to more thoroughly address goods movement planning in their Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs).

Last summer, staff formed a Freight Working Group and invited the owners of various systems from the airport, border, maritime, pipelines, rail, and highway systems to participate. This Working Group proceeded to tackle three main tasks: (1) identify the needs of each freight system; (2) identify how these different freight systems can work together; and (3) identify how to integrate our freight systems with the rest of the region, the state, and the nation. The approach of the Freight Working Group was to document existing freight systems and operations; evaluate where the gaps are, where the integration requirements are, and opportunities; identify improvements and concepts to add more capacity; evaluate the connectivity with Southern California and Baja California; and prepare a draft Regional Freight Intermodal Strategy for input to the 2007 RTP.

Data on goals and needs in the freight world are pretty hard to come by, however, the Freight Working Group did find enough evidence that San Diego mirrors what is happening elsewhere. We were surprised and unprepared like everyone else, but since freight has not been a key focus in the region, San Diego was already behind the curve in providing infrastructure for goods movement activities. The region lacks a defined role in trade, as well as a strategy to move forward, costing the region potential economic opportunities. Regardless of the changes in global trends, the healthy and growing economy in San Diego is already putting an increasing strain on our roads and railways. Binational and international trade are expanding the problems faced by freight infrastructure. Bottlenecks cause delays at the air, land, and sea ports; business is impacted; and the expansion of the freight system to meet demand often creates land use conflicts in constrained areas.

The regional role in freight needs to be defined. Mr. Hix asked several questions. What role does the San Diego region want to play in global trade, given what is happening here on the
West Coast? In terms of infrastructure, do we want to ignore it, try to accommodate it, or expand the system to capture some of the global market? What are the opportunities, costs, and impacts of different approaches? What work does staff need to do so the elected officials can make an informed decision to set the future course for freight strategy here in the San Diego region? What can be done in the meantime?

The Freight Working Group has developed a draft Goods Movement Action Plan. It sets a baseline strategy until the region’s role can be defined; it provides reasonable expansion of the region’s freight capacity; it is based on incremental improvements to meet existing and forecasted needs; and it includes concepts and thoughts for long-term capacity. The Freight Working Group has looked at the needs and broken them out into four scenarios that build on each other. The first three scenarios are near-term and address needs through 2030 by adding increasing levels of capacity improvement. They are: Business Level I, Business Level II, and Business Level III. The long-term scenario includes concepts for capacity needs beyond 2030, assuming that some trade growth continues at the present pace and is summarized in the staff report. Areas that demand the most attention are the border crossing, Port of San Diego terminal capacity, and rail. Other needs identified include Air Cargo, Border Crossing, Maritime Pipeline, and Rail and Truck way. It should be pointed out that these scenarios only address the existing freight demand that are on our doorstep and are assumed to continue beyond 2030. Until the region’s desired role as a global gateway is studied and decided, these scenarios do not add additional capacity to serve new markets or to capture new trade.

The Goods Movement Action Plan schedule includes bringing this issue to a SANDAG Board Policy Meeting. The Plan would include a project list, project evaluation criteria, and policy questions. In November 2006, the Board will be asked to adopt the Goods Movement Action Plan; in December 2006, all of the input will be needed for the RTP; in May 2007, the draft RTP will be distributed; and action to adopt the final RTP will be considered at the November 2007 Board meeting.

Chairman Kellejian thanked the Freight Working Group for its input. He added that he was glad to see staff is trying to move goods movement from truck cargo to rail. There has been discussion about the north/south capacity and the ability to put in another rail line to diminish truck capacity on the roads. He mentioned that he and the SANDAG Executive Director have discussed this issue with Senator Perata as well as the Board having this discussion at the retreat. He noted that nothing is cast in stone, and this is just a recommendation from the Working Group. Mr. Hix indicated that there is a need to think of other ways to move freight, and if the present rate of growth continues, the north/south capacity for trucks and rail will not serve the region past 2030.

Chairman Kellejian stated that another rail line would take cargo coming out of Mexico from truck on to rail and will free up the freeway system for more automobiles rather than truck traffic, specifically on Interstate 5 (I-5) and I-15, which are the only two north/south accesses in the county. Mr. Hix agreed and mentioned that there are industries such as Toyota in Baja California that would prefer to use rail rather than trucks to ship their products. There are opportunities and the demand is out there.

Councilmember Kellejian commented that with regard to another rail alignment, the region already has the right-of-way up on State Route (SR) 125 to SR 52 to I-15 to Riverside County. He asked if staff is looking at tunneling or elevation in the I-15 corridor, where the region has now run out of room and access. Mr. Hix indicated those options have not yet been investigated.
Public Comment:

Patti Krebs, representing the Industrial Environmental Association and the Working Waterfront Group, stated that she has a number of member companies that operate out of the Ports of San Diego, Los Angeles, and Long Beach, and she offered their strong and enthusiastic support for the Regional Goods Action Plan. She also congratulated SANDAG for taking on this early action role to address both the immediate problems as well as the long-term future. She added that she has been a part of the Governor’s Statewide Goods Movement Action Plan Work Group and said that this plan will help to address the problems and relieve truck traffic. She urged the Transportation Committee to move this item forward at this time.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (MTS) stated for the record that there is a critical working relationship between the San Diego Port District and the City of Chula Vista regarding different rail lines options. He wanted to be sure that the Transportation Committee, as well as the staff, recognize the intensity of the situation in which they will be working to come up with some proposals. They will be looking at the San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) Railway, which may ultimately be a preferable option. The Committee should note that this is a controversial and critical issue and all of the options should be considered and carefully examined.

Mayor Mary Teresa Sessom (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority) questioned slide #8 regarding the Air Cargo Needs, stating that the currently adopted Airport Master Plan is not designed to accommodate anything past 2017. She expressed her curiosity about the report indicating near-term priorities that are being developed to meet 2030 demands. John Duve, Associate Regional Planner, replied that the 2030 date is simply to indicate that the existing airport will most likely be in place until that time, even though the planning has primarily addressed the 2015 time frame.

Mayor Sessom clarified that the current Airport Master Plan does not go past 2015. She asked if under the long-term needs for air cargo, the Working Group was clear that the new airport site selection vote is only advisory, and the Transportation Committee does not have to abide by that advisory vote result.

Councilmember Emery mentioned that this was a good report, and he stated that it is about time we recognized goods movement and using heavy rail. Looking at heavy rail at the border and the possible reinstitution of the Desert Line is important, and he is glad to see it as a major part of this report.

Mayor Art Madrid (East County) asked if consideration has been given for alternative fuel pipeline needs. By 2030, there may be a huge need for storage capacity. He also asked if there is a place where the fuel tanks can be relocated. Mr. Duve stated that the tank farm, which is run by a private entity, is looking at the expansion of its capacity. One way is with the placement of more tanks. They can add tanks either at the existing Mission Valley terminal or potentially at its alternate location in Miramar.

Mayor Madrid asked if there is any way that they can be encouraged to start looking at the potential for alternative fuels by the year 2030. Mr. Duve indicated that they could do that because they deal with products of various types and as long as it is a liquid, they could easily deal with alternate fuels.
Councilmember Madaffer noted that one of the issues that the Committee has discussed is the Carrizo Gorge Railway group, who has received approximately $6 million in private funds and additional federal funding from Congressman Bob Filner to operate the railway into the desert. One issue of concern now is the need for some passing tracks to make the line more efficient. The Railway group would like to have a meeting with SANDAG staff, within the next 60 days, so that it can include its needs on the master list of regional freight projects. The group would like to hopefully see some prioritization and receive some early funding for improvements. Councilmember Madaffer made the motion to accept the staff report to include that additional request.

Councilmember Emery seconded the motion.

Councilmember Druker appreciated the staff report that helped shed some light on some issues that the Transportation Committee needs to address very quickly. Ultimately, the region needs to get freight from the border up to Ontario. The I-15 corridor is a major hub for the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and the rail going east and north. Coastal rail does not get to that area and that is the reason why it isn’t used for freight. If freight is going to be used and San Diego is going to have a strong Port, it is essential to have a link to Ontario to reduce the amount of truck congestion. Without that link, the maquiladoras in Mexico and the Port of Ensenada will eventually send freight by truck to Ontario, because Ontario is where the warehouse distribution area is for all of Southern California.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) asked how staff is going to work with the cities where freight lines are being proposed. He asked if special studies will be done to address those issues. He questioned the second bullet on slide five which doesn’t address how the environmental quality is going to be improved, and he added that staff is misusing the word mitigation. There ought to be additional bullets to explain how the environment is going to be improved. Mr. Hix stated that in some cases, various studies are being conducted on the I-5 corridor that runs through National City, Chula Vista, and down to the border. Not only are there potential freight needs there but there are also freeway needs, and staff wants to look at how to put all of those needs together. Staff will begin to reach out in those communities to bring all the parties involved to the table to discuss more specific details of the project.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, commented that the $3.1 billion piece out of the Proposition 1B measure that’s called, “The California Port Infrastructure Security and Air Quality Improvement,” is highlighting $1 billion for emission reductions. Staff has been working closely with Port of San Diego staff on how to get the Port set up so it can implement “cold ironing,” which would be one way to improve air quality in San Diego to compete for these dollars. Basically, cold ironing would allow the cruise ships to literally plug into the electrical system when they are in Port instead of continuing to burn their diesel engines. Staff will continue to work with the Port of San Diego to look for other opportunities that will allow the region to compete for funding and to find a way to prevent San Diego from becoming like Long Beach or Los Angeles.

Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) stated that this is not just a local issue. He said that there are a whole series of issues that need to be addressed. The San Diego region would be fortunate if it received anywhere close to its proportionate share, which is unlikely because Los Angeles and other places are far ahead of San Diego when it comes to dealing with goods movement in their communities. He mentioned that the slides of what’s happening nationally and internationally paint a good picture, but they are really not very informative in terms of what is going on today in San Diego. The region needs to see realistically what might be coming in at the Port in the future, and what the realistic growth is going to be. He suspects that what the region
will see is the potential growth in shipping at the border, which will be many times greater than what they will see at the Port and at the airport. The region is going to have to deal with that. At some point, the Committee will probably have to take a look at other alternatives. There are a lot of major cities that have put their trains underground. The supply chain needs to be changed and the region needs to come to grips with this issue in San Diego. There is a lot of work that needs to be done and a visionary plan needs to be developed.

Councilmember Kellejian noted that he and Mr. Gallegos met with Senator Perata and the Governor and was told that there was no funding available for goods movement. At least now, this issue has been brought to the forefront and is being discussed.

Mr. Gallegos stated that the State of California has a Goods Movement Action Plan which the California Transportation Commission (CTC) will use to allocate funds if the bonds are passed. Originally, San Diego and the International Border were left out of that plan. He and First Vice Chair Sessom met with Secretary Sunne Wright McPeak and received a commitment from the Secretary that the CTC would work to include San Diego and Imperial County in the Master Plan for the Border that Caltrans will be conducting. This could be the vehicle that would include our region’s goods movement projects in the statewide plan and make them eligible for funding. This action would allow the region to provide input. Currently, most of the focus for the Southern California region has included Los Angeles and Long Beach. He noted that some of the CTC Commissioners visited San Diego last month and met with elected officials from Tijuana to better understand the region’s needs. The strongest candidate for funding and growth is probably the International Border.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Councilmember Emery, the Transportation Committee voted unanimously to accept the staff report and to have a meeting with SANDAG staff and representatives from the Carrizo Gorge Railway, within the next 60 days.

**JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Regional Planning Committee (RPC) Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler convened the Joint Regional Planning and Transportation Committee meeting at 11:12 a.m.

**CONSENT (A)**

A. 2007 COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN WHITE PAPER: ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (INFORMATION)

A number of white papers are being developed for the 2007 Comprehensive Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program is intended to improve the preservation of habitat areas associated with regional transportation projects. The information in this paper will be used in the development of the 2007 RTP.

Action: The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees accepted Consent Item A for information.
Chair Holt Pfeiler introduced this status report on the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program regarding potential additional funding.

Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner, explained that this item included two parts. The first being the recommendation on the $4.3 million in additional funding available for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (PSGIP), and the second part is to provide a brief update on the status of the projects that were previously approved.

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees (RPC/TC) jointly approved $19 million in federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program funds for the PSGIP in September 2005. That action funded 14 out of a list of 33 projects. The projects were ranked based upon the criteria (shown in the matrix in Attachment 1 of the staff report) and the evaluation process developed by the Working Groups and approved by the RPC and TC.

Since then, an additional $4.3 million in TE funds have become available in the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The STIP has two years of funding capacity—FY 2010 and FY 2011. Since the original call for projects included more good projects than were able to be funded, the staff recommendation is to use the original project priority list to fund two additional projects, as well as to fully fund two projects that were partially funded.

The two partially funded projects were the Old Palm Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project (City of Imperial Beach) and the Maple Street Pedestrian Plaza (City of Escondido). The original allocation for the Old Palm Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project was $685,000, and the recommendation is to add $315,000 giving the City the $1 million originally requested. The Maple Street Pedestrian Plaza (City of Escondido) was originally awarded $647,000. This action would add $298,000, for a total of $945,000, as originally requested.

The two new projects recommended for funding are the 25th Street Renaissance Project (City of San Diego) and the Grand Avenue/El Mercado Streetscape Project (City of Escondido). The 25th Street Renaissance Project would receive $1,425,000 to improve a six-block area north of State Route (SR) 94 along 25th Street with traffic calming and streetscape improvements. This commercial area in Golden Hill has high frequency transit service. The Grand Avenue/El Mercado Streetscape Project (City of Escondido) would receive $1,320,000 for pedestrian scale lighting, enhanced sidewalks, and curb extensions. This project would also improve the connection between Escondido’s downtown and the Escondido Transit Center.

After funding these projects, staff recommends that the remaining $942,000 be held in reserve as contingency for future uses either in this program or in future TE eligible projects.

Attachment 3 of the staff report provides a brief update on the status of the projects that were previously funded.

In order to spend the funds that are awarded in this program, each project has to receive an allocation vote from the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The CTC recently voted on two projects that this program is funding: the Bird Rock Area Traffic Management Plan (City of
San Diego) and the National City Boulevard Streetscape Enhancement Project (City of National City). These two projects can now move forward with construction.

Staff will continue to monitor all the projects over the next year and will return to the RPC/TC with a lessons learned report as the process to develop guidelines for the $280 million long-term TransNet-funded SGIP is initiated.

Councilmember Monroe made the motion to approve the staff recommendation, and Chairman Horn seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) asked if the projects that have already been funded are identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map (SGCM). Mr. Vance responded that these projects were funded in advance of the SGCM being developed, but they all fall into smart growth areas on the SGCM.

Deputy Mayor Heebner suggested that there be further discussions in the future regarding disincentives for sprawl growth as well as incentives for smart growth. She suggested that disincentives should be the other side of the equation.

Chair Holt Pfeiler commented that the approach in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is to use carrots, not sticks, and to continue to use carrots until they do not work.

Councilmember Dave Druker (North County Transit District [NCTD]) expressed concern that some of the projects on the list are sending the message that they are about smart growth, but they are really pedestrian enhancements. There are two projects that he is aware of: the Solana Beach Mixed Use Development (NCTD) and the San Luis Rey Transit Center at North River Village (NCTD) that include high-density development along with the Transit Center. These projects are rated very low and are just the type of development that the Committees should be incentivizing. As this program moves into the next phase, it is extremely important that this be taken into consideration. In addition, the Committees are going to have to look at ways to notify builders that if projects are being built outside of the Smart Growth areas, the builders will have to pay a fee.

Chairman Kellejian noted that there was quite a bit of discussion regarding this issue when the project selection criteria were being developed. One of the facts is the color of money. TE money can only be used for specific types of projects. The other fact is that 22 points were given to projects that had low-income housing, and that does not provide opportunities for cities that are built out. As the $280 million TransNet Smart Growth funds become available, the criteria and requirements, hopefully, will be different.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, added that there also will be new Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers to consider.

Councilmember Druker commented that he understands the color of money but as this program moves forward, the Committees need to ensure that the message being sent to the public is that those areas that are growing smart will be incentivized.

Councilmember Monroe stated that there were a lot of good ideas discussed when the project selection criteria for the PSGIP were being developed. He is glad to see that new projects can be picked up.
Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) pointed out that the North Park community has supported the density in the urban core because it is getting some of the amenities that local government promised along with the density. Amenities such as lights, sidewalks, and pedestrian orientation, need to be connected to transit to convince the communities that intensification and densification can be a benefit if done correctly. If some of the infrastructure and amenities are not put in place in advance, it will take longer to work with communities to have them understand that it can be okay. She commended staff for doing a good job with an almost impossible set of criteria.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Monroe and a second by Chairman Horn, the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees unanimously approved $4.3 million in additional Transportation Enhancement program funding for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program as described in the Discussion section of the staff report.

C. REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: DRAFT BASELINE REPORT FOR PERFORMANCE MONITORING (ACCEPT)

Chair Holt Pfeiler stated that staff will discuss the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) - Draft Baseline Report for Performance Monitoring. She commented that SANDAG is truly good at providing quality information. The hope and expectation is that local jurisdictions use this information to make different decisions that support the RCP. This is the first Baseline Report, and it contains a lot of good information.

Coleen Clementson, Principal Regional Planner, provided the TC and RPC members with the first draft Baseline Report for the RCP. Assembly Bill (AB) 361 (Kehoe) mandated that the RCP be prepared and that SANDAG monitor progress toward RCP implementation through realistic and measurable indicators. The RCP discusses how to approach monitoring in Chapter 8 and lays out the 39 indicators to monitor progress over time. This report establishes a baseline for future performance monitoring that can be used over time to see how well SANDAG is doing. The report explains the significance of each of the 39 indicators, it reports findings for the most recent data available (in most cases the report covers at least five years of data and includes data from 2005), and provides a discussion of SANDAG’s work efforts underway that may influence performance over time.

The report indicators are organized into six categories, which are subject areas that are in the RCP: Urban Forum and Transportation, Housing, Healthy Environment, Economic Prosperity, Public Facilities, and Borders. Staff presented the Committees with one example to illustrate how the report is organized.

It is known that many of the actions and the paradigm shifts proposed in the RCP will take years to implement and fund and that some of the short-term impacts may be subtle and difficult to recognize. In general, there appear to be areas where the region is moving in the right direction. Nearly one-third of the new housing units built in 2005 were located within the Smart Growth Opportunity Areas on the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map; transit ridership has increased significantly with population growth over the last several years and the transit mode share has remained at nearly 4 percent; crime has decreased; beach closures adjusted for weather have declined; the days where there have been air quality issues have gone down significantly; the workforce is increasingly more educated; and the energy produced from renewable sources has increased substantially.
The report also identifies some areas for improvement. Housing affordability continues to be an issue. In 2005, only 9 percent of the region’s population could actually afford a median-priced home, which compared with 1995 data where 38 percent of households could purchase a home. Congestion on most roads and freeways has increased over the last ten years as well as the amount of time that people are sitting in traffic. This is an area where progress can be monitored as the Early Actions in TransNet are constructed and hopefully, over time, there will be some reduction in these areas. There are a number of impaired water bodies in the region. Several of our beaches are losing sand, and most of the region’s job growth (59 percent) remains in low-wage industries.

Next steps include a 60-day public review and comment period. During that time, the report will be presented to the Regional Planning Technical and Stakeholders Working Groups. Any adjustments needed will be made and staff will bring the document to the Board of Directors for consideration in October.

Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) expressed appreciation for the staff report. She indicated that she is cautious when hearing housing statistics because they don’t ring true when you have housing developments that open up and the houses are pre-sold or there are lines around the block to purchase the homes. She pointed out that if you were to look at homeownership throughout the county, it would be much higher than 50 percent. She feels that these numbers need to be adjusted because saying that no one can afford a home defies reality and the numbers need to be put in context with the actual home sales of both existing and new homes, as well as the condominium shares and re-sales. She admitted that homes are pricy in San Diego because the region has a lot to offer. She made the motion to approve the staff recommendation.

Councilmember Emery seconded the motion.

Chairman Kellejian asked if the 4 percent of increased transit use reflected all modes of transportation. He asked what time of the day does the ridership increase. Ms. Clementson noted that the ridership increase is home-to-work trips, which is considered peak period.

Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) questioned if that was regionwide. Ms. Clementson responded that that is a regionwide number and does not identify the specific corridors.

Councilmember Emery commented that if you put those numbers on the major transit corridors, you’d get a lot higher number—that needs to be identified.

Chairman Kellejian stated that when these numbers are distributed, they need to be specific. There isn’t transit in many of the areas, and a lot of the areas have good density but do not have the ability to be serviced by public transit. Ms. Clementson commented that the report also discusses that the next indicator in line is travel times in key corridors. However, that data isn’t available for this report. Discussions have been held about where to make the transit investment and what the return on the investment would be.

Councilmember Druker mentioned that he is happy to have the report. His main concern is setting the targets and what will happen if those targets are not met, especially for smart growth. Specific targets need to be met and if they aren’t being met, a decision needs to be made as to what is going to be done.
Mr. Gallegos pointed out that the key to that issue is that elected officials in the region are the land use decision makers. It has a lot to do with what the local jurisdictions do with their general plans. In looking at the Smart Growth Concept Map, 40 percent of the areas are in adopted local plans; the other 60 percent require changes to local plans to make them happen.

Councilmember Monroe stated that he enjoyed this report, and it included a lot of information. He noted that power is being added to data when time is included. He mentioned that the Committees need to look at what industry standards are and/or what other areas are doing to set targets. He concluded that this is a great report with a great format and was very well done.

Supervisor Slater-Price announced that on Wednesday, August 2, the County Board of Supervisors (BOS) looked at the circulation element for its General Plan update 2020 and in that process they changed a lot of their road designations from four lanes to two lanes in the more outlying rural areas, reducing the potential cost for the County by more than $7 billion, but also increasing the capacity of roads that are closer in. The BOS also voted to put several roads that are currently shown on the Parkway Plan onto the map.

Chair Holt Pfeiler questioned if the purpose of the 60-day review is to establish baseline information and then test the logic or is it just to collect data from various organizations. Ms. Clementson replied that there is a lot of data in the report, and staff wants to make sure the information is easy to understand and accurate because this is a document that will be used for many years to come. Staff is looking to interested parties and the region’s experts to weigh in on it, and allow staff time to consider the suggestions received.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater-Price and a second by Councilmember Emery, the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees unanimously voted to accept the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP): Draft Baseline Report for Performance Monitoring and authorized the release of the draft report for a 60-day public review and comment period.

**ADJOURN JOINT MEETING WITH THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

Chair Holt Pfeiler adjourned the joint portion of the meeting at 11:43 a.m.
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<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Jerry Rindone</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Madaffer</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toni Atkins</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerry Sanders</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Cox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit Development Board</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Jerome Stocks</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Norine Sigafoose</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governor’s Appointee</td>
<td>Xema Jacobson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandor Shapery</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>