



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
NOVEMBER 30, 2007**

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.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (APPROVE)

Action: Upon a motion by First Vice Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (City of Escondido), and a second by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego), the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the minutes from the October 12, 2007, Board Policy and November 9, 2007, Business meetings.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

Clive Richard, a member of the public, commented that he was asked by Chuck Lungerhausen to pass on several comments for him. First, he expressed Mr. Lungerhausen's concerns regarding the state raid on transit funds and his hope that SANDAG will urge our legislators not to take away transit funds again next year. He also stated Mr. Lungerhausen's request that SANDAG move forward with the improvements to the Trolley Blue Line to improve mobility in the San Diego region. Mr. Richard also expressed his own desire that SANDAG continue to urge our legislators and the Governor not to raid transit funding next year.

Efren William Flores Ray, a member of the public, stated that he does social work in Mexico and is active in installing street signs and lights in his neighborhood there. He also is active in Chula Vista supporting neighborhoods there. He stated that he would appreciate any donations for street signs and lights in his Tijuana neighborhood.

Jim Schmidt, a member of the public, submitted written comments and an article from *The Daily Transcript* regarding the lack of support from the California Coastal Commission (CCC) for the desalination plant even though 16 local legislators support the plant. He stated his desire for a change in the CCC staff to have more members that would support the desalination plant.

3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (APPROVE)

This item summarized the actions taken by the Executive Committee on November 9, and the Transportation and Public Safety Committee meetings on November 16, 2007.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Mark Lewis (City of El Cajon), and a second by First Vice Chair Pfeiler, the SANDAG Board approved Agenda Item No. 3, Actions from Policy Advisory

Committees. Yes – 16 (weighted vote, 93%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – San Marcos, Santee, Vista.

CONSENT ITEMS

4. ANNUAL MEETING CALENDAR (APPROVE)

The Board of Directors approved the meeting calendar for the Board and the Policy Advisory Committees for the upcoming year.

5. QUARTERLY INVESTMENT REPORT - PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2007 (INFORMATION)

The SANDAG Investment Policy requires that the Board be provided a quarterly report of investments held by SANDAG. This report includes all money under the direction or care of SANDAG as of September 30, 2007.

Robert Hoffman, member of the public, stated that during a recent Transportation Committee meeting he heard the comment that “they should take transit, it is good for them.” He stated that he wanted to express his displeasure with SANDAG. He presented a slide to the Board which showed volume per hour for different transportation modes. He stated his belief that SANDAG was not investing in the appropriate forms of transportation for the region.

6. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS – JULY TO SEPTEMBER 2007 (INFORMATION)

This quarterly report summarized the current status of major highway, transit, arterial, traffic management, and transportation demand management projects in the SANDAG five-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program for the period July through September 2007.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that Caltrans has advertised for the State Route (SR) 52 freeway extension between SR 125 and Cuyamaca Street in Santee. Also, many Board members participated in the South Bay Expressway kick-off event. He commented that Caltrans also has advertised for the SR 905 project near the Otay Mesa Port of Entry, which is critical project for the region. In addition, he stated that he, along with San Diego Mayor Sanders and Gary Gallegos, attended a recent California Transportation Committee meeting to urge funding for the SR 905 project and other projects from the Trade Corridor Improvement Fund program in Proposition 1B.

7. CALIFORNIA BIODIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING (INFORMATION)

This item provided a summary of the California Biodiversity Council (CBC) meeting on October 3-4, 2007, in Clarksburg, California. The focus of the meeting was to discuss the effect of climate change on biodiversity conservation. The CBC is a statewide council established to design a strategy to preserve biological diversity and coordinate implementation of this strategy through regional and local institutions.

8. REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (INFORMATION)

In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy Nos. 003 (Investment Policy), 017 (Delegation of Authority), and 024 (Procurement and Contracting-Construction), this report summarized certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board meeting.

9. REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG (INFORMATION)

Board members provided brief reports orally or in writing on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board of Directors meeting.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer, and a second by First Vice Chair Pfeiler, the SANDAG Board approved Consent Items Nos. 4 through 9. Yes - 16. No - 0. Abstain - 0. Absent – San Marcos, Santee, Vista.

CHAIR’S REPORTS (10 through 12)

10. REMARKS FROM MAYOR KURT HONOLD, CITY OF TIJUANA (INFORMATION)

Chair Sessom expressed the Board of Directors' appreciation to Tijuana Mayor Kurt Honold for his active participation and his support of effective binational planning with Otay Mesa - Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan and his support during the wildfires. He sent a team of firefighters to support our County, and Baja California also transmitted energy to support the region during the wildfires. Mayor Sessom presented Mayor Honold with a plaque from the Board in appreciation for his leadership, hospitality, and contributions as Mayor of Tijuana.

Mayor Honold thanked SANDAG for its continued support of the City of Tijuana during the City's 18th administration (2005-2007). Working together, SANDAG and the City of Tijuana have enhanced the border dialogue and advanced important cross-border initiatives including the region's first binational plan: The Otay Mesa - Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan. Mayor Honold expressed pride in the accomplishments that SANDAG and the City of Tijuana have jointly achieved, and he wished SANDAG much success in its future cross-border planning endeavors. He stated his support for the region and the strong relationship between Mexico and the United States. He presented the Board with a plaque representing the partnership between the City of Tijuana and SANDAG. He expressed his support for continued binational coordination and cooperation for regional growth and understanding.

Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) expressed his and the County's appreciation to Mayor Honold. He stated that Mayor Honold was the first to call and offer support during the wildfires and expressed his best wishes for the future.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

11. 2008 ANNUAL SANDAG BOARD RETREAT (APPROVE)

The next SANDAG Board retreat is scheduled for January 30 through February 1, 2008, in the desert community of Borrego Springs. The primary objective of this public meeting is to afford participants the opportunity to discuss strategies for some of the agencies more important regional policies and programs, and develop ideas for the future direction of the agency.

Colleen Windsor, Communications Director, presented the item. Ms. Windsor stated that the Borrego Springs location was chosen due to its isolation. After a competitive bid process, La Costa Del Zorro was chosen as the retreat venue. The agenda will cover quality of life issues such as habitat preservation, water quality, beach sand replenishment, and public transit. Breakout sessions will be held to provide the opportunity to discuss the quality of life priorities. Staff recommended inviting one or more speakers who have successfully implemented quality of life measures. The Executive Committee also recommended holding a forum with our state delegation to discuss policy initiatives such as climate change and public transit funding. We also would invite experts to discuss climate change. As in past years, an introductory workshop for new and returning Board members also is proposed.

Second Vice Chair Jerome Stocks (City of Encinitas) requested that the Board invite the Attorney General to discuss his ideas concerning how environmental impact reports should address potential climate change impacts.

Mayor Art Madrid (City of La Mesa) stated his support on the discussion of climate change. He also requested that we consider two other issues: energy and water. He also suggested that the Board invite either the Mayor of Seattle who is in the forefront of climate change or Ron Simms who is the Executive Director for its Board of Commissioners.

Councilmember Crystal Crawford (City of Del Mar) stated that the agency consolidation occurred in 2001, and requested that SANDAG take an opportunity either at the Retreat or at another Board meeting to look back at what has been accomplished since the consolidation and what we might change or improve. Councilmember Crawford also referred the members to a staff report given during a recent Biodiversity Council meeting which dealt with climate change. The report provides more information on what the state is doing and the resources it is are putting together. She supports climate change as an item on the Retreat agenda.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (City of Coronado) requested clarification of the balance on the agenda for the several issues that staff has recommended.

Ms. Windsor stated that the quality of life issues would be a half day and climate change would take place over another half day with the balance filled with other topics. The other topics would include a discussion with the state delegation on climate change and on public transit funding.

Councilmember Monroe recommended a full half day on climate change due to its importance in the region.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, suggested that we balance the topics so that there is extensive discussion on climate change, and how the topics relate to climate change.

Mayor Jim Wood (City of Oceanside) stated that the agenda should include discussion on smart growth issues, climate change, and legal implications of the letter from the Attorney General. He stated that the Attorney General should be invited to discuss in detail his recently submitted letter on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Commissioner Marilyn Dailey (San Diego County Water Authority) requested clarification on whether the Retreat agenda item would be on water quality or stormwater management.

Chair Sessom stated that the issue is water quality.

Chairman Ed Gallo (North County Transit District [NCTD]) requested a copy of the letter from the Attorney General referenced by Mayor Wood.

Chair Sessom commented that the letter was received late yesterday via e-mail, and there are copies provided at each member's places.

Councilmember Matt Hall (City of Carlsbad) expressed his desire that SANDAG be proactive in communicating with citizens as we move forward. If we are going to be asking for an increase in sales tax, we need to be able to show benefit and that we will invest the funds wisely.

Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego) commented that there is a lack of water resources in the region, and this is a major issue that needs to be addressed at the Retreat.

Action: Upon a motion by First Vice Chair Pfeiler and second by Mayor Wood, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the topics listed in the report as the basis for developing the 2008 SANDAG Retreat agenda with incorporation of comments made by the Board as appropriate. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – San Marcos.

12. REPORT FROM NOMINATING COMMITTEE ON SLATE OF BOARD OFFICERS FOR 2008 (INFORMATION)

In September, Chair Sessom appointed a six-person Nominating Committee for Board officers. Councilmember Madaffer stated that four of the six appointed members of the nominating committee met, reviewed the applications, and unanimously recommended the slate of officers to the Board. The recommended slate for 2008 is: Lemon Grove Mayor Mary Teresa Sessom for Chair, Escondido Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler for First Vice Chair, and Encinitas Deputy Mayor Jerome Stocks for Second Vice Chair. In accordance with SANDAG Bylaws, the election of officers is scheduled for the December Board meeting. Additional nominations from the floor also may be made at the December meeting.

Councilmember Monroe stated that the re-election of the current slate of officers eliminates the opportunity for those other Board members who are soon to be termed out of office in their respective cities to be elected to the Board leadership. The term for Chair and Vice

Chair was to be for a one-year term to allow for progression in leadership. He asked whether the nominating committee considered that in its decision-making process.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that the current process is modeled after the League of California Cities process where interested applicants submit an application and questionnaire, the applications are reviewed, and if necessary, the applicants are interviewed. If interested parties want to fill these positions, they need only to submit an application. In this case, only the three applications were received.

Mayor Ron Morrison (City of National City) stated that traditionally the leadership terms were for two, one-year terms. There was discussion to make them just a one-year term, but that was not supported at the time.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

REPORTS (13 through 15)

13. FINAL 2030 SAN DIEGO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (APPROVE)

Councilmember Madaffer presented the item. He stated that 2030 RTP is the culmination of two and a half years of coordination and collaboration to plan our region's transportation system. The new plan will set SANDAG's long-range transportation actions and policies for the next four years, until 2011, when the next update is scheduled. After the Draft RTP was released in June, we held a public hearing in September. Then in November, we discussed the comments received and accepted staff's proposed changes for the final RTP. Staff has prepared the Final 2030 RTP along with the Final EIR. It is important to note that the RTP can be a flexible document and can be adjusted as we move forward. Mike Hix, Principal Regional Planner, and Rob Rundle, Principal Regional Planner, will summarize the comments and the documents and the staff recommendations.

Mr. Hix stated that since July of 2005, staff has worked closely with our transportation partners and our public stakeholders to develop and refine the 2030 RTP. We've come to the Transportation Committee and the Board numerous times to discuss options and alternatives, and to seek your guidance along the way.

During that time, the Board reconfirmed the RTP policy goals originally established in 2003. You conducted lengthy discussions on the recommendations from the Independent Transit Planning Review and how they should influence the new RTP. You approved updated criteria to objectively prioritize the projects in the RTP. Then, given the challenges of higher project costs, the Board asked staff to evaluate potential higher levels of investment on which to base this RTP. The result of this interactive process between the staff, our stakeholders and the Board was the \$57 billion Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario that is the basis of the 2030 RTP.

There were differing opinions on what types of projects should be emphasized in the RTP. The Board directed that we continue a multi-modal approach, develop the planned network of HOV and Managed Lanes in our major corridors, providing a balanced distribution of highway, transit, and local expenditures.

Before turning it over to Rob to discuss the EIR, I'd like to clarify two things that came up during the November 9 Board meeting regarding the proposed changes for the Final RTP.

First is the removal of I-15 in Mid-City from the Goods Movement network. While the HOV lanes in this area were never under consideration for truck use, removing I-15 from the identified freight network should not be interpreted to mean trucks immediately will be banned from the freeway in this area. That is not true. Caltrans and SANDAG have committed to work with the community and the City of San Diego to evaluate feasible options for moving truck traffic off I-15 and to another facility.

Second, a request was made at the November 9 meeting from the Mid-City community to commit in the RTP that nothing would be done in the I-15 median until the transit station issues were resolved. Once again, we are working with the community to find a solution everyone can live with, and the first planning meeting was held Tuesday night. But we do not think it is appropriate to prohibit in an RTP any median improvements until the transit issues are resolved.

Let me turn the mic over to Rob Rundle to discuss the EIR, and then I will summarize the multiple recommendations before the Board today.

Mr. Rundle stated that on May 24, SANDAG circulated a Notice of Preparation to inform agencies, organizations and the public that a draft EIR was being prepared for the RTP. The Notice of Preparation is distributed to solicit input on what should be addressed in the document and to seek input on what alternatives to the plan should be analyzed. As you recall, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires EIRs to analyze alternatives to the proposed plan.

SANDAG received many comments on issues that should be addressed in the EIR, including comments from the State Attorney General's office and the Center for Biological Diversity on the importance of properly addressing greenhouse gas emissions and potential measures to reduce such emissions.

In addition, SANDAG worked extensively with Save Our Forests and Ranchlands (SOFAR). As you recall the last time the RTP was adopted, SOFAR challenged the adequacy of the EIR and entered into a settlement agreement with SANDAG which required that for this RTP, we would analyze an alternative that was recommended by SOFAR.

Before the Notice of Preparation was distributed, and at the request of SOFAR, SANDAG and SOFAR amended the settlement agreement to redefine the alternative that would be analyzed in the EIR. The new alternative, called the Transit Emphasis Urban Core alternative, concentrates more transit investment in the urban core of San Diego and was analyzed in the EIR per the settlement agreement.

On August 21, SANDAG released the draft EIR for a 45-day public comment period. By the end of the public comment period on October 5, SANDAG received approximately 24 comment letters and prepared responses to those comments. All comment letters and SANDAG's responses can be found in Appendix E of the EIR.

While many of the comments were focused on the plan itself, and not the adequacy of the environmental document, comments generally focused on: the need for further technical

analyses that would be required when individual projects were being designed (such as noise, air quality, water quality, cultural resources, and biological resource assessments); goods movement through Mid-City; land use/smart growth assumptions; and greenhouse gas emissions.

Regarding greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, this is the first time SANDAG included a discussion of that issue in the EIR for an RTP. CEQA currently does not provide guidance on how the issue should be addressed, but SANDAG quantified the estimated GHG emissions for the existing condition, Revenue Constrained, and the Reasonably Expected Scenario. We identified that the plan would contribute to the cumulative impact of global climate change and provided mitigation measures in the plan to reduce that impact. Earlier in the year, SANDAG entered into a partnership with the California Energy Commission (CEC) to prepare a climate action plan as part of the Regional Energy Strategy update. This plan will identify land use and transportation strategies that can be implemented in the region to reduce GHG emissions. In addition, the EIR identifies other mitigation measures that can further reduce GHG emissions including the type of lighting used on transportation projects, increased funding for vanpools, and requesting that contractors use alternative concrete and asphalt mixes that reduce GHG emission where feasible.

Approximately one month after the public comment period ended, SANDAG received another comment letter from the Center for Biological Diversity. The comments were generally positive and focused on how SANDAG addressed greenhouse gas emissions in the document.

The law firm of Shute, Mihaly, & Wienberger submitted comments on behalf of SOFAR on November 14, about five weeks after the end of the public review period. The letter was included in the Board package, and SANDAG's response was sent out earlier this week. The letter outlines areas of disagreement with the plan and SANDAG's analysis, including the alternatives that were analyzed in the document and how we addressed GHG emissions.

Finally, the Attorney General's office submitted comments to SANDAG yesterday afternoon (November 29, 2007). Many of the comments are similar to those that have already been raised and responded to specifically in the letter submitted on behalf of SOFAR. However, I would like to address the specific topics raised in the letter.

Regarding the Smart Growth Incentive Program, the Attorney General states many of the Smart Growth Opportunity Areas are dispersed in suburban and rural areas and providing incentive funds to these areas would be inappropriate. The Smart Growth areas defined on the Smart Growth Concept Map were the result of collaboration between SANDAG and the local jurisdictions. Many of the Smart Growth areas are labeled potential, not because they do not have enough density or land use mix, but because they don't have access to transit. Unless these areas are served by future transit, they would not be eligible for capital incentive funds. Other locations with existing transit stations were not designated Smart Growth areas for a variety of reasons by the local jurisdictions, as they have land use authority. But as requested in the comment letter, the criteria for awarding Smart Growth incentives do factor the availability of existing or planned transit. It is not the intent of the program to fund all the Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, rather, to provide incentives to encourage smart growth where it makes the most sense.

Regarding the Transit Emphasis Urban Core Alternative, this RTP continues the direction established in the last RTP, MOBILITY 2030, adopted in March 2003. As part of the development for MOBILITY 2030, SANDAG evaluated a transit extreme alternative in which all available funding was used for transit. This alternative did not perform as well against the performance criteria as a more balanced approach.

In developing the transit network for this RTP, in response to the Independent Transit Plan Review, SANDAG analyzed four initial transit concepts, including an alternative that converted Managed Lanes to transit-only lanes. This alternative also did not perform well against the same criteria.

In developing transit alternatives for the RTP and EIR, the transit alternatives were based on taking the additional \$10 billion for transit and not based on all available transportation funding. Information regarding the development of the transportation networks is included in RTP Technical Appendix 3.

Regarding new freeway lanes, the RTP includes regional investment in a Managed Lane/HOV system that would support transit, carpools, and FasTrak® passengers. The RTP does not include many general purpose lane improvements. The comment states that SANDAG did not evaluate the impact of these improvements; SANDAG did evaluate these impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions and other issue areas such as impacts to biological resources, water supply and quality, and visual quality. Additionally, there were some changes to the RTP after the draft EIR was distributed for public review such as additional lanes on SR 56, but these changes did not result in new significant impacts that were not already identified in the draft EIR.

Regarding green construction policy, SANDAG intends to incorporate the types of measures suggested in the letter in the climate change action plan that is being developed through our partnership with the California Energy Commission. These and other land use/transportation strategies will move the region in the direction of meeting greenhouse gas emission targets that will be established as a result of AB 32.

And the last comment in the letter relates to Safe Routes to Schools. SANDAG and the City Heights Community Development Corporation recently received an Environmental Justice Transportation Planning Grant from Caltrans for the "City Heights Walks to School!" project. This project proposes outreach to parents, children, officials, community stakeholders, and residents to plan for safe routes to schools in City Heights. Part of the education and outreach for this project will include discussions with parents about the effects of automobile emissions in the atmosphere. Although this program will be implemented in City Heights, if successful, local jurisdictions may be able to partner with other community groups to implement similar projects in the future. Additionally, SANDAG does allocate bicycle and pedestrian funding that is outlined in the RTP. This funding was not identified in the EIR as mitigation since it is already part of the plan.

Even though these comments were received after the comment period ended, SANDAG staff believes we have adequately addressed all the comments received, and that the EIR is adequate and was prepared pursuant to CEQA.

Mr. Hix summarized by stating his thanks for the Board's leadership as we've worked together to update what has always been one of SANDAG's core responsibilities as the regional transportation planning agency.

Today you are asked to approve three separate recommendations, which are legally in the following order:

- Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 RTP and adopt the Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- Find the 2030 Revenue Constrained plan in conformance with the state implementation plans for air quality; and
- Adopt the air quality conformity determination and the 2030 RTP.

Mr. Gallegos stated that he spoke with Attorney General Brown and expressed SANDAG's disappointment in receiving the letter so late in the process. Right after the Notice of Preparation had gone out, SANDAG got a letter from the Attorney General talking about incorporation of greenhouse gas emissions into the RTP. We went to the Board asking for more funding and time to do this and went through an extensive process, followed CEQA, and had the appropriate time for public comments, and yet a few hours before this item came before the Board we received a letter which I consider a late hit. I expressed our frustration and disappointment to the Attorney General who shared the importance of greenhouse gas emissions for the region and that he thinks time is of the essence. He apologized for the lateness of the comments. We shared with him the complexities of what we have to deal with and shared with him that the RTP process is lengthy and we have been working on it for two and a half years. During the process the federal government changed the requirements for how we cost out projects. We learned this just last spring and when the federal government set these new rules they have to set a deadline of when the new rules apply. The new guidelines are in effect for any RTP adopted after December 11, 2007. If we adopt an RTP before December 11 the old rules apply, and after December 11 we play by the new rules. This RTP is built on the old rules so if we don't meet the December 11 timeframe that could result in significant delays to transportation as the existing plan expires in March 2008. I explained these complexities to the Attorney General and suggested that pending the action taken today, we should meet with him and understand the issues he is concerned about. In our conversation, it became apparent to me that there are some misunderstandings in the areas of smart growth, where smart growth areas are, and some misunderstanding about where we are building roads. When you look at the SR 78 Corridor and the SPRINTER line opening, that is where a lot of smart growth areas are for North County and the investments are matching up. I'm not sure that the Attorney General understood that. He welcomed the suggestion to meet and emphasized that these were comments, apologized for the lateness, and said he was willing to sit down with us after the fact to discuss what was missing. I suggested that if there are things that are missing and that are doable, we can always supplement and do more than we are advocating doing today. The Attorney General seemed agreeable to that. The Chair asked me to share the conversation with the Board today.

Mayor Wood stated that he appreciates that our Executive Director explained what took place with the Attorney General because he was somewhat shocked when he received the

e-mail at such late notice in the afternoon and was lucky to read through it. My concerns at the time, and I think you answered some of my questions, were this is a potentially legal issue for us. This could impact us down the road and we need to address it now, not later as it doesn't play into our hands with a letter like this coming from the Attorney General. That was my main concern. The other thing I thought about was should we defer smart growth aspects of this to a later date and time, and go forward with the rest of it. I'm not sure. I was a little concerned about the legal ramifications more than anything else, and I think you helped answer some of those questions, but I'm still concerned that there is an opinion letter floating out there for some other party to come along and lay legal action against us because of that letter. So that is my main concern.

Mayor Morrison stated that the question he had is about the other letter posted at our stations from the City Heights Community Development Corporation. They bring up a number of legal issues, and I was wondering if we could have those responded to.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that he plans to raise those in his comments.

Chairman Gallo stated it seems to me that we have this Attorney General thing now, and he just had a chance to briefly go through it and asked what is the process for amending, or supplementing, or changing the RTP? How many more years do we have before we have to redo it anyway? What is the process?

Mr. Gallegos stated that the RTP is currently updated on a four-year cycle as required by the law. Amendments are not easy; they require extensive review, but during anytime after you adopt it, you can seek to amend.

Chairman Gallo said that is why we should go for it today.

The following comments were made by members of the public:

Former State Senator Jim Mills stated there are some remarks I would like to make with regard to your proposal as far as I understand it. One point that is important for you to remember is that freeways do not solve traffic congestion; they generate it. You may recall that when you had the representative from the independent review group on the subject of *TransNet*, the rep from Los Angeles made that point. He said that "we have learned that freeways don't solve traffic congestion problems, we have learned that they generate it, and we hope that you will benefit from our sad experience." What we know is that when you build a freeway, development takes place all around it. Freeways do generate traffic in that way. The policies before you, I'm afraid, will make San Diego another Los Angeles. You are talking about a million new residents. I don't know anybody who wants another million residents in San Diego County. What we do know is that freeways are not to deal with the problems of growth; the freeways are to generate growth. The real reason to build freeways is because we want a million people in San Diego County, and we want to create a situation where this sprawl can continue. With reference to history, in 1974 as some of you may remember, as President Pro Tem of the Senate, I carried Proposition 5 which allowed the use of highway funds for passenger railways. As President Pro Tem of the Senate, I could get the votes because people who were afraid to vote against it, voted against me. But member after member of the Senate and the Assembly said Jim, ok we will give you the vote because we know that the voters will vote against that. What happened was that the voters passed it by almost a two-to-

one margin. You have to remember that most voters are drivers. Most voters like the idea of spending highway funds for railways to solve traffic congestion. In Proposition A in 1987, I was the chair of that campaign and much involved in putting together that campaign and putting together the proposition. The polls that we took at that time were extensive and helped shape the proposition. The most popular transportation projects were the rail projects. Transit had more support in those polls than did highways. After the campaign was over, I used campaign surplus funds; we had a surplus. Nobody thought that it was going to pass but it did and people didn't contribute until the last minute so we had a surplus, and I used a large part of that surplus to have an analysis of the vote. The analysis of the votes showed the same thing, that rail was more popular with the voters who voted for that proposition than were the freeways. I gave bound copies of that to SANDAG, and SANDAG should still have it. This plan that we have now, the new plan, again has one-third for highways, one-third for city streets, and one-third for transit. But it isn't really so because almost all the money is capital, unlike what you get as local governments. You get to use money for maintenance of streets and so forth. The transit money is almost all capital, and the transit money is under the plan that was presented and is used to help finance freeway lanes at terrific cost and the justification is that buses will be allowed to use those lanes. John Bonsall, who is perhaps the leading expert on busways in the world, was part of the independent review group and mentioned with reference to the I-15 lanes that it would not be a very successful busway because freeways are a hostile environment for busways. Freeways are a hostile environment for transit. An example of a proper busway is the Orange Line in Los Angeles, a great busway which is not on a freeway. When gasoline gets to be \$5, \$6, \$7, or whatever, we may have a different view as to what we really need and what we really want.

Lani Lutar, representing San Diego County Taxpayers Association, stated that based on your action at the last meeting it is clear that this Board will be approving the staff's updated Regional Transportation Plan today. However, for the record, I would like to reiterate the concerns that I expressed just a few weeks ago. It is unfortunate, sad, and disappointing that you are not adequately responding to and giving greater consideration and weight to the community's input and recommendation. A half dozen modifications to the plan in response to more than 500 comments from over 100 individuals or organizations is unacceptable. We believe that the plan being adopted today is overly optimistic in its assumptions regarding new sources of revenues or tax and fee increases, as well as its projections for transit ridership. Have we already forgotten how difficult it was to obtain voter approval for *TransNet II*, the extension of the half-cent sales tax, in spite of the endorsement of our organization? The next time around it will be even more challenging to obtain voter support and the same goes for endorsement. Our level of scrutiny will be significantly greater, and I can assure you that we will not rubber stamp a proposal that is unable to clearly demonstrate improvement to the region's mobility of people and goods. The performance to date in transit is not one to be proud of, and if it is not working, we should not be throwing more money down the drain adding lines to a broken system. But please don't misunderstand me. I'm not saying that we shouldn't invest in transit. What I am saying is that we need to be assured that if we do invest in transit, we are going to be cost-effective in investing in a system that works. Thank you for your time.

Mikaela Gladden, representing Briggs Law Corporation, stated they submitted a letter on behalf of their clients. I want to make sure that you received and you take our comments into consideration when you make your decision today. Thank you very much.

Ronald Schneider, stated that he is very interested in climate change, and I'm glad it is finally getting a lot of attention here. It is very gratifying. This plan that has been presented will increase greenhouse gases. Deeply buried into the program, I did a search last night, the word telework appears only twice, once under the Rideline work program. For the last year, I have been researching telecommuting, and it is a big opportunity we are missing, and the time is very ripe for it, and it should be a major effort now. Japan's Prime Minister a couple of weeks ago announced that Japan will double its telecommuting by 2010. Connecticut has a very successful program. I urge you all to look at www.telecommute.com. It is a very successful program over the last few years. Connecticut is comparable in size to San Diego, maybe 20 percent bigger in population, size, commuters, workers, and that sort of thing. They have reduced commuter mileage by 520 million miles a year. The calculations I have made based on SANDAG data and verified by a SANDAG statistician, are that with a well directed program, we could take 30,000 cars per day off the freeways during peak hours and that is very, very conservative for many reasons. The cost of such a program would be \$500,000 per year. That is about what Connecticut is doing. And that is a lot of money to me but when you look at the numbers in this program, it is peanuts. The people in this room could start such programs within their organizations and make a significant beginning impact. I'd like to share my analyses. I have a PowerPoint presentation on it, and I've been putting together a program plan. My e-mail is rschneid@san.rr.com. And the other thing I'd like to say I think the SANDAG program, I mentioned the SANDAG program. I've looked into it, I've talked to the people in it, and I think it is somewhat misdirected. Connecticut's big success was not going to employers but going to employees. And, what they did was put on the radio on the traffic announcements while they are sitting there in traffic, "why don't you consider working at home, look at telecommute.connecticut.com." And, those people went to telecommute.connecticut.com and found out how to go to their employers and were very successful. Seventy percent of their projects were initiated by employees. Ninety percent of those inquiries came from their radio announcements. Thank you very much.

Jay Powell, representing the City Heights Community Development Corporation, stated that the Board has a two-page, back-to-back handout including a letter regarding the final EIR responses and our comments on the RTP content. The second page of our letter is a request for brief annotations to three of the tables. I think I got the page numbers wrong but the tables are correct, and at text either 6-27 or 6-30 specific. These are very brief annotations that we are requesting to really reflect the spirit and the specifics of the agreement that we work cooperatively with Caltrans, SANDAG and other agencies staff in the Community Working Group to identify all alternative BRT station and system design in the SR 15 Mid-City segment of I-15. This Working Group incidentally were seated at a community meeting this past Tuesday as led by Councilmember Atkins, and I appreciate Councilmember Monroe was in attendance there. I think we had over a hundred people, and Mr. Orso-Delgado was there as well and made a presentation and responded to public comments, and we want to express our appreciation for that. I think we have really gotten going on a very important, and long overdue frankly, process to engage the community directly in a re-design and to really open up those stations and that system by 2012. We have an ambitious schedule, and we have a project director that has been appointed by your Executive Director, Bill Emerson, who walked the Working Group of a little over a dozen community representatives through our process and our timeline and our outline. You have also been provided a fact sheet and on the reverse of that a covenant that reflects our position in participating in the cooperative process. The request

also reflects the testimony before you that I laid before you on November 9th. And I understand the staff's reservations about a project-specific annotation, but I would like to point out that there are already annotations to the table, and this project is the subject of a pre-existing conflict in your current RTP. Also there is an estimated allocation of about \$265 million in that line item which we think is something that needs to be prioritized again for transit first through the Mid-City. We want to be sure that the priority of all parties in this segment is to get the BRT system operating by 2012 and to achieve the goals we have outlined in the covenant, which is attached as I mentioned. I don't know what the other technical issues may be, and I'm prepared to answer questions or respond to that. Once again, I want to express our appreciation to this Board, to this staff, to the staff of Caltrans, in working with us and moving forward. But, I think these very brief annotations and footnotes to those tables and to the text are what we are looking for to have an explicit expression to the commitment to make this happen. Thank you very much.

Clive Richard commented that his only criticism with the entire process, and I have participated in it for a little over the two-year period, is that everyone has been doing this. The bottom line is this, I'm convinced that we have to do something with the SR 15 Mid-City area. I'm convinced that that project has to move forward. I remember becoming excited by the promise of what could be done with SR 15. And, I remember the disappointment in learning that that couldn't take place for various reasons. I would not like to see us move forward with other projects if we can't somehow fulfill what we have promised before. Promises are made to be broken, but I don't believe that this is a promise that should be broken. I think we need to do everything we can to make this a project that is completed. That is my input. Let's not break that promise, and I think that should be included in what we do. We have to make that promise again, and this time we have to be committed to completing it. And, I was at the meeting where Mr. Orso-Delgado did present what I thought were some interesting ideas. And, I think it is something that we need to look at and work on and we are going to need the funding for it. And, that has to come out of what we plan to do in the next 30 years. Thank you.

Chair Sessom called Duncan McFetridge and stated that Mr. McFetridge has accumulated well over 30 minutes of time. However, he has graciously agreed to keep his remarks to 12 minutes, but we are going to put 15 on the timer.

Duncan McFetridge, representing Save Our Forests and Ranchlands (SOFAR), stated on behalf of those people who donated me time, thank you from CPI, Affordable Housing Coalition, students, members of SOFAR. I'd like to start off about this vigorous exchange of letters between SOFAR and SANDAG staff; it includes the Attorney General late in the day and set the record straight here right away about a possible misinterpretation of our relationship with SANDAG staff. Let's put it this way, I consider SANDAG staff the most knowledgeable, competent, professional planning staff in San Diego County. We have no quarrel with the professionalism. Let's put it another way. If Gary Gallegos and Rob Rundle were to come to work for SOFAR, developers watch out. Now, the quarrel we have with this plan and the EIR is simple. It's called land use. It is the Achilles heel of this organization. This drama here that is unfolding with SOFAR and SANDAG is more like a Greek tragedy because Ron is doing his job, you are doing your job Sir, but these are two irreconcilable forces at work here, and SOFAR is doing its job. We are on a collision course and that collision course is coming to a head with things like affordable housing, climate change, and energy dependence. So, when you leave this room, land use agents, you go

back and adopt sprawl, auto-based plans. And, then you come back here and make the transportation plan. There is something wrong with this; this is the problem here. So, now I'm speaking to the land use agents not to SANDAG for the rest of my comments. So, all 18 land use agents here represent the entire county and so what do the people of San Diego County want? Jim, Senator Mills, mentioned it and let's take a look at the most authoritative survey ever performed in San Diego County, The Public Policy Institute with San Diego Dialogue and here it is, back in 2000. Transit, affordable housing, resource protection up in the seventy percentiles, eighty percentiles, now that is a true measure of what your citizens want. Now, let's get a progress report on what they want. SANDAG did this survey, five years later. Sixty percent of your constituents want to leave San Diego County for what? Affordable housing and congestion. What a grade, what a report, folks. You all get an F in land use. And now we have a new player on the scene: climate change, energy dependence. This will sink us all. If the rest of the world lived the lifestyle of San Diego County or America, England, and France, we would need three planets to provide the resources. So, ladies and gentlemen, our land use is out of whack. Our auto-based infrastructure that serves -- that is out of whack. So, let's take a look at our local geography, urban geography here. We have 800 square miles of urban land, more than enough room to solve all our problems. But what have we done with our auto-based infrastructure, we have covered 200 square miles with asphalt, concrete and parking lots. Let's give you an idea of what that means in terms of wasted space. If you filled that 200 square miles with the density of the San Diego downtown city plan, you could fit 4 million people into 200 square miles. So, have you been to Little Italy lately? Is that oppressive? It is a great success story. Again, we are pointing out here the land use problem. We do not believe you have followed the recommendations of the Independent Transit Planning review. You could summarize that whole review which criticized your lack of transit, your auto-based emphasis in this most important slide here. If we had real transit-based communities, we could fit the entire projected growth in relatively small areas. But what's the key here? It is not your smart growth projects. Developers love smart growth projects. That way they can claim they are doing smart growth. But you know what they do; they build smart roads to smart growth projects. So, if we had real transit based communities connected by transit, we could solve our problems. And we are going to get into a recommendation on that later on. A way to imagine it is this, Madam Chair, Director of SANDAG, just think, we have 18 cities, how about two square miles at the heart of each of the 18 cities, two square miles at downtown density. Santee, Vista, Oceanside, Escondido, two square miles in the center of each center at downtown planned densities you could fit 700,000 people. This is my way of saying that we are investing in a graveyard. Now this person carried the love affair with a car a little too far; she is being buried in her automobile. I use this as a symbolism that the auto-based infrastructure is a graveyard for resource protection, it is a graveyard for affordable housing, it is a graveyard for climate change, energy dependence. We can not mitigate our way out of this. So why is it, why is it that developers love roads? Why to you land use agents love roads? It is real simple, Senator Mills just said it. Why does the *San Diego Union Tribune* advertise their developer clients every week? It is because roads bring land to the market place. They don't give us transportation. The great outdoors for sale. Developers love it. Now, Supervisor Horn is absolutely wrong. I brought this slide to your attention last time. This is a symbol of San Diego County. It is not water, lack of water that will destroy agriculture. This is the latest Pardee Farm. A hundred acres of economically viable productive agriculture that Pardee Construction bought and wants to put unaffordable homes on, and there is only one way he can do it, SANDAG and that is if you build the roads to that project. And lo and behold, we are talking about developing

Guejito Ranch. I'm showing you crimes, land use crimes. Now, we had a big wringing of the hands about water availability. Water availability, we are running out of water, well ladies and gentlemen this is our watershed. And our backcountry produces twenty percent of our water. SANDAG I know you are not land use but you are going to build the roads to Guejito Ranch while we leave older San Diego, our transit-based communities, bereft of infrastructure. Here is the whole summation of the SANDAG plan: increase of freeway miles, vehicular miles traveled, gasoline consumption. Let me just rest here for a second. One point four million gallons of gasoline per day, six percent of that, one million gallons comes from foreign suppliers. That's what we are doing. We have a house of cards here. Our misadventure in Iraq, the price of oil, the falling dollar. We are investing in a tragedy. About the SOFAR alternative, here it is in graphic form, The Urban Core Alternative. We propose that SANDAG study a transit based community inside the trolley ring including National City. Is that a great thing to study? Of course it is. Did it pan out? No. Are we unhappy? Yes. But I'm going to come back to my opening remarks. The land use is not there. Forty square miles, what kind of community could we have in that trolley ring and why don't we have it? Where is the City of San Diego here? They left early. Back there? Very good. This is good because we need the City of San Diego here or we could have other people here too. Now, has anyone traveled down Market Street lately from downtown? Imperial? National Avenue? Go down those streets; take University all the way, El Cajon Boulevard all the way. You have a community screaming for infrastructure. Now how is it that we can provide infrastructure to Guejito Ranch and our orange orchards in advance and imagine building homes out there and we do not have the vision to invest in the trolley ring to make it a car free transit dependant community and have higher density? Because, Madam Chair, what is the complaint always? We can't take the density. How about this we've got to think out of the box now?

[NOTE: Tape switched sides at this point.]

And we haven't even seen the beginning of the financial crisis on its way. Thank you very much.

Jim Schmidt stated that he again appreciates being here. I am on your stakeholders group, and I've been very impressed with SANDAG. As usual, they did a great job. One of the issues I want to hit on that we talked earlier about is growth. I'm over forty now, and I've been around awhile, but I went through that early 70s era when we had people start opposing new housing saying it causes growth. The Sierra Club started opposing the Mira Mesa development, they didn't oppose Scripps Ranch because you couldn't see it, it was on the other side of the hill. But what really bothers me is that people say that new housing causes growth which is total garbage. The affordable housing issue is a delay, delay, delay situation. That is what it is. If you only had a short time to process the affordable housing situation would go away. One issue on growth is that it is not people moving here from other parts of the country, it is people like myself living too long. It's births over deaths. Your SANDAG numbers show that. I hope nobody argues against the use of prescription drugs, because my cholesterol is down 100 from what it used to be. We can always make big improvements but when you have the delay, delay, delay mentality, the ballgame's over. The affordable housing issue will never go away if it takes three and four years to continue to develop new projects. I suggest you approve the plan; you can always make amendments. Again, SANDAG, I continue to be impressed with SANDAG like I have been forever, keep up the good work. Thanks a lot.

Dave Nielsen, representing Pardee Homes, stated he was here to testify in support of the SR 56 widening project. In your currently adopted RTP, the widening is included in the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Scenarios. If you adopt the staff recommendation, they remain the same; there is no change. A way of background, this is a congested corridor. The project has broad-based community support. And, there are local dollars available to supplement state and regional funds. A quick comment on the Attorney General, if you take the action today you are not adding this project into the RTP, it is already there as part of the No Project alternative. Thank you.

Councilmember Madaffer stated he listened with interest to comments especially that of you, Mr. McFetridge, because really there is a lot that you said but little that I disagreed with in general concepts. But, at the end of the day, there is only so much that we as a region can do that ultimately addresses some of the things that you talked about. You did point out the key issue, and that is, SANDAG does not do land use. That is up to the County and the individual cities and we don't want to change that, at least I don't. I think that we want to make sure that we respect individual land use abilities and powers of each of the local cities around the State. The thing that I wanted to touch on focuses on the letter from the Attorney General. I think it does a good job in offering some of the observations as to the concerns that are out there on climate change issues and really, the implementation requirements of AB 32. I really appreciated the comments. I didn't think we needed to get the letter so late, but when I've read all of this, as I've spent a lot of time going through this, I can certainly make the findings that staff has recommended on the EIR, and I appreciate Rob Rundle's staff report where he addressed each of the issues that the Attorney General raised. And, I think the responses were point on. With this RTP, the CEQA process has been followed very closely, and as Mr. Gallegos pointed out in his comments, we responded early on the issues that were raised by the Attorney General's office. So, I think that we have been very receptive. I think the observation that we should all leave with, with respect to the letter from the Attorney General, is that these are things that each of us face in each of our jurisdictions as cities. We all will face letters like the one that SANDAG received late yesterday, and I think it is a good wake up call. Whether it is with our General Plan or other issues, cities are going to get hit with this. It is just the same with the County. We all know what happened in Riverside County with the litigation when the Attorney General sued. In fact, I had a meeting with the Attorney General about a month ago and we talked about creating a checklist for cities that cities can follow. I think the COG should also be in that as well so each of us as individual jurisdictions will know exactly what the rules are because right now AB 32 is still fuzzy. You have got Steinberg's SB 375 trying to interpret it. You have got another bill out there, SB 303 trying to deal with land use and housing. But, those two bills ultimately write into what we do as a region when it comes to our transportation plan. And, I think again, it gets back to what Mr. McFetridge was saying. There is a lot that makes sense. Sure, in a perfect world it would be great to densify in each of our areas, but at the same time, in a perfect world, there are those that dream of a wife, a kid, and dogs and cats and a yard to play in, and you can't do that if you have to live on the 32nd floor of a building in downtown San Diego. So, we have to be conscientious of the fact that not everybody wants to fall into that particular lifestyle. But, at the same time, we also would be doing a disservice to the region if we did not respond to the needs of the region when it comes to transportation planning. And, having spent a lot of time with this, I feel very comfortable with this document. And, I would be offering a motion in a moment. I do want, and I probably should have talked to our attorney first, but Jay Powell raised some issues in his letter, and thank you Mr. Monroe for calling those out earlier. There are several areas where he is suggesting that we interlineate into the RTP some language that would

recognize the fact that if the HOV lanes would be there, depending on what would happen with the SR 15 Mid-City BRT stations, as you are probably aware right now there is discussion and debate, and Caltrans has been doing a fantastic job working with the community as to whether or not we will end up doing these center lane BRT stations. They may end up being outside the center lanes and if that is the case, then they would be HOV. Mr. Powell was simply asking in his letter, which I would like to have made a part of the record, that would amend the four points that he has pointed out to page 6-28, page 6-27, page A-19, and page A-21, and I can give this to the attorney. But all it simply does is ask that the HOV dedication and/or construction is contingent on the completion and operation of SR 15 Mid-City BRT stations. He just wants to make sure that we are not losing sight of the BRT possibilities. I don't know, Madam Chair, if you want me to incorporate these word-by-word, or if I could just give this to the attorney, and they could be interlined into the document.

Chair Sessom stated that the General Counsel has indicated that incorporation by reference will be appropriate.

Councilmember Madaffer concluded his comments by offering a motion that we adopt the three items that staff has called on.

Chair Sessom stated that we really need three different motions.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that he would start with Resolution 2008-08, which certifies the Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 RTP and adopt the findings, the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program. We will start with that motion and I will come back to the others.

Chair Sessom stated that we do have a motion on the floor. I have several speakers; I'm not sure exactly what order.

Mayor Pfeiler seconded the motion.

Chair Sessom acknowledged Mayor Pfeiler's second to the motion and called on Mayor Madrid for comments.

Mayor Madrid stated that he wanted to ask a question of the Director first and then wanted to speak to some of the items that have been mentioned. First of all, Gary, I wanted to just clarify because I think I heard you accurately that the RTP is updated or reviewed every four years. Based on the serious concerns that have been brought to us by the speakers, I'd like to see if in fact we could do the following. The minutes of all these Board meetings are very detailed but I would like to see a verbatim transcript of the comments made by the speakers is prepared and given to this Board with emphasis to the Transportation Committee, and at the end of the year, we could go back and review just exactly how far we have either succeeded or achieved those successes or where the challenges are. And then the next question I pose, is while we are supposed to update that every four years, we might look for an opportunity to try and make those adjustments prior to that because, the fact of the matter is, time is so critical that if we defer for four years to make some adjustments, it may be the opportunity to go ahead and make some meaningful changes with a bypass. I'd like to not make that in the form of a motion, but if I think it can be done administratively, that is something I think my colleagues would agree with.

Mr. Gallegos stated that we have been working on the RTP for a little over two and a half years, so it takes roughly about three years. So, you literally adopt one and take a deep breath and start over again. That is usually how the process works.

Mayor Madrid stated that what I really want to emphasize is looking at the comments and the concerns and the red flags that are being raised and have that verbatim report with us as a reminder of what it is that we are attempting to do. And, I don't know if it takes the form of a motion, but I would rather not. Madam Chair would that take a motion?

Chair Sessom requested the clerk transcribe the comments verbatim so that we do have them available. I think it would be up to the Chair of the Transportation Committee to review it at the end of the year to see how far we have come.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that he would be happy to docket that, and it would be a great thing.

Chair Sessom stated that there was no need for a motion.

Mr. Gallegos stated that one of the commitments in here, and as a partnership that we have with the California Energy Commission is to do a climate change plan. So a lot of the issues that you are talking about here are focused around climate change and global warming. So you as an agency are already committed in partnership with the California Energy Commission to develop a Climate Action Plan that is documented in this RTP. So Mayor and members of the Board, that is another undertaking this next year that hopefully will help start to address some of the issues, at least those related to climate change that are being brought up this morning.

Mayor Madrid stated that he would like to follow up with several other comments. I'd like to follow up on the letter from the Attorney General. I think Mayor Wood started that and I think even Mr. Gallo had a couple of comments. Even though it came after the fact, the Attorney General was a keynote speaker at the recent State League of California Cities meeting. He spoke very eloquently in spite of the fact that some people think that he is a democrat. He spoke very eloquently on the issue of what we are attempting to do with climate change and he was really on target. And he was not reticent about going out there and filing suits against those local jurisdictions that in their General Plan have not included the climate change issues. So we have to start addressing that very frankly. The concern that I have, and I think that Rob made a very good point, on page two of his letter, where he talks about smart growth incentive programs, he has identified a \$280 million project and we talked about 193 proposed smart growth areas. Rob indicated something that really just struck with me; it says smart growth where it makes sense. So therefore I would suggest very frankly that we don't deal in gray areas, we have black and white issues where smart growth doesn't make sense there, let's take it off, because we have had several examples where this body has gotten itself into a corner by making some very generic, broad statements, knowing full well that they would never be achieved. And then when something happens we have these community groups coming to us and saying, on this page you indicated that this is what is going to take place. I would suggest that we kind of scrutinize the smart growth mentality, the philosophy and if it doesn't make sense or it doesn't qualify as smart growth, we should not go ahead and falsely encourage people to say that is going to be placed there. The other thing that I want to stress and I want to

make a couple of comments about and that is telecommuting. That's been an issue that I have been pursuing for about the last ten years. If I can just digress and give you a personal experience, in my other life, I worked for a telephone company. We were able to go ahead and get a grant of half a million dollars and we gave \$250,000 to the City of San Diego and the \$250,000 to the County to implement a telecommuting program. Three months later after the findings were developed, it was astonishing about the improvements of the work performed by those people telecommuting, but the fact of the matter was that there is a typical mind set, I'm just philosophizing now, by management that unless they see an employee in front of them, they are home screwing off. I think those are the types of things we want to focus on. I was really pleased to hear the third speaker, who got up and spoke about telecommuting in Connecticut. I know that it is briefly touched on in this plan, but I really want to start making sure that we start focusing on telecommuting. Half a million dollars is something that we can just, it's usually rounded up or rounded down one way or the other so I would like to plead that we start focusing on telecommuting. And, my final comment is also a personal one. You know it is interesting how this is the first time, for a minute, I thought I was in church when Mr. McFetridge was speaking. Not a single sound was being made by virtually everybody. I can just imagine what went through everybody's mind as he was speaking. Some people were concurring with him, other people may be ridiculing him and just doing all kinds of other things that they normally do to people that bring a message. We have a tendency as a society to just shoot the messenger. I think what Mr. McFetridge did was speak about the cause and not the symptom, and we have a tendency as a society and as an organization to deal with the symptom and not the cause. So, I'm going to support the EIR and the Plan with the conditions that I've just said that we review them very rigidly at the end of the year, given that we have a four-year waiting period. Because, I think we've got to start taking some real, making some real hard choices, about what's facing this region.

Mr. Gallegos pointed out that smart growth is part of SANDAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan adopted by the Board. One of the things that is unique about the smart growth piece is that it is really an organic process, a totally bottoms-up process with you all individually as local land use authorities coming up with where there is potential for smart growth areas and where there's already some that are existing. So, as we look to address some of Mayor Madrid's concerns I would point out that just like the RTP, the RCP is also a living document that gets updated on some regular basis. So, as we look at it, these are your smart growth areas and if you don't think they work, we need to hear from the bottom up because we came up with them not tops down but bottoms up.

Mayor Madrid stated that Mr. Gallegos was absolutely correct and the reason we have done that is that we are all very greedy. We have the tendency to think that if we label any development smart growth, we are going to get monies. And, it's up to us to go ahead and state that is not a true smart growth development. But, that it is our own greedy, responsible approach to be more pragmatic and more candid about those things.

Mayor Mickey Cafagna (City of Poway) commented that the Board needs to remember that this process has taken many, many years, more that the two and a half or three years that we have been working on this Plan, and it has had a lot of public input. When we did *TransNet*, we went to the public. *TransNet* wasn't just a guessing game; I think we will try it this way, a third, a third, a third. This was public input from our constituents, the people that drive the roads and ride the public transit. This is what they wanted and that is why *TransNet* was put together in the fashion that it was. This transportation plan has had hours

and hours, thousands of hours of work dealing with these issues. Part of the problem that I think the Attorney General has and Assembly-member Steinberg has in these bills that they are trying to impose is that the County of San Diego is on the cusp of these climate issues and these environmental issues and these transportation issues. We are ahead of the game in the State of California and maybe in the country. We are the ones that are setting the standard for the future of all of California as it relates to smart growth, densification, environmental issues, climate control, and all the things that are important to us today. I believe that this body is far ahead of anyone else as it relates to those issues. This Plan is as we said, is take a breath and start working on the next one very soon. And I think that all of these ideas are good and need to be talked about and kept on the drawing board and continue to discuss them and revise the Plan as necessary as things change and the ability for us to pay for those changes. These ideas are great but where does the money come from to deal with the additional public transportation and the densification. We all deal with, you talk about we have land use control at the local agencies, of course we do. And we deal with our constituents and they tell us what they want. And downtown development in a lot of our communities is just not possible; it is not going to be accepted by the communities. And densification as you pointed out today cannot work in every community. Smart growth I think is a very broad general term on what should take place in relationship to densification along public transportation lines. We don't have the ability in this County to add more roads. What we are doing today is expanding existing roads to their maximum. But there is no ability to add roads in this County anymore. We have to go to alternative transportation choices in order to accommodate the kind of growth that is projected to come here, projected to grow within as well. We all know that sixty percent of that growth is going to come from within. I think we just have to remember that we are, in my opinion, ahead of the game on all these issues. This is a terrific transportation plan; the environmental impact report is very comprehensive and covers the issues that are important today, but they are changing everyday. Tomorrow there will be different global issues that we need to deal with and those will be incorporated into the next plan. And I think the way we work together on this Board, and any other County looking at the example we set for these issues will find that this Plan is a good start, is a good continuance of reasonable and realistic prospects for growth and public transportation within the ability to pay for it. I support the Plan.

Councilmember Monroe stated that he has three points, two specific and one kernel of wisdom from the Monroe side. First, Mr. Gallegos, could you help me and some of the others with the difference between an EIR for a program and an EIR for a project? I think that is one of the issues that we are facing today.

Mr. Gallegos stated that the RTP EIR looks at a programmatic level to look at the transportation system from a 20,000 or 30,000 thousand foot view. A lot of the projects do not have a lot of detailed environmental assessments so we are kind of looking at a higher global view. But, all the projects in the RTP require a project level EIR and that is where you get into the nitty gritty of how you deal with water quality, how you deal with sound impacts, how you deal with visual impacts, how you go about getting 404 permits, 1,601 permits, Section 7, and the list goes on and on. It is usually in the project level EIRs that you get a more refined look at what the environmental impacts are and how you attempt to try to mitigate for those.

Councilmember Monroe stated that he hoped that was helpful. Number two, I'd like to talk about the Mid-City issue and thank you Jim for bringing it up. I did attend the workshop

the other night and 100+ plus people, and Pedro, did a great job of understanding what had been promised and then he essentially looked at them and said we can't do that. I would tell you that from the other night, and Toni Atkins' leadership was important in this, but the idea of a centerline BRT is dead, and it was probably this meeting that let people of the Mid-City accept that reality. And, I think you will shake your head and say that happened at that meeting too. But they have now formed a working group of great people to figure out how to bring BRT into that area at those two stations, and I think burying one and moving on is the other. It is supposed to be done by 2012 so my particular question is, when they decide what to do, is the funding for the project there even though it is undefined in here in the Constrained budget. Because one of the big deals of our Board here is we say we promise the voters, they were promised this, and we can't do what we promise, but is there money to do the result of that working group?

Mr. Hix responded that yes, there is money for the stations and the BRT development.

Councilmember Monroe continued with his third point. I often have to personally remember the difference between maximize and optimize. I think we hear a number of speakers that come before us with their interests and they want us to maximize a certain thing. They want us to maximize transit, they want us to maximize land use, they want us to maximize density and other things. And, I think our job really is to optimize transportation. And, I think this particular RTP does that. And, we at the elected official level, we need to balance the interests of many people and come up with what is optimum in terms of transportation. I think we did that with *TransNet* II extension, I'm proud of the work that we did there, and we built a big tent to try to get a lot of people involved. One of the things that I've learned in the past is that if we optimize anything in the system, you very seldom maximize any element of that system. And that is just one of those things that happen. So, when I do listen to people, like Mr. McFetridge, I know where he is coming from, I know what he wants us to maximize, but I walk back a little bit and say, hey, there is a bigger picture. There is land use, there is density, there is economic development, there is all of these things too and rather than maximize any one of those, we optimize the whole system. And, I think we did that.

Councilmember Crawford stated that I do not think my comments are going to come as a surprise to anybody on this Board. I am pretty consistent in the issues and comments that I have made over the years. I want to start out by making a similar comment to that of Mr. McFetridge in that my inability to support this Plan is no reflection on the hard work of staff, or the hard work of the Transportation Committee. It is in fact a reflection of the hard work that was done by the members of our Stakeholders Working Group. Del Mar has been sounding the alarm about the impacts of growth long before I was on this Board back in the 80s when the City sued, as many of you recall, in opposition to what was then called North City West, because of concerns about traffic congestion, quality of life issues, and those sorts of things. So, our little community is long on record about many of the points that I continue to raise here. And, my opposition to this Plan is because it is not transit-oriented enough. And, I voted against the modifications that were made, along with what I believe is my sister city, back in October because I preferred an option that would bring us closer to a more transit-oriented approach even if it's still not perfect for some. I've had the pleasure of spending the last year and a half or so chairing the Stakeholders Working Group meetings; prior to that it was Jack Dale. That group has been meeting for pretty much the whole two and a half year period that we have been working on this. The folks on that committee represent all parts of the county, people from all walks of life, many who came to that

group that weren't as well informed about transportation or transit or what's going on with goods movement at the border or with Riverside or Orange Counties as perhaps members of this Board, and yet over time as they became more and more informed about transportation and transit issues, I saw them become more and more committed to seeing changes in the way that we are doing things and that many of the suggestions that our own Stakeholders Working Group made about how we could improve transit service, encourage people to get out of their cars are in fact in the letters that we have received recently. Some of the examples in the letter from Shute, Mihaly on behalf of SOFAR, the list of suggestions that they identify as coming in fact from the Attorney General's previous letters about the draft EIR. Things like passenger amenities, improved transit access, transit information, marketing and promotions, all these things have come, we have heard about that from our own constituents who are represented on the Stakeholders Working Group. And, I don't believe that we have done a good enough job here in demonstrating the leadership necessary to incorporate many of those things, to be more aggressive in incorporating those things into this Plan. And, I understand that we are an aircraft carrier, we are not a skiff, and it takes a long time; you have to set your course, and it is hard to turn an aircraft carrier on a dime. I'm not a pilot, but I certainly appreciate that. And, I know that we are trying to make changes and that we are in a tough spot because regulations are changing. The CEQA regulations for example give us no guidance about what to do about AB 32. We are navigating in the dark on that one. So, we are in a tough spot now and I appreciate that but my gut is telling me now that I cannot support this because it's going to be too little too late. We are at a critical juncture and Mr. McFetridge has made that point very eloquently today and Senator Mills, I really appreciate him taking the time to come down here and share comments with us that actually reflect things that the public was telling him and other leaders decades ago about what they want us to do. They are looking to us for leadership in solving problems that they do not know how to solve or what to do, and we are the ones they elect, we are the ones that they look to to take care of their public health, to deal with issues about the increase in particulates. Supervisor Roberts knows better than any of us about the air quality issues in this county, and the increased use of automobiles is doing nothing for the public health of our children, for us. There is more and more data coming out about that. The increase in lanes on I-5 and we have more and more particulates in Del Mar than we ever have had before. It is collecting on all of our plants, on the ground; it is there, you may not realize it, but it is there, you are breathing it. And even in coastal communities where we have prevailing winds, we are seeing higher and higher levels of particulates that are a direct result from the increased freeway usage and increased reliance on automobiles. So, I for one believe that we are not acting quickly enough to address these critical issues and so for that reason, I will oppose this Plan, as I said not a surprise to you all, and I will continue to encourage us to make changes more rapidly. I very much appreciate Mayor Madrid's suggestion that we begin this process today to make plans to make changes even though I too believe that the adoption of this Plan is a fait accompli, but I believe we should at least make a commitment to look toward making greater changes in anticipation of the requirements of AB 32 and what will be coming down the pike.

Supervisor Roberts asked to make a few quick comments. There are some things that concern me about this Plan, and I've spoken out on these before. I remain skeptical of HOV lanes and the real impact, and I'm concerned that for the most part, they seem to be de facto toll lanes. And, I also remain concerned about the fact that we are talking about now toll lanes now in North County. They may be more honest than the HOV lanes, but they are the same thing in effect. We are gravitating to a system where people who can pay

will be able to move around the freeways, and those who can't will probably have to sit and wait, and I don't think that is a healthy sign. But, in spite of that, I'm going to support this Plan and hope that maybe we can work our way through some of those things in the future. There are a couple of things that I did want to mention though. On page 517, it talks about air quality, and it was mentioned just a minute ago. It mentions, and it is legal and correct, but is misleading. It talks about the federal eight-hour standard, and it does recognize that we have met the federal one-hour standard for ozone, most of you, your eyes will glaze over when you get these things, and appropriately so. The good news is we actually in June or July of this coming year will be acknowledged for having that federal eight-hour standard, and we will be the first urban area in California to have done so. And, the fact of the matter even with respect to particulates and other things is we are doing fine, we are improving, we are not getting worse, and you need to understand that we were working to improve. Ten years ago, we were theoretically discussing what is called PM 10, which is 10 microns -- a very small particulate. We were theoretically discussing, now we are regulating at PM 2.5, and you will see the results of that. It isn't up to SANDAG to fret over everything that is going on and think you have to solve all the problems of the world. If we could do a better job on the road and transportation systems, I'd be a lot happier. And we want to use this as a debate body. I'm also concerned about one thing that somebody else brought up and that is the funding at one third, one third, one third. I'd like to absolutely make sure that we are giving public transit with no questions ever to be able to raise over that because I think that is going to be part of the solution. I think some of the comments that I hear about climate change and fretting over that, doesn't fully understand what is going on at a state level and the things that can be done to significantly affect what we are going to be able to do. Regulations and I can tell you from an air stand point, they are coming. They are going to change this whole analysis and it is not whether you have done something or not, the systems that are heavily contributing, they are going to be changed. And they are things that will be beyond your reach to able to change. You can't negotiate with the auto manufacturers, you can't do a lot of the things that will need to be done that will significantly change that, and the doomsday scenarios that are being painted, I guess I've been through this too many times and I'm reading a book now, in the 16th Century when all of the religious groups were predicting the end of the world, and it sounds so much like today that it is just incredible to me. People are smarter than that, and people will make changes and I can tell you that change is coming in a significant way and because we in our little jurisdictions sometimes don't know about these things, we probably have an obligation, if we are going to be hoisting such concern over them, to get a little bit better educated about what is happening and not just go to hear an occasional speaker. I think our Attorney General needs to go to some of these meetings and get himself a little more fully informed. So there are some positive things coming, I'm going to support this. I might mention one thing that happened just recently, I think it was mid-November, and it was the San Diego Architectural Foundation has announced a new urban design award and it is going to be given annually. Mary knows about this as she was actually honored, if I remember correctly. It is going to be given in acknowledgment of a project in a community where the community participates in the development of the project, and it is going to acknowledge smart growth and green building along with good planning and good architecture. And the nice thing about this is that in addition to some wonderful plaque that is usually given there is going to be a grant of some significant dollars given to that community to make a physical improvement in that community that the community wants to make. You will hear more about this, but I think it is going to reinforce some of the things that we are trying to do here. I don't think this Plan is perfect, but there aren't too many perfect plans out there. I think it is a good plan and as I say it gives us the opportunity

I think I personally work towards changing and maybe improving on some of the parts that I continue to have discomfort with but I will support.

Mayor Morrison stated that he had a few quick comments and a couple of questions, one to staff. I heard the comment about people not wanting San Diego to grow in population and we don't want the million people, if I could ask of the five regions that we are a part of – Orange County, Riverside County, Imperial County, the Tijuana Region and then San Diego region, which one is growing at the smallest rate?

Mr. Gallegos replied, easy answer, San Diego.

Mayor Morrison stated that is exactly what is already happening. Everyone else around us is growing much larger and a lot of that is because these conditions we have made here, they are moving there and still working here, which is causing more of a transportation problem. I'd like some of those people to come back so we don't have them traveling 100 miles to go to work here. And, I'd like for my kids to actually be able to live here instead of having to move to Imperial County or somewhere. So that is one thing on that one. The other thing that was in the Attorney General's letter which I got a chance to read late last night. There was one quote that says a 38 percent increase in freeway lane miles is a highway heavy solution to the region's mobility needs. I just hope someone will get that quote to Roger Hitchcock. Beyond that, the other one being, in listening to Duncan awhile ago and could only about 99 percent applaud the things that I heard and for a good number of reasons. The area within that whole trolley ring, I think is something very poor and that we go on our peanut butter effect type of thing where we got to make sure that all of our different jurisdictions get something and all the different areas so that we get consensus. There can be a regional plan that doesn't have to affect specifically every area of the region and still have regional significance and have an impact upon the quality of life within the entire region. And I think we have spent a lot of money on that trolley system; the trolley system is not going to be expanding anymore once we probably get out to UTC. That's probably going to be basically it, why are we not using it more and capitalizing on it more? Another thing is a lot of that area is redevelopment area, we talk about housing and this term affordable, I wish we would throw that term out, there is no such thing as affordable housing in Southern California, the closest thing is subsidized housing and that takes a huge amount of money. Those areas within that ring, for the most part, are redevelopment areas. You put larger projects and more housing in that redevelopment area, 20 percent set aside has to go to affordable housing. There becomes our pot of money to do the affordable housing. To me that makes more sense so I would like to see us put more heavy weight as we start looking toward projects toward the idea of transit-oriented housing and transit-oriented projects. I think that once again, not so much the stick approach but the opposite, a carrot approach. Of course, if a carrot is big enough it looks like a stick, but I would like to make that carrot look a lot juicier. With that, I know we say sometimes that to our public, densification is not acceptable, but they want to accept the regional money. I think they need to go hand-in-hand, so we take a look at that. I know within our community that we are currently looking just on National City Boulevard. We have already planned for 10,000 housing units just on that one street alone. But, with that is an entire transit-oriented system. I'm sorry we are not depending on MTS for that transit. We are developing our own to make sure it happens. But, with that also are the parks and all the amenities going along with that. I say that, saying I'm very much for transit, and very much for transit-oriented development, but I don't necessarily think that transit by itself is always the answer because sometimes it is not the answer to congestion relief because all too often a bus with only a

driver and one person in it is more of a congestion problem than it is helping. So, I think, once again, while I am for mass transit I have a problem with public transit, trying to think that transit is for everybody. And, I think we could make better use of our transit dollars to make sure that we make a larger dent within the problem. The Plan, I think, I agree with my dear colleague from Del Mar, has a number of flaws, but it is because a lot of this is what started several years ago and things are constantly changing and as our Director has stated, we will probably be taking a very short breather and be immediately starting on the next one. And, I think we can do a much better job as we take a look at the change in things around us. So, while I think there are a lot of things that need to be addressed in here and I think we can do it as we do individual funding sources and we put criteria in, to make this a lot more applicable to the individual moment, I will be voting for it. If I could ask a legal issue, the Briggs Law Corporation put in a letter and had three legal questions concerning our actual actions today. One was on not having a public hearing on this version of the proposal, another one was on not having any notice of public hearing given in Riverside or Orange Counties, and the other one was on the insufficient findings and insufficient evidence, and I'm just wondering if we could have some comment made from our legal department on that.

John Kirk, Deputy General Counsel, stated that the first point raised was the assertion that the public hearing is mandated to involve the exact versions of the RTP that is before the Board today. The actual language of that section simply provides that prior to adoption of the RTP, a public hearing shall be held and then goes on to provide noticing provisions. It does not specify that it must be the absolute version that will be adopted. And, the purpose of that public meeting would be defeated if the body's hands were tied to adopt any meaningful comments that were elicited as a result of that meeting. So, I don't see the Government Code mandating what is asserted in the letter. As to the second point, they are looking for public hearings happening in Riverside and Orange County. That is not, again, what the Government Code provides. The Government Code provides for a public hearing, one public hearing after giving notice of the hearing in a publication in the affected county or counties. So, while it doesn't look for a hearing to happen in anywhere else that is affected, it simply looks for notice of the hearing that happens here to be given in other areas that may be affected. I am informed by staff that we did give notice in both Orange and Riverside Counties. And, finally, simply the broad assertion that there are insufficient findings for the Statement of Overriding Considerations, ultimately the ...

[Current tape ends.]

[New tape begins.]

...presupposes that there will be differing opinions on these and ultimately under Public Resources Code 21-168.5, the measure is whether there is substantial evidence to support the action that you took. It allows for disagreement amongst experts but says that disagreement amongst experts does not make an EIR inadequate and courts have looked, not for perfection, but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure taking into account the comments that were elicited as a part of that public screening process. And, it is my opinion that our staff has done just that.

Mayor Lesa Heebner (City of Solana Beach) stated I live in a community where the COASTER stops and as I climbed on the COASTER this morning, it was broken. We then had to climb off of the COASTER and get on to the Amtrak to come down here and what that usually

does is engender a lot of chattiness among people. What the topic of conversation was, was how come there isn't more investment in transit in this area. And, I spoke with many people about that this morning. It reemphasized my vote today, which I will not be supporting the RTP because I live in a city where I hear this frequently from our residents and that is why there isn't more investment in transit, and I mean rail transit, so that we can have more service frequency, late-night service, and so forth. I certainly understand that it is a hard choice between more freeway lanes and more transit. I certainly appreciate all the work that has gone into this document in the many years and appreciate the comments that were made by all of our speakers. I think what tips the scale for me toward voting against this because I was wishing for more rail transit infrastructure is the increase in greenhouse gas emissions. I think that we are on the right track, that we are working hard toward that I hear that, people though have been asking us to change and I think we need to change a little bit more quickly than we are. As to the comments that were about smart growth, I would be happy to hear more of those in the Regional Planning Committee. I think that the Committee this year has to take a breather; there is not a lot that's been going on. I think it would be interesting to take a look at somebody who made a distinction in one of the letters about creating smart growth communities versus smart growth projects. I would also like to take a look at what we have learned from our experience with smart growth over the recent years of the 10,000 units that have been built since the last monitoring report, only 1,200 have been smart growth. Why is that? What is the difference, where are they? Can we learn from them? One of the first things, I remember commenting at the very first retreat I went to is that there are 18 jurisdictions and only 7 designations for smart growth. I think there should be 18. I think we need to tailor our designations to the city's particulars. If we were to densify two square miles of Solana Beach that would be half of Solana Beach. It would completely densify Del Mar. So, I don't think that would work in our communities but it might in some other areas. So, again probably like my sister city, my remarks are no surprise, but I will not be supporting this. However, I understand the effort that has gone into it.

Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego) stated I'll be short and brief, but I usually vote against things. But I am going to vote for this. To me, perfect is when a plan comes together and it gets finished and it works. So, to me this is going to be perfect. I think staff did a lot of work on this. I've been to a lot of these meetings over the last few years. I know it is not the panacea. I prefer more lanes on the freeways. I find it ironic that the cities who want more transit don't want any more density in their cities. That's a problem. The SPRINTER line which we put in, which the Attorney General seems to have addressed, the San Marcos area, we are putting in the SPRINTER line. I think we need to increase the densities within a two-mile radius of that rail line. That is public transit; that is what you have all been talking about. We have to go the further step. I'm sorry the climate is changing. I don't think my car had anything to do with it. It is an issue. I would return to the water issue at some point, which I think we have to address. Not just the regional water quality or what have you. I think we are going to have to address this for the State of California. But I'm going to vote for this. I would just ask you folks who are going to vote against it, I think you need to look at the policies you have in your own cities. Everyone likes to live at the beach. And, I don't think they would mind living in high rises. And, if you are going to put everybody along the coast so they can ride the train to work, I think that would solve part of Mr. McFetridge's complaints. So, unless we are going to castrate everybody at ten years of age, we are still going to get the million people.

Councilmember Jack Feller (City of Oceanside) stated I don't have a lot of questions because I actually read the RTP, not the thick book because that would glaze me over, but this book here, I read that. There are things that I don't agree with in there. It says State Route 78 and 5 will be built by 2030. That doesn't impress me much. In a plan like this, I think we all understand that we cannot all get everything we want, and at this point, it's a great point made, this is when we start again. Probably even the guy in the yellow shirt over there, Mr. Madrid, said it. We should all start over right now for the next update and so, I'm going to certainly support this. I was around when we started this process, and I think that it is probably time to go to lunch. I call for the question.

Mayor Cheryl Cox (City of Chula Vista) stated I just reached over and said I'm going to call for the question so he beat me to it. Just as a city of 55 square miles that has struggled with smart growth concepts and making sure that jobs and housing and transportation all balance, I agree with the comments that each of our jurisdictions needs to do what we can do to promote all those elements so that people stay off the roads and maybe live and work in the same community. But that said, Chula Vista has benefited tremendously by the opening of SR 125 as has the southern areas of San Diego and the southern areas of San Diego County. Chula Vista has plans for a BRT that's going to run from east to west. We also benefit from the Blue Line which is the highest trafficked and the highest cost revenue recipient of mass transit. So, I think the population in the southern portion of the county is certainly trying to do its part on encouraging mass transit, but if we don't get that congestion taken care of, either by convincing people they can live and work in the same city, or to make sure that transportation is available and easy for people to access, we are going to live with the congestion. So, while people are talking about making sure there is money for mass transit and making sure there is money to eliminate congestion, I would also like to remind us that, our voters, when they voted for this, thought they were going to see some of the results themselves, so we can't forget that we've got local road improvements to do as well. I do agree with Mayor Madrid that we need to pay attention to the comments of our speakers, but having lived through a 700 page EIR of comments that I know Commissioner Rios is well aware of on the Bayfront and hundreds of pages of EIR comments on SR 125 that took 11 years to get where it's going, I can say that rather than reading the verbatim comments of speakers, I would really appreciate having staff pull this into some sort of a matrix similar to what they did in their earlier transportation comments. I was not as thorough as I wanted to be in reading this big book, but I certainly did go through this one and in order to be respectful to the public, I think we need to make sure that the electeds have an opportunity to digest some of those comments. And, I also want to add that Chula Vista will support this Plan. I do think it's a work in progress but in making sure that we can have this Plan be supported, I think we also need to give recognition to Mary Sessom, Gary Gallegos, and to one of our County Supervisors for making that field trip up to Sacramento and making sure that that \$400 million is indeed allocated to San Diego County. So, with that, I am gratified for the staff report, like to see this get going, certainly thank the speakers and to let you know it makes sense for all of us to do whatever we can to promote smart growth, sustainable energy, renewable energy and so forth. I'll call for the question.

Chair Sessom stated we have a motion of the floor to adopt that first bullet point, I see no more discussion, please vote.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by First Vice Chair Pfeiler, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved Resolution No. 2008-08 certifying the Final

Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 San Diego RTP, and adopted the Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Yes – 16 (weighted vote, 98%). No – 2 (weighted vote, 2%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – San Marcos.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Second Vice Chair Stocks, the SANDAG Board of Directors found that the 2030 RTP Revenue Constrained Plan was in conformance with the State Implementation Plans for air quality. Yes – 16 (weighted vote, 98%). No – 2 (weighted vote, 2%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – San Marcos.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that as we do the last motion which is to approve Resolution No. 2009-09, which adopts the air quality conformity determination and the 2030 RTP itself, I've talked with our attorney, Mr. Kirk, and he is going to make sure that the letter is incorporated from Mr. Powell. I don't know if you want to respond to that.

Mr. Kirk stated that yes, it will be with the language that is set forth in the November 30, 2007, letter from the City Heights Community Development Corporation page two with the correction of page numbers. Where it reads on item one page 6-27 that will instead refer to 6-28; where that set forth on item two 6-29 will instead refer to 6-27; at item three reference to page A-17 will instead refer to A-19, and on item four the reference to page A-19 shall instead refer to page A-21; the substance of the comments are unchanged simply correct references to where those do appear.

Councilmember Madaffer stated I just want to offer one last word on this motion which does adopt the RTP and that's that this document really is our transportation blueprint through 2030, but one of the things that the Executive Committee, and I share this will all the Board members, has talked about is encouraging state legislation that does exactly what Mr. McFetridge was talking about and that is to encourage incentive dollars back into our jurisdictions to actually put infrastructure first and to do what we can in that area along the lines of smart growth principles for the urban core. So, I think that a lot of what this body is already doing while we may not be talking about it specifically today is incumbent on the work that is moving forward in the future. And, I just wanted to offer that observation as I make the motion again to approve Resolution No. 2008-09 adopting the air quality conformity determination and the 2030 RTP with the interlineations that Mr. Kirk has indicated.

Mayor Morrison asked the Director, the additional language, just for clarification so I have a full understanding, will that in anyway constrain us on any projects or be something that five years from now we go, whoops, why did we do that?

Mr. Gallegos stated I don't believe so from the perspective that the projects being built right now are the projects that are in your TIP and that's the next five years. So you will be adopting this and looking at it probably once more before we get to those projects, I think we are okay.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by First Vice Chair Pfeiler, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved Resolution No. 2008-09 adopting the air quality conformity and the 2030 RTP with the interlineations as indicated by Counsel. Yes – 16 (weighted vote, 98%). No – 2 (weighted vote, 2%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – San Marcos.

14. 2006 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 9 (APPROVE)

Sookyung Kim, Financial Programming Manager, presented this item. Ms. Kim stated that required public hearings were held in accordance with Board policy. Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) amendments are approved by the Transportation Committee. She stated that the Board of Directors needs to approve Amendment No. 9 due to federal regulations that require finding the amendment and the RTIP in conformance with the adopted RTP. The RTP was adopted at this meeting. The Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC) reviewed the recommendation with only one significant comment regarding the California Transportation Commission's recent deferral of STIP funds due to state budgetary concerns. The ITOC suggested that the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors be briefed regarding the impact on *TransNet*-funded projects. Ms. Kim stated that there are 66 total projects affected by the Amendment and briefly reviewed one of the projects and its recommended funding changes.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Horn and a second by Second Vice Chair Stocks, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved Resolution No. 2008-10 approving Amendment No. 9 to the 2006 RTIP, which finds the Amendment in conformance with State Implementation Plans for air quality. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – San Marcos.

15. TRANSIT PROJECT PROGRAMMING AMENDMENT (APPROVE)

Councilmember Madaffer presented the item and stated that the Transportation Committee recommended approval of the transfer of funds and stated that the transfer of funds was necessary due to the implementation of the new fare structure.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Roberts and a second by Councilmember Jack Dale (City of Santee), the SANDAG Board of Directors approved a transfer of the \$4.5 million currently programmed on the Regional Transportation Management System project to a project to extend acquisition of farebox collection equipment to MTS Contract Buses. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – San Marcos.

16. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for Friday, December 21, 2007, at 9 a.m. **Please note that the December Board meeting will be held on the third Friday of the month due to the holiday schedule.**

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

**SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING
NOVEMBER 30, 2007
ATTENDANCE**

JURISDICTION/ ORGANIZATION	NAME	ATTENDING
City of Carlsbad	Matt Hall (Member)	Yes
City of Chula Vista	Cheryl Cox (Member)	Yes
City of Coronado	Phil Monroe (Member)	Yes
City of Del Mar	Crystal Crawford (Member)	Yes
City of El Cajon	Mark Lewis (Member)	Yes
City of Encinitas	Jerome Stocks, 2nd Vice Chair (Member)	Yes
City of Escondido	Lori Holt Pfeiler, 1st Vice Chair (Member)	Yes
City of Imperial Beach	Jim Janney (Member)	Yes
City of La Mesa	Art Madrid (Member)	Yes
City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom, Chair (Member)	Yes
City of National City	Ron Morrison (Member)	Yes
City of Oceanside	James Wood (Member)	Wood: 9:00-10:23 a.m.; Jack Feller: 11:17 a.m. – 12:01 p.m.
City of Poway	Mickey Cafagna (Member)	Yes
City of San Diego – A	Jim Madaffer (1st Alternate)	Yes
City of San Diego - B	Toni Atkins (Member B)	No
City of San Marcos	Jim Desmond (Member)	No
City of Santee	Jack Dale (Member)	Yes
City of Solana Beach	Lesa Heebner (Member)	Yes
City of Vista	Judy Ritter (Member)	Yes
County of San Diego - A	Ron Roberts (Member A)	Yes
County of San Diego - B	Bill Horn (Member B)	Yes
Caltrans	Pedro Orso-Delgado (Alternate)	Yes
MTS	Harry Mathis (Member)	Yes
NCTD	Ed Gallo (Member)	Yes
Imperial County	Victor Carrillo (Member)	No
US Dept. of Defense	CAPT Steve Wirshing (Member)	Yes
SD Unified Port District	Sylvia Rios (Member)	Yes
SD County Water Authority	Marilyn Dailey (Member)	Yes
Baja California/Mexico	Ricardo Pineda (Alternate)	Yes
Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association	Robert H. Smith (Member)	No