Chair Mary Sessom (East County) called the Executive Committee meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   Upon a motion by Second Vice Chair Jerome Stocks (North County Coastal) and a second by First Vice Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland), the minutes of the December 7, 2007, Executive Committee meeting were unanimously approved.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS**

   There were no public comments, communications, or member comments.

**CONSENT (3 through 4)**

3. **FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE STATUS REPORT (INFORMATION)**

   This status report provides an update on recent federal legislative activities.

   **Action:** This item was presented for information only.

4. **INFORMATION ON PROPOSITIONS 91 AND 93 ON THE FEBRUARY 5, 2008, PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY BALLOT (INFORMATION)**

   This item summarizes state propositions relevant to SANDAG on the February 5, 2008, Presidential Primary ballot.

   **Action:** This item was presented for information only.

**REPORTS (5 through 7)**

5. **PROPOSED FY 2008 BUDGET AND OVERALL WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT: COASTAL RAIL TRADE CORRIDOR PROJECTS (APPROVE)**

   Jim Linthicum, Division Director of Engineering and Construction, reported that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) recently published guidelines for the
Proposition 1B Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF) program, and the region is preparing applications for a target amount of $400 million, which includes $139 million for projects in the Coastal Rail Corridor. We need consultant assistance to prepare the application materials. The applications are due on Thursday, January 17, 2008. In addition to preparing information for the applications, there will be follow-up activities and public hearings by staff and consultants before projects receive final approval. CTC project selection is anticipated for April. An amendment to the FY 2008 Budget and Overall Work Program (OWP) would include development of Coastal Rail Corridor TCIF application materials to allow SANDAG to respond to the opportunity to seek such TCIF funds. Contingency Reserve funds in the amount of $100,000 are proposed to fund this effort.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, said that in this particular corridor, and with the statewide competition for TCIF funds, we see the benefit of ensuring that project costs are accurate.

Mr. Linthicum added that existing information needs to be updated, and there is now a freight emphasis rather than a passenger emphasis.

Mayor Ron Morrison (South County) asked about our chances of getting these funds. Mr. Gallegos responded that there is a range of $250 - $400 million available for our region. He was optimistic that if we have good projects we will get funding. The key is whether we can deliver the projects.

Councilmember Matt Hall (North County Coastal) asked about the timeline for this action. Mr. Linthicum replied that the consultants have been working on developing the information for the applications since we received the CTC TCIF guidelines in December 2007. Final documents will be submitted to us early next week, and we will submit the applications to Sacramento by the January 17, 2008, deadline.

Mr. Gallegos noted that the CTC will start to make their funding decisions in April. He added that one of our agency’s strengths is that we provide good work products.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Greg Cox (County of San Diego), and a second by Second Vice Chair Stocks, the Executive Committee voted unanimously to use up to $100,000 of Contingency Reserve funds and approve an amendment to Work Element No. 3000900 of the FY 2008 Budget and Overall Work Program for the development of TCIF application materials for Coastal Rail Corridor projects.

6. SENATE BILL 375 (DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Genevieve Morelos, Senior Legislative Analyst, reported that Senate Bill (SB) 375 was introduced last year by Senator Darrell Steinberg (D-Sacramento). The current SANDAG position on this bill is to “oppose.” In August 2007, the bill was held in the Appropriations Committee with a condition that the League of California Cities (League), one of the main opponents to SB 375, would work with the bill sponsor and author on the bill. During that time, the League has held a series of meetings on amendments, and SANDAG has participated in those meetings. SANDAG staff developed suggested changes to the bill, which are summarized in the staff report. The amendments proposed by the League include
the proposed SANDAG amendments. The League’s strategy is to give these amendments to the bill’s sponsor with the understanding that an incentive package would go along with the amendments.

Chair Sessom reaffirmed that we have a pretty firm decision in opposition of this measure. Our discussion should center around whether we are on the right track with regard to the proposed amendments. The bill’s proponents continue to work on this bill. SANDAG General Counsel has expressed concerns about this bill. We should continue work to make this bill as acceptable as possible as it is mostly likely going to be approved by the Legislature. The main task is how to lessen any negative impact this bill might have on the San Diego region.

First Vice Chair Pfeiler said that part of what we have at stake is our reputation. If we want to keep that, we can’t be odd man out on this bill. The way we get things done is to have a united front.

Chair Sessom agreed that we have to keep our position in context with where we fit in the whole state.

Mayor Mickey Cafagna (North County Inland) said that this is the most important bill he has seen as an elected official, and it is the tip of a huge iceberg. It is a worldwide issue and it has to be resolved on a worldwide basis. He referred to the second page of the staff report where it talks about emission targets for greenhouse gas emissions sources. Our transportation plans will be altered if we don’t meet those targets. Poway cannot meet the sustainable community targets for greenhouse gas emissions. We will spend millions of dollars trying to achieve these goals. There is nothing in the bill about carbon offsets. We don’t know if what we do will even have an affect on global warming. He didn’t think that our recommended amendments will be acceptable to the bill’s author. In the long run, someone has to take a stand and it is our responsibility to take that stand. That’s why we are respected, because we take stands that are important, and this is one we have to lead on.

Mayor Morrison agreed with Mayor Cafagna. Our approach needs to be that we have been the instrument for change in the State of California, but we want to make sure it is sensible change. We have made practical changes that have made a difference.

Mayor Cafagna said the question is: what can we do about global warming? They are not giving us any money for public transportation to get cars off the road yet they want us to reduce automobile vehicle miles traveled (VMT). We are doing our share and we don’t need more restrictions.

Second Vice Chair Stocks commented his interest in what the League feels about this bill. He said that Mayor Cafagna brought up some good points. We are respected throughout the state and have an obligation to politely, and in a meaningful way, question when the state appears to be working at cross-purposes. He asked if reducing greenhouse gases is the primary goal of the state compared to housing and transportation issues. We should ask this question about the state’s priorities.
Chair Sessom mentioned that she has been sitting in on the negotiation sessions, and they have been taking that approach. One issue is the timelines that conflict with what the California Air Resources Board (CARB) is supposed to be doing. Another issue is coordinating with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The best we can do is to ensure the amendments make sense.

Mr. Gallegos stated that these three areas are not at odds. The primary intent of this bill is to reduce VMT. The facts are that our own plans show that VMT will continue to grow. The idea of the RHNA program is to house people in their own region to reduce VMT. Another piece is that our smart growth map is a good start, but only 40 percent of the smart growth areas are in the cities’ General Plans. Our Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) indicators were not positive last year. We have a lot of good ideas and have the potential to move them forward, but there is a lot of detail in how to implement the ideas. Since the RCP was approved, the Legislature passed and signed AB 32. We will get a greenhouse target from CARB, and we don’t know how we are going to make it work. If you can increase densities so that people don’t have to drive between counties to get to where they work, you will reduce the VMT. Where the bill falls short is that it only looks at transportation, and this issue should be looked at comprehensively.

Mayor Cafagna stated that SANDAG has plans designed to eliminate sprawl as fast as the money will allow, but we have to piecemeal the effort because we don’t have sufficient money.

Mr. Gallegos said that staff is working with the bill’s author to take in account what we have already done.

Kim Kawada, Policy/Legislative Affairs Program Manager, said that in terms of AB 32 consistency, CARB is responsible for the statewide approach. One of the things SB 375 requires is regional greenhouse gas emission targets set by CARB. The bill’s author has indicated a willingness to make changes in coordination with CARB. The way the bill is written you get regional targets from CARB and evaluate whether your plans meet these targets. We did a quick analysis from the RCP that assumed all smart growth areas were implemented, and that shows only a small decrease in greenhouse gas emissions compared to current local plans and policies. Trying to achieve the 1990 emission standards as required by AB 32 is going to be difficult, and we expect that in addition to the sustainable communities strategy, we would need to development the supplement that is required under SB 375.

Mayor Cafagna asked about carbon offsets. Ms. Kawada said that SB 375 does not specifically address carbon offsets. We are trying to tie SB 375 in with AB 32, which sets forth the more comprehensive approach.

Mr. Gallegos noted that in order to have any chance to achieve the requirements of the legislative and executive branches in AB 32, we need to look at all those things and not just at transportation in isolation.
Mayor Cafagna pointed out that we don’t control emissions from an automobile or the pollution from India and China, the most polluting countries in the world. We don’t even know if our efforts to control stormwater runoff are making a difference.

Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) said that the League is actively discussing a way that SB 375 can work with the intent of AB 32. We have 40 million people in the State of California, and it is hard to tell one part of the state that it should do things the same way as another part. Cars and trucks are responsible for more than 30 percent of the carbon emissions. We have done a lot of things we aren’t getting credit for. On one side they cut money for transit and then on the other side they want to reduce VMTs from automobiles. We should exert our leadership position to fashion an alternative to show the state there is more than one way to achieve the end game. What is absent in this bill is a focus on the whole picture. He mentioned several concepts that are incumbent in SB 375. We should demand more land use components to this bill. We should reward cities for smart planning efforts that are consistent with these tenets. This bill only works for Sacramento and Los Angeles. The bill’s author needs to realize there are different portions of the state that work differently. One size doesn’t fit all. The League’s position on the bill remains opposed. He encouraged the Executive Committee members to attend the League’s meeting next week in San Diego.

Mr. Gallegos stated that one real important distinction in the way the game is played in Sacramento is if you take an “oppose” position, there is no incentive for the author to work with you. If you take an “oppose unless amended” position, it’s easier to get an audience with the author. Those two positions are looked at differently in Sacramento.

Councilmember Hall expressed concern that the people who generate these bills (AB 32 and SB 375) don’t understand that they should be blended together.

Mayor Cafagna asked if we know the feeling of the rest of the state on this matter. Ms. Morelos said that everyone has been working through the League requesting stronger language. The League is trying to unify agencies in the state.

Mayor Cafagna suggested that if this bill has a benefit to the Sacramento Association of Governments (SACOG), then the bill should be limited to SACOG.

Mr. Gallegos said that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in the Bay Area also is in support of this bill. Some of the transportation commissions under them are opposed. Mr. Gallegos agreed that each region around the state has different ways of doing things.

Supervisor Cox expressed appreciation for Mayor Cafagna’s comments, and philosophically he agreed with him, but he also recognized the comments by Mr. Gallegos. He suggested that we change our position to one of “oppose unless amended” to show we are willing to work with the author of the bill.

Supervisor Cox asked for one modification to item No. 3 of the staff recommendation, and provided a handout noting the proposed verbiage related to lands that are identified in
other local programs established for the protection of agricultural resources. The consensus was to add that change to the staff recommendation.

Second Vice Chair Stocks agreed with Supervisor Cox with the suggestion to change our position to “oppose unless amended.”

First Vice Chair Pfeiler wanted to be sure that by changing this position we are not agreeing to something we are opposed to. Mr. Gallegos said that the downside with this “oppose unless amended” position is that the author will want to know what the amendments are so you will have to be prepared with the amendments.

Mayor Cafagna asked how many agencies have a regional comprehensive plan. Mr. Gallegos responded that all four of the largest metropolitan areas in the state have such a plan.

First Vice Chair Pfeiler noted that other regions are pretty forward thinking. but the big split is when they cut off the transit money.

Mr. Gallegos said that our RCP is the only one required in state law and, as a result, we suggested that SANDAG be exempted from this bill.

Ms. Kawada suggested that we not change our position on SB 375 today, but wait until we know what amendments have been included in the latest version of the bill.

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, noted that all the major metropolitan areas have smart growth or land use components, but SANDAG’s is more advanced and clear cut. He suggested that we use our RCP as a framework for a climate change plan for this region.

Mr. Gallegos stated that at the end of the last legislative cycle, we suggested that SB 375 be limited to a SACOG bill or to consider Mr. Leiter’s suggestion for an alternative approach. The SB 375 sponsor and author did not want to limit the bill as proposed.

Councilmember Madaffer said that local government should be incentivized to make the changes without this bill.

Ms. Morelos noted that the proposed incentive package is still being developed by the League.

Chair Sessom reaffirmed that at this point we will leave our position on this bill as “oppose.” We have time to work with the League on its consensus building on proposed amendments. We will come to the Executive Committee in February with a status report.

Mr. Gallegos said that staff could work on some suggested amendments to bring back at that time.

Action: This item was presented for discussion only.
7. REVIEW OF JANUARY 25, 2008, DRAFT BOARD AGENDA (APPROVE)

Diane Eidam, Chief Deputy Executive Director, reviewed the draft agenda for the January 25, 2008, Board of Directors meeting. She noted that after the Board meeting we will have refreshments to recognize the work of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group. Staff proposes to add an item on the 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) proposal for funding the widening of State Route 76 and maintaining our current STIP priorities.

First Vice Chair Pfeiler asked about the subject matter for the February 8 Policy Board meeting. Mr. Gallegos replied that it is a report on the Economic Prosperity Strategy.

First Vice Chair Pfeiler asked that the subjects of Policy Board meetings be noted on future agendas.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer, and a second by First Vice Chair Pfeiler, the Executive Committee voted to approve the agenda for the January 25, 2008, Board of Directors meeting as revised.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for Friday, February 8, 2008, at 9 a.m.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Sessom adjourned the meeting at 10:16 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
### JANUARY 11, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt Pfeiler, 1st Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Mickey Cafagna</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Jerome Stocks, 2nd Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cheryl Cox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Hal Ryan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Jerry Sanders</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Toni Atkins</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Greg Cox</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Dianne Jacob</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>