MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT WORKING GROUP

Wednesday, December 2, 2009

3:30 to 5 p.m.

SANDAG, 7th Floor Board Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Anne Steinberger
(619) 699-1937
ast@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- SANDAG OVERVIEW
- 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN OVERVIEW
- INPUT ON DRAFT PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or visit www.511sd.com/transit for route information.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
## MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT WORKING GROUP

**Wednesday, December 2, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>APPROVE SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 7 AND NOVEMBER 4, 2009, MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and approve the meeting summaries of the October 7 and November 4, 2009, meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>COMMENT PUBLIC COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public who would like to address the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group (PWG) on a topic not on the agenda should do so at this time. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>INFORMATION MID-COAST TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT UPDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff will recap the November tour and respond to recommendations made by the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>INFORMATION SANDAG OVERVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff will present an overview of SANDAG roles and responsibilities and major programs and projects. As the forum for regional decision making, SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transportation, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>INFORMATION 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) OVERVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solutions to our region’s transportation needs require a comprehensive planning effort that coordinates land use and transportation and develops an integrated, multimodal transportation system. The RTP contains specific public policies and strategies, as well as projects and programs aimed at meeting the diverse mobility needs of our growing and changing region. Staff will present an overview of the 2050 RTP and development schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>DISCUSSION INPUT ON DRAFT PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN (PIP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | Members will be asked to provide input and feedback into the Draft PIP circulated for public comment on May 22, 2009. The PIP was provided to members at the September meeting. It is posted at [www.sandag.org/midcoast](http://www.sandag.org/midcoast). The discussion questions are included as an attachment.
8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for January 6, 2010.

9. ADJOURN
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AGENDA ITEM NO.: 2A

Action Requested: APPROVE

SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 7, 2009, MEETING

Members in Attendance:

Ron Roberts, Supervisor, County of San Diego (Chair)
William Beck, University City Community Planning Group
Anette Blatt, Scripps Health
Robert Emery, Retired MTS Board Member and Poway Councilmember
Brad Gessner, San Diego Convention Center General Manager
Debra Gutzmer, SAIC
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Charles Lungerhausen, SANDAG Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee
Lani Lutar, San Diego County Taxpayers Association
Evan McLaughlin, San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council/La Jolla resident
Barbara Obrutz, La Jolla resident
Jeff Perwin, Linda Vista Community Planning Group
Brooke Peterson, Clairemont Community Planning Group
Andrew Poat, San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation
David Potter, Clairemont resident
Carmen Sandoval, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
Ann Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage, Inc.
Chris Westling, UCSD student

Others in Attendance:

Eleanor Beck, UCPG
Debby Knight, Friends of Rose Canyon
Walter Shannon, Resident

SANDAG Staff in Attendance:

Leslie Blanda
Jack Boda
Greg Gastelum
Anne Steinberger
AGENDA ITEM #1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The PWG Chair Ron Roberts, County of San Diego Supervisor, called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM #2: SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2009, MEETING

Brooke Peterson, Clairemont Community Planning Group, made a motion to approve the September 9, 2009, meeting summary. Andrew Poat, San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation, seconded the motion and the summary was approved. Lani Lutar, San Diego County Taxpayers Association, abstained from the vote as she did not attend the last meeting.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment given.

AGENDA ITEM #4: APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR

Chair Roberts explained that at the first PWG meeting, he recommended delaying the appointment of a vice chair to allow the group to get better acquainted. Chair Roberts recommended the PWG appoint Bob Emery as the vice chair of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group. Mr. Emery has a long history of transit experience with the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and Metropolitan Transit Development Board. Ann Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage, Inc., made a motion appointing Mr. Emery as vice chair. William Beck, University City Community Planning Group, seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #5: MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT: FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION NEW STARTS PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Leslie Blanda, SANDAG, provided an overview of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts Program. The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is a TransNet project that was included in the original TransNet Ordinance passed in 1987, but remains incomplete. It received priority for implementation under the TransNet Extension Ordinance. The ordinance specifies that project implementation relies upon the receipt of federal funds. The FTA New Starts Program provides funds for fixed-guideway transit projects and extensions such as Light Rapid Transit, Bus Rapid Transit, and commuter rail transit. The funding is discretionary and is highly competitive.

FTA funding commitments are made through a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA), which establishes the scope of project, New Starts funding amount, and the schedule for federal funding.

Ms. Blanda explained that the New Starts criteria are established by the “Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users” and used by the FTA to evaluate/rate projects. She then reviewed the steps in the New Starts application process.
1. Initial New Starts application is submitted to the FTA with Preliminary Engineering (PE) application.

2. FTA must approve project entry into PE.

3. Once the project enters PE, New Starts application updates must be submitted annually to the FTA.

The FTA reviews and evaluates all New Starts application updates annually and prepares the Annual Report on Funding Recommendations to Congress. The Annual Report contains ratings for all projects in PE and final design and FTA project funding recommendation to Congress.

Ms. Blanda reviewed the evaluation criteria and rating system for New Starts. There are two main categories of evaluation criteria: Project Justification and Local Financial Commitment. To determine the overall rating for a project, average scores for Project Justification and Local Financial Commitment are taken.

The Project Justification Criteria is weighted as follows:

- **Mobility Improvements (20%)**: Number of transit trips using the project, user benefits per passenger mile on the project, number of trips by transit dependents using the project, transit dependent user benefits per passenger mile, and share of user benefits received by transit dependents compared to the share of transit dependents in the region.

- **Environmental Benefits (10%)**: Based on current Environmental Protection Agency air quality designation, projects in “high attainment” areas for transportation-related pollution receive a “high” rating; all others received a “medium.”

- **Operating Efficiencies (10%)**: Rating is based on difference between the ratios of Operating and Maintenance (O&M) Costs to Systemwide Passenger Miles and calculated for the Build and Baseline alternatives.

- **Economic Development Effects (20%)**: Growth management, transit supportive policies, supporting zoning regulations near transit, performance of land use policies, and potential impact of transit project on regional land use.

- **Cost Effectiveness (20%)**: The Cost Effectiveness Index (CEI) is calculated by adding the annualized capital cost plus annual O&M costs and dividing by the user benefits. The CEI measures costs per hour of “user benefits,” and the benefits/costs are measured against a “baseline” alternative.

- **Public Transit Supportive Land Use Policies and Future Patterns (20%)**: Existing land use patterns, transit supportive regional/local plans and policies, performance and impacts of land use policies, and other land use considerations.

- **Other Factors**: Environmental justice considerations and equity issues, opportunities for increased access to employment for low-income persons and welfare-to-work initiatives, evidence that the proposed project is a principal element of a congestion management strategy, and other factors which articulate benefits of the project not captured in the criteria.
The Local Financial Commitment Criteria are weighted as follows:

- **Non-New Starts Share (20%):** Need 50 percent or more from other sources, typically not more than $750 million.
- **Strength of Capital Funding Plan (50%):** Capital financial condition, commitment of Non-New Starts capital funds, and systemwide state of good repair.
- **Strength of Operating Funding Plan (30%):** Operating financial condition, financial capacity to operate and maintain all existing and planned services, TransNet provides O&M funding through 2048.

The overall project rating is based on the Project Justification rating (50%), and the Local Financial Commitment rating (50%). The rating scale used is “high,” “medium high,” “medium,” “medium low,” and “low.” To obtain an overall “medium” rating, the project requires at least a “medium” rating for Project Justification and Local Financial Commitment; a rating of “low” in either category will result in an overall rating of “low.” The project must receive an overall rating of “medium” to enter into PE or final design. The FTA recommends FFGAs for projects that are rated overall “medium” or higher, are rated “medium” or higher for cost effectiveness, are in the final design phase and demonstrate ‘readiness’ to utilize funds base on a reasonable schedule, and can be completed with New Starts funds within program resources.

Chair Roberts asked whether the PWG had questions.

Mr. Poat commented that this was a good presentation. He heard there is concern about the capacity for infill development along the route. Ms. Blanda explained that FTA looks at overall ridership and project benefits in their evaluation of the project. The project will be rated on overall productivity. Chair Roberts added that he has met with FTA staff in Washington, D.C., to discuss the region’s support of the project.

Ms. Peterson requested clarification on the reference to “performance of land use policies.” Ms. Blanda explained that as part of the analysis of alternatives, SANDAG is considering potential impacts to land use policies and whether this route would lead to any changes in land use.

Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation, inquired about the current schedule and when the FTA application would be submitted. Ms. Blanda stated that in order for SANDAG to submit the application to the FTA, the SANDAG Board of Directors would need first to select the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Once the LPA is selected, then the PE application would be developed and submitted to the FTA. SANDAG is currently working on preliminary cost effectiveness of alternatives. A decision by the Board is anticipated after the public scoping period.

Ms. Van Leer asked how SANDAG is measuring mobility improvement. Ms. Blanda replied that FTA considers five (5) indicators for mobility improvements referenced in the presentation: number of transit trips using the project, user benefits per passenger mile on the project, number of trips by transit dependents using the project, transit-dependent user benefits per passenger mile, and share of user benefits received by transit dependents compared to the share of transit dependents in the region. The FTA feels these are all indicators that best represent a mobility improvement in that corridor.
Chuck Lungerhausen, SANDAG Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee, stated that this project, once completed, will be a crown achievement for the Trolley system in San Diego. It will connect and expand student use of the system. Chair Roberts agreed that it will provide an important transit connection to the university.

Jeff Perwin, Linda Vista Community Planning Group, inquired about Ms. Blanda’s role in the project. Ms. Blanda stated that she is the Mid-Coast Corridor director, leading the engineering and construction teams for the project. Mr. Perwin then asked about funding for the project. Chair Roberts confirmed that about 50 percent of the funds are local TransNet dollars, and SANDAG is pursuing the other 50 percent through the federal New Starts program. Mr. Emery suggested that staff provide a quick overview of SANDAG and how it functions at a future meeting. Chair Roberts agreed that would be helpful.

Barbara Obrzut, La Jolla resident, asked who would be a typical user of this extension. Ms. Blanda explained that the ridership model will project ridership.

Ms. Lutar asked how MTS’s action to automate their passenger counting could affect the models. Ms. Lutar recommended that updated counts be used in the model. Ms. Blanda explained that each year SANDAG will update the model, and this new information/data would be accounted for in the update.

Ms. Van Leer inquired whether the FTA would like SANDAG to use the predictive model. Ms. Blanda confirmed that the FTA would like SANDAG to use the predictive model, as they want a model for 2030.

Ms. Peterson asked if the application could not be submitted to the FTA until the LPA is selected, whether that means the application would not be submitted until the final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is approved. Ms. Blanda explained that there was a previous EIR, and a LPA was selected in 1995 and then confirmed in 2003. Now, SANDAG is revisiting both due to changed conditions in the corridor. Under the federal process, there is an option where the Board of Directors can approve a LPA prior to a draft environmental document being approved.

Mr. Hutsel asked whether there was potential for these federal funds to be exhausted quickly due to the competitive nature. Ms. Blanda explained that there are some projects already in the pipeline, but as it stands now, federal dollars are projected to be available for the project.

Evan McLaughlin, San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council/La Jolla resident, asked whether this project would compete with others in the region. Ms. Blanda explained that this project has top priority for the region, as it is a TransNet Early Action Project, but would compete nationally with other similar projects.

Mr. Beck inquired about the target for construction dates. Ms. Blanda explained that, based on the preliminary schedule, 2011 would be the earliest time that construction could begin. SANDAG staff is currently updating the project schedule. Chair Roberts suggested staff distribute the schedule in the coming months. Ms. Blanda agreed to do so at a future meeting.
Chris Westling, University of California, San Diego (UCSD) student, asked how SANDAG was addressing the proposal for high-speed rail. Ms. Blanda explained that SANDAG is working with the high-speed rail project representatives and will continue to do so as the high-speed rail project moves forward.

**AGENDA ITEM #6: MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT DRAFT PIP**

Anne Steinberger, SANDAG, explained that at the October meeting, the PWG agreed to have a facilitated discussion on the draft PIP. Ms. Steinberger explained that she would lead the group through a series of questions to solicit input, and comments will be recorded.

Mr. Beck appreciated the work that was done on the plan, but thought it would be good to have a shorter “Cliff’s Notes” version of the plan. Chair Roberts suggested something more accessible and user-friendly. Mr. Poat agreed and recommended a two-page fact sheet.

Ms. Van Leer recommended that the mission statement or objective of the plan be prominently displayed in the document. Mr. Hutsel agreed and suggested that this is stated at the beginning of the document.

Mr. Perwin asked whether this plan was a requirement of the FTA. Ms. Steinberger confirmed that this is a requirement of the FTA New Starts application. Mr. Emery commented that this not only was required by the agencies, but also outlines how to reach out to the public on the project.

Mr. Beck asked how SANDAG planned to present this information to the various stakeholders. Chair Roberts confirmed that SANDAG staff will make presentations to interested groups on the project. Ms. Steinberger added that staff has had many briefings with key stakeholders on the project. Staff will present a report on these meetings at a future PWG meeting. Staff is available to make presentations to organizations, as requested.

David Potter, Clairemont resident, thought the group might be confusing the PIP with communication tools that would be used in outreach with various stakeholders. Ms. Steinberger explained that the plan demonstrates SANDAG’s approach for the project, and the communication tools that are outlined in the plan will assist in implementation of the plan.

Debra Gutzmer, Science Applications International Corporation, commented that the mission and the objectives for the plan are well stated in later sections of the plan.

Anette Blatt, Scripps Health, inquired about the structure of the Speaker’s Bureau. Ms. Steinberger confirmed that SANDAG staff would be available and on-call for presentations to organizations, as requested.

Mr. Lungerhausen remarked that he would like to see more people use transit, as there are numerous opportunities to do so within San Diego County.

Mr. Hutsel commented that the PIP was well written. He suggested that the Mission Valley Community Planning Group and the Mission Bay Park Committee be added to the list of stakeholders for the project.
Mr. Westling suggested that the UCSD Graduate Government be added to the list of stakeholders. He was also concerned that no one from the University of San Diego is listed.

Debby Knight, Friends of Rose Canyon, recommended that the scoping period for the project be extended to 60 days, rather than 30 days. Similarly, she suggested that the comment period for the EIR be extended to 60 days, rather than 45 days. She then asked that Rose Creek Watershed and Friends of Rose Creek be added as stakeholders since they are heavily impacted.

Ms. Knight also requested that the results of the evaluation of alternatives be made available to the public and that a 60-day public comment period be provided for this information.

Ms. Van Leer commented that the group should be clear about the purpose of the project and what is driving it. Ms. Lutar agreed and suggested that when the alternatives are presented, they are done so objectively.

Ms. Peterson suggested adding Clairemont News to the list of publications.

Mr. Hutsel asked whether property owners along the route will be notified of the project. Mr. Potter mentioned that for a project of this size, notices usually are posted in the newspaper, rather than posted to individual property owners.

**AGENDA ITEM #7: NEXT MEETING**

Chair Roberts announced the next PWG meeting will be held on November 4. He suggested a tour along the route, in lieu of a meeting at SANDAG. Staff will notify the group of the details, and the start time may need to be adjusted to accommodate the tour. Mr. McLaughlin asked whether the group would resume questions on the PIP at the next meeting. Chair Roberts thought they would continue this discussion at the December meeting, as the tour would take the entire November meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM #8: ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

Key Staff Contact: Anne Steinberger, (619) 699-1937, ast@sandag.org
San Diego Association of Governments
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AGENDA ITEM NO.: 2B

Action Requested: APPROVE

SUMMARY OF NOVEMBER 7, 2009, MEETING

File Number 1041501

Members in Attendance:

Ron Roberts, Supervisor, County of San Diego (Chair)
Robert Emery, Retired MTS Board Member and Poway Councilmember (Vice Chair)
Daniel Allen, La Jolla resident
William Beck, University City Community Planning Group
Anette Blatt, Scripps Health
Greg Fitchett, Westfield LLC
Brad Gessner, San Diego Convention Center General Manager
Debra Gutzmer, SAIC
Rob Hutzel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Lani Lutar, San Diego County Taxpayers Association
Barbara Obrzut, La Jolla resident
Brooke Peterson, Clairemont Community Planning Group
David Potter, Clairemont resident
Chris Westling, UCSD student

Others in Attendance:

Harry Mathis, MTS
Paul Jablonski, MTS
Rob Schupp, MTS
Brent Boyd, MTS
Mel Hinton
Kristen Byrne, MJE Marketing
Susanne Bankhead, MJE Marketing
Dennis Henderson, PB
Hadi Saami, PB

SANDAG Staff in Attendance:

Leslie Blanda
Greg Gastelum
Anne Steinberger
Opening Remarks

PWG Chair Ron Roberts, County of San Diego Supervisor, and Anne Steinberger, SANDAG, welcomed the attendees and thanked them for participating. Ms. Steinberger explained that this is an opportunity for the PWG to see the Mid-Coast Corridor first hand. The tour is not intended to showcase a particular route, but there will be references made to the current LPA (copies of a map of the LPA were distributed). The tour will start in downtown and continue north along the corridor to University City and UCSD, with stops at key destinations within the corridor.

Old Town Transit Center

Paul Jablonski, MTS, provided an overview of the facilities and ridership at the Old Town Transit Station.

- Bus and rail service are provided through station
- Two heavy rail tracks
- Two trolley tracks
- Between 10–12 million trips a year come through the station
- Looking at upgrades to tracks to accommodate low floor cars in downtown

Old Town Transit Center to Interstate 5 (I-5)/State Route 52 (SR 52)

The tour continued up Morena Boulevard where the current railroad Right-of-Way exists. Ms. Steinberger pointed out proposed locations for transit stops included in the current LPA: Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, and Balboa Avenue. She also pointed out that a number of smart growth focus areas are proposed along this section of the corridor.

I-5/SR 52 Merge to UCSD

Ms. Steinberger explained that north of the I-5/SR-52 junction, there are a number of potential alignments being evaluated. She pointed out that the existing railroad Right-of-Way continues through Rose Canyon on to Miramar. One option being looked at is to continue transit service along the railroad Right-of-Way to Genesee Avenue, and another is to continue along I-5 before heading west to UCSD.

A proposed station in the LPA at University Center Lane and Nobel Drive was pointed out. This station would serve nearby high-density residential development and employment.

UCSD West and East Campuses

Brian Gregory, UCSD, gave an overview of existing transit operations at UCSD (MTS, SuperLoop) and explained the need to include light rail stations on campus. He explained that the configuration and location of transit stations on campus will depend on the ultimate route selected. The group walked from the Price Center to Pepper Canyon to see the proposed location for the West Campus station.
Mr. Gregory explained future development proposed for this area and how a future transit station would complement this development.

The tour continued from UCSD’s West Campus across I-5 via Voigt Drive to UCSD’s East Campus and the Scripps Memorial Hospital campus. Ms. Steinberger pointed out a proposed station location in the current LPA that would serve this area of campus, as well as Scripps Memorial and other employment in the area.

**UCSD East to University Town Center (UTC)**

The tour continued along the current LPA route, south on Genesee passing La Jolla Country Day School and the Jewish Community Center toward Westfield UTC.

Greg Fitchett, Westfield LLC, provided an overview of current transit service at UTC, as well as future plans for redevelopment of the center and a new transit center:

- Westfield UTC, currently a 1,061,000-square foot regional shopping center, has been approved for an expansion including:
  - 750,000 square feet of new retail, restaurants, and entertainment
  - 250 multi-family housing units (including 10 percent onsite affordable)
  - New transit center
  - LEED-ND Gold-level sustainability approval from the United States Green Building Council
  - Major pedestrian, streetscape, and urban form improvements

- UTC area is high density, well suited for (and in need of) better transit service
  - More than 20,000 residents within one mile of proposed UTC transit center
  - More than 20,000 jobs within one mile of proposed UTC transit center

- The new transit center will be a state-of-the-art facility:
  - Expands bus capacity from 6 bays and 2 layover spots to 11 bays and 4 layover spots
  - Integrated, visible, and accessible from the street, the shopping center, and adjacent properties
  - Connects to new MTS SuperLoop service
  - Designed to integrate with future light rail transit (LRT) – LRT station would be immediately adjacent to bus station

The final stop on the tour was a bridge over Rose Canyon that provided a clear view of the existing railroad Right-of-Way.

The tour concluded at SANDAG at 5:15 p.m.

Key Staff Contact: Anne Steinberger, (619) 699-1937, ast@sandag.org
1. After having read the introduction and project description, do you feel that you have an understanding of the project and its current status?
   a. Can you tell me more about specific areas where more information might be helpful?
   b. Do you have suggestions for changes or additions that would make this section more useful to the public?

2. Based on your experience and knowledge about the Mid-Coast Corridor, is there any additional information (or information to be corrected) that should be included in the section discussing the Mid-Coast Corridor Characteristics and Demographics?

3. Is the list of stakeholder categories in Section 2 comprehensive?
   a. Do you have suggestions for additional categories of stakeholders that are not included?

4. Do you feel that the goals and objectives of the public involvement plan reflect SANDAG’s responsibility and desire to ensure public involvement? If not, are there additional goals and/or objectives that you would add?

5. After reading the Public Involvement Plan Structure and Implementation section, do you feel you have a good understanding of how SANDAG plans to conduct public outreach and involvement for this project?
   a. If not, do you have suggestions for changes to make it more understandable to the public?

6. Are there strategies and/or tactics that are not included that you feel would enhance public involvement?

7. SANDAG is developing a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the public involvement plan at key milestones in the process. What do you feel are the most important factors to evaluate to demonstrate how effectively we are involving the public?