MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT WORKING GROUP

Wednesday, March 17, 2010
3:30 to 5 p.m.

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

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

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• DRAFT COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES REPORT

• PUBLIC OUTREACH AND SCOPING MEETINGS

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.
ITEM # RECOMMENDATION

+1. SUMMARY OF DECEMBER 2, 2009, MEETING  APPROVE

Review and approve the meeting summary from the December 2, 2009, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT  COMMENT

Members of the public who would like to address the PWG on a topic not on the agenda should do so at this time. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

+3. MID-COAST TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT DRAFT COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES REPORT  DISCUSSION

Staff will present an overview of the findings of the draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report, which is being prepared as an initial step in developing the alternatives and issues to be addressed in the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report. Members also will be updated on the schedule and process for presentation of the alternatives report to the Transportation Committee and the SANDAG Board of Directors. (The March 19, 2010, Transportation Committee report will serve as the agenda report for this item. The Transportation Committee report will be available on the SANDAG Web site by 5 p.m. on Friday, March 12, 2010. PWG members will be notified when the agenda is posted, and the agenda item will be distributed in the format PWG members have requested. Printed copies and CDs of the complete alternatives report will be available at the March 17 meeting.)

4. PUBLIC OUTREACH AND SCOPING MEETINGS  DISCUSSION

Staff will present the proposed timing and format for the scoping meetings and solicit input and discuss options for PWG members to participate in the scoping process.

5. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 7, 2010.

6. ADJOURN

+next to an item indicates an attachment
SUMMARY OF DECEMBER 2, 2009, MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT WORKING GROUP (PWG)

Members in Attendance:

Ron Roberts, Supervisor, County of San Diego (Chairman)
Robert Emery, Retired MTS Board Member and Poway Councilmember (Vice-Chairman)
Daniel Allen, La Jolla resident
William Beck, University City Community Planning Group
Anette Blatt, Scripps Health
Greg Fitchitt, Westfield Corporation
Brad Gessner, San Diego Convention Center General Manager
Brian Gregory, UCSD
Debra Gutzmer, SAIC
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Joe LaCava, La Jolla Community Planning Group
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 Obrzut, La Jolla resident
Brooke Peterson, Clairemont Community Planning Group
David Potter, Clairemont resident
Carmen Sandoval, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
Ann Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage, Inc.

Others in Attendance:

Susanne Bankhead, MJE Marketing
Kristen Byrne, MJE Marketing

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Staff in Attendance:

Leslie Blanda
Greg Gastelum
Anne Steinberger
Heather Werdick
AGENDA ITEM #1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Vice-Chairman Robert Emery called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM #2: OCTOBER 7 AND NOVEMBER 4 MEETING SUMMARIES

Mr. Emery made a motion to approve the October 7 and November 4 meeting summaries. William Beck, University City Community Planning Group, seconded the motion. Joe LaCava, La Jolla Community Planning Group, suggested that his name be added to the list of attendees for the last meeting. The motion carried unanimously, with Mr. LaCava’s edit.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public were given the opportunity to address the PWG on any topic not on the agenda. No public comment given.

AGENDA ITEM #4: MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT UPDATE

Anne Steinberger, Marketing & Communications Manager, SANDAG, provided a recap of the November 4 tour of the Mid-Coast Corridor. The latest project newsletter provided an update on happenings in the corridor, including the current expansion of the UCSD campus. A similar update will be provided from Westfield UTC in the December edition of the newsletter. Each month the newsletter is distributed via e-mail to those on the project’s interested parties list.

Daniel Allen, La Jolla resident, asked how the various conceptual designs/alternatives would be reviewed during public scoping. Ms. Steinberger explained that question would be addressed during the discussion on the Public Involvement Plan (PIP).

Mr. LaCava was under the impression that Item 4 would be more robust than Items 5 and 6, which appear to be outside of the PWG’s purview. Mr. Emery explained that at the October meeting, the PWG had questions about SANDAG and its function in the region. It was suggested that staff provide an overview of SANDAG, as the PWG is a subcommittee of this body. Mr. LaCava understood and explained that he is looking forward to getting to work on this project.

Mr. Emery added for clarification that his motion on Item 2 to approve the meeting summaries included both the October 7 and November 4 meetings.

AGENDA ITEM #5: SANDAG OVERVIEW

Ms. Steinberger provided an overview of SANDAG, which is composed of 18 member cities and the County of San Diego. SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, supervisors, and council members from each member jurisdiction. Board members are appointed by their council or board each year. Additionally, there are appointed officials (Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), North County Transit District (NCTD), Port of San Diego) that serve on the board and also participate in the decision-making process. The SANDAG Board is supported by five policy advisory committees: Executive Committee, Transportation Committee, Public Safety Committee, Borders Committee, and the Regional Planning Committee.
The SANDAG FY2010 program budget is $1.1 billion, most of which comes from the TransNet half-cent sales tax. The remaining funding comes from the federal and state governments.

A large portion of SANDAG work pertains to planning for the future of the San Diego region. There are currently 3.1 million people in the county, and population is expected to grow to almost 4 million by 2030. There is a need to plan for housing, jobs, and transportation to support that growth. Ms. Steinberger showed an aerial view of the region, illustrating growth that has occurred.

A key part of the long-range planning process at SANDAG is the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The foundation of the RCP is smart growth, aiming to incorporate good urban design while preserving habitat and open space. SANDAG has identified 200 smart growth areas throughout San Diego, centered on key transit and job locations. The jurisdictions developed and approved recommendations for smart growth areas, which then were approved by the SANDAG Board.

Ms. Steinberger explained that almost 50 percent of the SANDAG budget comes from TransNet, the local half-cent sales tax dedicated to transportation projects. Ms. Steinberger referenced nine projects that have been identified as TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) projects, which will receive priority for implementation. She added that the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is one of the EAP projects.

Ms. Steinberger provided an overview of other current SANDAG initiatives, which include:
- Developing the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- Collaborating with Caltrans and Mexico on Otay Mesa East Port of Entry project
- Implementing infrastructure projects receiving ARRA funding
- Considering options for tracking graffiti

Ms. Steinberger encouraged the PWG members to subscribe to the SANDAG electronic newsletter to stay up to date on key SANDAG projects and services.

Mr. Emery asked whether there were questions.

Mr. Allen asked about reference to a “TDA Sales Tax” on the FY 2010 Program Budget slide. Ms. Steinberger explained that TDA stands for Transportation Development Act, and this is a state tax.

Mr. Allen asked about the difference between the NCTD and MTS. Mr. Emery explained that legislation enacted (in 1975) established the NCTD. As a result, NCTD and MTS are distinct entities with separate boards of directors. SANDAG handles all aspects of transit planning and construction, while NCTD and MTS handle operations and maintenance. Mr. Allen asked whether there were geographical boundaries between the two agencies. Mr. Emery explained that they each have their own service areas, but in some cases there is crossover in transit service across MTS and NCTD boundaries.

Ann Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage, asked how SANDAG interfaces between all of its responsibilities. For instance, when planning for big transportation projects, such as freeways and highways, does SANDAG consider other modes of transportation in the process? Ms. Steinberger
explained that as SANDAG is planning for large projects, the agency also considers other modes of transportation. It is part of the mission of the RTP to create better connections for bikes/pedestrians.

AGENDA ITEM #6: 2050 RTP

Heather Werdick, SANDAG, explained that the RTP is the blueprint for the region’s transportation system. SANDAG is required to update it every four years with new projects. This will be the first update that will account for 40 years into the future (past updates only accounted for a 20-year outlook). Looking out to 40 years is necessary as TransNet goes through 2048, and it is important to ensure all projects are captured.

Under new legislative mandates in Senate Bill 375, SANDAG is required to complete a Sustainable Communities Strategy as part of the update to the RTP. This new element will allow SANDAG to demonstrate how the region will meet greenhouse gas reduction targets established by the California Air Resources Board. The results of other studies underway, such as urban area transit strategy, airport multimodal planning, energy/climate change planning, and 2050 RTP economic analysis will be incorporated into the development of the 2050 RTP.

Other key tasks in RTP update include:
- Updating revenue projections
- Evaluating cost estimates for projects
- Updating evaluation criteria
- Updating performance measures

SANDAG staff also will update the public participation and outreach strategy and expects to finish this task in early 2010. Ms. Werdick reviewed the stages of the 2050 RTP development process and oversight for the 2050 RTP.

Mr. Beck thanked SANDAG staff for the presentation, but wondered how this affected the PWG’s work on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. Mr. Emery responded that the overview on SANDAG and the RTP was to help PWG members understand SANDAG’s role in the region and how the work for the PWG contributes to the transportation planning process.

AGENDA ITEM #7: MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT DRAFT PIP

Ms. Steinberger explained that one of the roles of the PWG is to review the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project PIP. At the October 7 meeting, the PWG began reviewing and providing comments on the PIP. She suggested the PWG continue that exercise today in order capture more feedback and comments on the document.

Mr. Allen asked about timing of the scoping period. He stated that SANDAG should have baseline designs/alternatives before going out for scoping. Ms. Blanda explained that staff is in the process of reviewing all alternatives. The SANDAG Transportation Committee and Board will be asked to determine which alternatives will be carried through scoping.
Greg Fitchitt, Westfield Corporation, suggested adding the following groups to the stakeholder list: the local chapters of Urban Land Institute, National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, Building Industry Association, and the San Diego Housing Federation.

Ms. Van Leer asked whether each of the alternatives was being considered equally by staff. Ms. Blanda responded that they will all be evaluated using the same criteria.

Brooke Peterson, Clairemont Mesa Community Planning Group, asked if all the alternatives would be reviewed at the same level of detail. Ms. Blanda replied that they would all be reviewed at the same level of detail.

Ron Roberts, Chairman, asked whether staff was accounting for the proposal for high-speed rail. Ms. Blanda explained that staff is coordinating with LOSSAN and the High-Speed Rail Authority and will continue to do so throughout the project.

Mr. LaCava suggested that La Jolla Community Planning Group and Pacific Beach Planning Group be added to the list of stakeholders. Additionally, he suggested that libraries within the corridor be added as places to post project information. Under Section 3, he suggested that the title of the section be revised to “Goals of the Project” rather than “Key Information About the Project.”

Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation, suggested that Mission Valley Community Planning Group be added to the stakeholder list.

Mr. Allen pointed out that the plan identifies several employers that seem pretty far away from the corridor as potential users of this system. He suggested SANDAG consider whether they are potential users as they are not located in the corridor.

Chuck Lungerhausen, SANDAG Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee, voiced a concern with the high-speed rail. Mr. Roberts explained that this is a separate project, but there will be coordination between the two projects because of shared right-of-way in some areas.

Evan McLaughlin, San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council/La Jolla resident, suggested a few edits to the plan. In the introduction, he suggested clearly stating the requirements of California Environmental Quality Act for this project. He also recommended that employee groups (labor unions) be added to the list of stakeholders as these employees will be the ones utilizing the transit system. He offered to help coordinate meetings if staff is interested. Under Section 1.2, he asked about contemplated service hours for the system. Mr. Roberts explained that the operating hours will be determined by the operating agency and are not yet known.

Brian Gregory, UCSD, stated that he has shared the PIP internally with other UCSD departments, and they feel it is a very good document. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Gregory whether the plan was shared with UCSD’s employee groups. Mr. Gregory explained that they have not shared this with the employee groups yet; however, they plan to work through their internal process and share the plan with the employee groups at the appropriate time.

Mr. Allen suggested in Section 3 that La Jolla be listed as a “Visitor Serving Center.”
Mr. Hutsel complimented staff on a very good document overall. He suggested that the Sports Arena should be referenced in the plan as a stakeholder.

Ms. Steinberger thanked the PWG for the comments and confirmed that staff will develop a “Cliff’s Notes” version of the plan as requested.

Mr. LaCava complimented staff on a very good document and thanked them for the effort. He asked staff to think about how they would assess the effectiveness of the document.

Mr. Hutsel noted that in Appendix B, the meeting times for the PWG are incorrect.

Barbara Obrzut, La Jolla resident, explained that she would like to see connectivity between Mission Bay Park and the proposed Tecolote Station. Mr. Roberts explained that access to pedestrians/bikers would be provided at Clairemont Drive and agreed to have staff look into that as the stations will need to be fully accessible.

Ms. Van Leer agreed with Ms. Obrzut’s comments and would like to see stations accessible and walkable for all patrons. Mr. Roberts agreed.

**AGENDA ITEM #8: NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Roberts explained that on the November 4 tour, Mr. Beck suggested that staff provide an aerial view of the proposed route to better orient the PWG members with specific locations along the corridor. Staff will look into options to accomplish this in a cost-effective manner and will present it at a future meeting.

Ms. Steinberger noted that the first Wednesday falls on January 6th at 3:30 p.m. She will coordinate with the PWG members on whether to meet in January.

**AGENDA ITEM #9: ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.