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BOARD OF DIRECTORS AGENDA  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 22, 2002 BOARD MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 9)**

The Board of Directors will take action on the consent agenda without further discussion and with one vote unless an item is pulled by a Board member or by a member of the public for comment.

+3. SUMMARY OF DECEMBER 6, 2002 POLICY DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING | APPROVE |
+4. DISCUSSIONS AND ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES | APPROVE |

A. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (December 6, 2002)
B. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (December 12, 2002)
C. REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (December 6, 2002)
D. BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (November 15, 2002)

+5. LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (LTA) PROJECTS REQUIRING MORE THAN $1,000 OR THREE DAYS STAFF TIME (Jeff Tayman) | INFORMATION |

Local Technical Assistance (LTA) policy guidelines require that projects involving more than three days staff time be reported to the Board of Directors. The projects covered in this month’s report are a public opinion survey of Chula Vista residents and a collaborative transportation modeling project with the Cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside.

+6. NON-DISPOSAL FACILITY AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENTS (Nan Valerio) | SUPPORT |

SANDAG, as the Integrated Waste Management Task Force, reviews the Non-Disposition Facility Element and the Household Waste Management Element of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. The two elements being reviewed apply only to the County unincorporated area of the region. SANDAG’s Technical and Citizens Advisory Committees have reviewed, commented, and support the Elements. The Committees recommend that the Task Force support the Elements and submit them to the County Board of Supervisors for adoption.
7. PROGRESS REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS (Jose Nuncio) INFORMATION

This report summarizes the current status of major highway, transit, arterial, traffic management, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects in SANDAG’s four-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). The TransNet one-half percent local sales tax and other local, state, and federal sources fund these projects.

8. CALENDAR OF MEETINGS OF THE SANDAG BOARD AND POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (Stephanie Rose) INFORMATION

The 2003 meeting schedules for the SANDAG Board of Directors and the Policy Advisory Committees’ meetings are provided. Changes to meeting times due to holidays are noted. The first Board meeting of each month may be either a policy development meeting or a business meeting. Meetings in August will only be held if needed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

9. Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Board. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by filing a written request with the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

CHAIR’S REPORT

10. GLORIA McCLELLAN AWARD (Vice Chair Mickey Cafagna)

SANDAG has established the annual award to honor the memory of Vista Mayor Gloria McClellan. The first annual award recipient will be announced at the Board meeting. The award recognizes a local leader who advocates regional concepts and programs. During her 29 years of public service, Mayor McClellan was often described as an ordinary person who accomplished extraordinary things. She shattered the illusion that one person couldn’t make a difference. This year’s award recipient exemplifies the values, standards, and vision Mayor McClellan demonstrated throughout her public career.

11. AWARDS OF APPRECIATION TO BOARD MEMBERS

The Board will recognize retiring Board members Betty Harding, Dennis Holz, Shirley Horton, Chuck Marks, and Julianne Nygaard for their service and contributions to the region and SANDAG.
12. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

As per Board policy, the SANDAG Chair will appoint the Chair and Vice Chair for the Transportation Committee.

13. APPOINTMENTS TO FILL SANDAG VACANCIES TO THE REGIONAL ENERGY POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL (REPAC)

Appointments to fill vacancies from the South County and the North County Inland Cities to the San Diego Regional Energy Office’s Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council will be made.

14. UPDATE ON THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON TRANSITION

A report on the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition meeting that took place on Friday, December 13, 2002, and the Working Group’s progress to date will be provided.

REPORTS

+ 15. REVIEW OF TRANSITION ITEMS: INTERIM BYLAWS (Debra Greenfield)  APPROVE

The Executive Committee recommends that the provisions set forth in the staff report be included in the interim bylaws and other policy documents that will be before the Board, as the new agency, for approval in January. Approval would accept for distribution the interim bylaws and endorse items in the report for inclusion in Board policies.

+ 16. 2003 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM (Debra Greenfield)  APPROVE

The legislative program including the priorities for 2003 as recommended by the Executive Committee are presented for approval. For the first time, it incorporates the programs of the Transit Boards.

+ 17. CENTRAL INTERSTATE 5 CORRIDOR STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS (Councilmember Ron Morrison, Chair, Central I-5 Corridor Policy Working Group; Michael Hix, SANDAG Staff)  APPROVE

On November 21, the Central I-5 Corridor Policy Working Group approved a list of recommended corridor improvements. The draft final report also was issued, with a comment period ending on December 30, 2002. At its December 12 meeting, the Transportation Committee recommended changes that are highlighted in this report. The Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the use of the study, with their recommended revisions, to update the Central I-5 Corridor improvements included in the Draft 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, MOBILITY 2030.
+ 18. SCHEDULE FOR THE SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES ON THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) (Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair, Regional Planning Committee; Carolina Gregor, SANDAG Staff)

As part of the public involvement program for the Regional Comprehensive Plan, SANDAG’s Regional Planning Committee is hosting Subregional Roundtables throughout the region this January and February. The report includes a schedule of the upcoming roundtables. Board members are encouraged to attend the workshops and invite other elected officials and stakeholders from their jurisdictions.

+ 19. PROPOSED STATE BUDGET CUTS — POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM IMPACTS (Councilmember Joe Kellejian, Vice Chair, Transportation Committee; Craig Scott, SANDAG Staff)

The Governor has recently announced proposed cuts in the State budget in response to predicted State General Fund shortfalls. Included in the proposed cuts is the deferral of the Proposition 42 transfer of General Fund revenue to transportation purposes ($1.1 billion in FY 04), and the deferral or cancellation of the repayment of the $500 million loan to the General Fund from the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP). Also included in this report is a discussion of the State Transportation Improvement Program shortfalls. Staff will report on potential impacts to specific TCRP funded projects as well as the shortfall in STIP funding and potential action strategies in response to the proposed cuts discussed at the December 12 Transportation Committee.

Note: Board meetings in January will be held on Friday, January 10 and Friday, January 24.

ADJOURNMENT

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment.
MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
November 22, 2002

Chairman Morrison called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:13 a.m.

Attendance was as follows:

Voting Members
City of Carlsbad..............................................................Ramona Finnila, Councilmember
City of Chula Vista.......................................................... Absent
City of Coronado............................................................ Phil Monroe, Councilmember
City of Del Mar............................................................... Crystal Crawford, Councilmember
City of El Cajon............................................................... Richard Ramos, Councilmember
City of Encinitas............................................................ Maggie Houlihan, Councilmember
City of Escondido........................................................... Lori Pfeiler, Mayor
City of Imperial Beach ...................................................... Absent
City of La Mesa............................................................... Art Madrid, Mayor
City of Lemon Grove..................................................... Mary Teresa Sessom, Mayor
City of National City...................................................... Ron Morrison, Councilmember
City of Oceanside........................................................... Jack Feller, Councilmember
City of Poway.............................................................. Mickey Cafagna, Mayor
City of San Diego .......................................................... Dick Murphy, Mayor
City of San Marcos....................................................... Hal Martin, Councilmember
City of Santee............................................................... Hal Ryan, Councilmember
City of Solana Beach..................................................... Joe Kellejian, Councilmember
City of Vista................................................................. Judy Ritter, Mayor Pro Tem
County of San Diego..................................................... Ron Roberts, Supervisor

Advisory Liaison Members

Department of Transportation Pedro Orso-Delgado, District Director
U.S. Department of Defense Capt. Christopher Schanze, USN
Mexico Absent
San Diego Unified Port District Jess Van Deventer, Commissioner
San Diego County Water Authority Bud Lewis, Director
Metropolitan Transit Development Board Jerry Rindone, Member
North San Diego County Transit Development Board Absent
Chairman Morrison welcomed all to the meeting and pointed out that there are speakers' slips available for those that wish to speak to specific issues or under Public Comment.

1. MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 25, 2002 SANDAG MEETING (APPROVE)


2. ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

None.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 7)

3. DISCUSSIONS AND ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (APPROVE)

A. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (November 8, 2002)
B. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (November 14, 2002)
C. REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (November 1, 2002)
D. BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (October 18, 2002)

4. 2002 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP) AMENDMENTS

A. 2002 RTIP AMENDMENT NO. 2 – UPDATED AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS (Resolution 2003-15) (APPROVE)

5. FY 2003 DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PROGRAM (APPROVE)

6. QUARTERLY INVESTMENT REPORT – PERIOD ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2002 (INFORMATION)

Action: Escondido – San Marcos. A motion was made, and second, to pull item 7 for discussion and approve Consent Agenda Items 3 - 6. Yes – 15. No – 0. Absent – 4 (Santee, Oceanside, Chula Vista, Imperial Beach). Abstain - 0. The motion passed.

7. SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION ALLOCATING INDIAN GAMING SPECIAL DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO ADDRESS LOCAL IMPACTS (APPROVE)

Public Comment

James Landry, speaking on behalf of Jamul Indian Village, requested that the SANDAG Board consider amending their support of this legislation to include consultation with the tribal government that provided the funds concerning how the money is spent. He stated that this doesn't currently affect them, but may in the future and would set a precedent on future legislation. He also encouraged a stronger formal partnership between tribal governments and the County.
Councilmember Monroe (Coronado) asked whether Mr. Landry represented multiple sovereign nations.

Mr. Landry clarified that he only represented Jamul Indian Village.

Supervisor Roberts (County) concurred with Mr. Landry on the tribes’ rights to consultation with the County on how the funding is spent.

Councilmember Finnila (Carlsbad) suggested that if this type of legislation impacts other tribes in the future, they should speak to the legislators.

Chairman Morrison (National City) asked how much money was in the fund.

Mr. Landry responded that approximately $7-10 million is in the fund.

Action: El Cajon – San Marcos. A motion was made, and seconded, to approve Item #7 to include an allowance for consultation from the affected tribes with the County. Yes - 15. No - 0. Absent - 4 (Chula Vista, Imperial Beach, Oceanside, Santee). Abstain - 0. The motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS / COMMUNICATIONS

8. Public Comment

Clive Richard, a San Diego resident, spoke regarding consolidation of all transit agencies, and asked whether all agencies will retain their names, or become one.

Chairman Morrison stated that both MTDB and NCTD will remain as operational boards and the overall structure will be combined.

St. Clair Adams, representing San Diego HIV Prevention Board, encouraged the Board’s support of HIV Awareness Month. He commented on the impact on the economy and quality of life as a result of the disease, and offered his telephone number for those interested in supporting this cause (619-296-3400, ext. 148). He thanked the Board for their leadership.

Supervisor Roberts (County) commented on the reasons given for SANDAG not issuing a proclamation for HIV/AIDS Awareness Month. He stated that he voted against denying the request at the Executive Committee, and felt that it was in line with SANDAG’s mission, and that SANDAG should establish clear definitions and policies for issuing proclamations.

Vice Chair Cafagna (Poway) commented on the role cities have had historically in issuing proclamations on health and social issues, and that as we establish the new agency and expand its scope of regional work, we need to consider including such requests beyond transportation issues.

Counsel cautioned the Board against continuing further discussion of this item since it is not on the agenda and suggested the Board direct staff to put it on a subsequent agenda.
Councilmember Ramos (El Cajon) indicated he will not support a motion to take action at this Board meeting since his City already took action, but other cities may not have.

Councilmember Monroe (Coronado) stated he did not think SANDAG focused only on transportation issues, but rather a wide variety of regional issues.

After discussion by Board members whether there should be action taken today or at a future meeting, the Board directed staff to bring back clear definitions and policies for issuing proclamations at a future meeting.

9. INTENTIONALLY NOT USED.

CHAIR’S REPORT

10. APPOINTMENT OF SOUTH COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE TO THE REGIONAL ENERGY POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL (REPAC) (APPOINT)

Chairman Morrison (National City) reported that the appointment to represent the South County cities (Chula Vista, Coronado, Imperial Beach and National City) on the San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO) Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council will be continued to the next meeting.

11. AGENCY CONSOLIDATION UPDATE: REPORT FROM AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON TRANSITION (INFORMATION)

Chairman Morrison (National City) reported on the actions to date by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition and its work in progress. Policy Working Group has met twice, arrived at some agreements, and will continue working on this effort.

12. 2003 ANNUAL RETREAT (APPROVE)

Staff outlined the Executive Committee’s recommendation of three primary topics for the 2003 Annual Retreat to take place January 29, 30, and 31, 2003 in Borrego Springs. The primary topics are:

(1) The extension of the TransNet local transportation sales tax program
(2) Roles and responsibilities under the new consolidated agency; and
(3) Integration of regional planning work, such as the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Councilmember Ramos (El Cajon) asked for clarification that Eric Haley and D.J. Smith are not attending the retreat as speakers, but rather as participants.

Staff confirmed that Mr. Haley and Mr. Smith are attending as participants in the TransNet Extension session.

Mayor Lewis (SDCWA) suggested water issues be included in the program.
Mayor Madrid (La Mesa) suggested a speaker that is informed about current issues and the future of fiscal reform be invited.

Vice Chair Cafagna (Poway) suggested devoting a Policy Meeting to water-related issues.

Mayor Murphy (San Diego) agreed that water issues should be a topic for a future Policy Meeting.

Councilmember Finnila (Carlsbad) suggested including a section on water issues during the “Basics” portion of the retreat agenda.

Supervisor Roberts (County) reminded the Board that San Diego Taxpayers Association sounded a warning against TransNet groups like SANDAG crossing the line in developing campaigns.

Action: Oceanside - Poway A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the Executive Committee’s recommendation of the three primary topics for the 2003 Annual Retreat, and include water issues during the Basics portion of the program. Yes – 17. No – 0. Absent – 2 (Chula Vista and Imperial Beach). Abstain - 0. The motion passed.

REPORTS

13. OUTCOME OF TRANSPORTATION-RELATED MEASURES ON THE NOVEMBER 5, 2002 BALLOT (INFORMATION)

Gary Gallegos presented a recap of the key transportation measures on the November 5, 2002 ballot, including sales tax measures in five counties. The results indicated all measures failed to get the required two-thirds voter approval, except in Riverside County.

Councilmember Houlihan (Encinitas) asked what factors lead to the differences between early polling and actual voting results. Staff responded that organized opposition and track record play a part.

Chairman Morrison (National City) commented that voter turnout also contributes to the result.

Mayor Madrid (La Mesa) clarified that our effort is a political campaign, and that some organizations will aggressively pursue opposition. He suggested using any legal, ethical and positive tools we have available to get them passed.

Staff is working with staff in Riverside to determine how they worked with supporters of legislation.

Councilmember Finnila (Carlsbad) suggested beginning early and raising significant funding for these efforts.

Staff indicated the business community - Chambers of Commerce and Economic
Development Corporations in the region are already working together.

Vice Chair Cafagna commented that Riverside County is considering on its agenda a request to increase fees on new development, and said that it's over $100,000 per acre or $166 per square foot per dwelling unit. The building industry supported the sales tax measure, unaware of this factor.

Councilmember Ramos (El Cajon) referenced criticism by Taxpayers Association and other supporters of this measure, for not informing the public. SourcePoint provided outreach funding, but also was criticized. Our efforts need to remain within the law, but we can't let one group dictate.

Councilmember Martin (San Marcos) commented that Riverside County is the only county that spent a significant amount of money, and still the measure barely passed.

Councilmember Crawford (Del Mar) commented that we have a unique opportunity in the next few years, to begin preparing for the effort.

Councilmember Houlihan commented on the importance of not overselling what the sales tax measure will pay for, such as required infrastructure.

Mayor Lewis (SDCWA) suggested specifying which areas will receive benefits to help voters understand.

Mayor Madrid stated that the distrust of local government and low voter turnout contribute to measures failing.

Mr. Orso-Delgado (Caltrans) commented that Riverside’s measure passed by 8,000 votes, and asked how funding is distributed. Staff responded that for the local roads allocation there is effort to try to leverage money by requiring local development fee ordinances.

14. WALKABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION GRANTS – PROJECT UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Mayor Mary Sessom (Lemon Grove), Chair of the Walkable Communities Advisory Committee, introduced Rob Rundle to give the project update on the Walkable Communities Demonstration Grants. Mayor Sessom recommended that walkability be part of the criteria for funding transportation projects and requested that TransNet and other sources be considered for additional funding of pedestrian projects throughout the region.

Mayor Murphy (City of San Diego) asked if the Walkable Communities Committee will continue to meet, and supported their efforts.

Councilmember Kellejian (Solana Beach) complimented the work by the Walkable Communities Committee and the projects they are working on.

Mayor Sessom reported that she would be introducing a proposal for permanent Walkable Communities funding to the Transportation Committee at their January 2003 meeting.
15. **I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (IRP) – DRAFT EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT (INFORMATION)**

Councilmember Crawford (Del Mar), Co-chair of the I-15 Interregional Partnership Working Group, introduced the item, and turned it over to Jeff Martin, who presented a progress report on the IRP and discussed findings from the draft “Existing Conditions Report” that will define the interregional commuting problem, document existing programs that are addressing the jobs/housing imbalance, and forecasts future commute conditions. The final report will be released in January 2003. Assistant City Manager Jim O’Grady from Temecula addressed the Board and expressed commitment from Temecula officials to continue to work with jurisdictions in Riverside and San Diego counties for the “betterment of the region.”

Councilmember Houlihan (Encinitas) commented on the need to try to see the “total picture” of a household’s commute patterns. In some cases families have one partner commuting in one direction, and the other partner in an opposite direction, thereby choosing a “mid-way” point within which to live.

Councilmember Monroe (Coronado) pointed out that the other part of that question in the survey, asked whether couples would move once their children are grown; and the answer was usually no.

Vice Chair Cafagna (Poway) suggested that some commuters enjoy the drive.

Councilmember Finnila (Carlsbad) commented on the number of people that would rather take a cut in pay to work closer to home.

Chairman Morrison (National City) asked if it is known why commuters haven’t been influenced to carpool.

Mr. O’Grady responded that Riverside needs to do more outreach and signage encouraging carpooling.

Councilmember Kellejian (Solana Beach) commented that the survey question on choosing a single family home versus an attached home near work was asked after residents had moved. He suggested asking the question before the residents move.

Councilmember Martin (San Marcos) commented on the reluctance to carpool.

Councilmember Crawford pointed out that many of the commuters surveyed are already well-established in their careers, and homeowners planning to retire in Riverside County.

16. **PROGRESS REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS (INFORMATION)**

Staff presented a progress report on transportation projects to the Board, summarizing the current status of major highway, arterial, traffic management, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects in SANDAG’s four-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).
Councilmember Houlihan (Encinitas) suggested getting the total picture of Van Pool programs operated by other agencies and companies. Staff responded that a summary would be provided in future reports.

Councilmember Finnila (Carlsbad) asked about easing congestion at the Interstate 5 / 805 merge due to construction, and suggested a greater public education effort. Staff responded that there will be a focus on notifying the public and providing specialized transit service to curb congestion throughout the project.

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Morrison announced the next Executive Committee and Policy Development Board meeting is scheduled for December 6 and Board Meeting is December 20, 2002. He adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Secretary
SUMMARY OF THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING
Meeting of December 6, 2002

The meeting of the SANDAG Policy Development Board was called to order at 10:32 a.m. by Chair Ron Morrison. Attendance was as follows:

SANDAG Board Voting Members
City of Carlsbad.................................................................Ramona Finnila, Councilmember
City of Chula Vista .................................................................Patty Davis, Councilmember
City of Coronado .................................................................Phil Monroe, Councilmember
City of Del Mar.................................................................Crystal Crawford, Councilmember
City of El Cajon .................................................................Richard Ramos, Councilmember
City of Encinitas.................................................................Maggie Houlihan, Councilmember
City of Escondido .................................................................Lori Holt Pfeiler, Mayor
City of Imperial Beach .........................................................Patricia McCoy, Councilmember
City of La Mesa .................................................................Art Madrid, Mayor
City of Lemon Grove..........................................................Mary Teresa Sessom, Mayor
City of National City ..........................................................Ron Morrison, Councilmember
City of Oceanside ...............................................................Jack Feller, Deputy Mayor
City of Poway .................................................................Mickey Cafagna, Mayor
City of San Diego ..............................................................Dick Murphy, Mayor
City of San Marcos .............................................................Hal Martin, Councilmember
City of Santee .................................................................Hal Ryan, Councilmember
City of Solana Beach .........................................................Joe Kellejian, Councilmember
City of Vista .................................................................Judy Ritter, Mayor Pro Tem
County of San Diego ............................................................Ron Roberts, Supervisor

Advisory Liaison Members
California Department of Transportation......................Pedro Orso-Delgado, District Director
Metropolitan Transit Development Board..........................Leon Williams, Chairman
North San Diego County Transit Development Board..................Julianne Nygaard, Chair
U.S. Department of Defense...........................................Capt. Ken Butryn, USN
San Diego Unified Port District......................................Jess Van Deventer, Commissioner
San Diego County Water Authority....................................Bud Lewis, Director
Consul General of Mexico..................................................Absent
Staff stated that the Draft 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) were distributed for public review and comment in October and November 2002. She noted that today’s public hearing is held to receive public comments on the two documents. She also announced that a series of public workshops are scheduled in the North, South, and East County areas in the second week of December. The deadline for public comments on the RTP and EIR is December 30, 2002.

Chairman Morrison opened the public hearing.

Public Comment:

Supervisor Bill Horn, County of San Diego, spoke in support of including the SR 76 widening project between Mission Avenue and I-15 in the 2030 RTP Revenue Constrained Plan. He noted that improving SR 76 was part of the original TransNet program, and widening is needed to handle traffic from commuters traveling between homes in Riverside County to North County jobs.

Board members asked staff to address why SR 76 is not included in the current Revenue Constrained Plan.

Gary Gallegos responded that the funding limitations in the Revenue Constrained Plan ($30 billion) does not allow the region to complete all of the projects proposed in the Mobility Plan, which is based on the $42 billion Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. Adding SR 76 to the Revenue Constrained Plan would require removing another project from the plan. Staff also noted that Caltrans has identified significant environmental constraints with widening SR 76 between Mission and I-15.

Several Board members from the North County area spoke in support of including SR 76 in the Revenue Constrained Plan.

Eric Bowlby, San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club, stated that he does not support the proposed highway expansions in the unincorporated, rural areas, such as SR 67 and SR 76. He suggested focusing more resources on competitive, multi-occupant vehicle facilities and services, such as high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and flex trolley services. He also stated that transportation expenditures in the region should be linked with water quality and habitat improvement needs.

Brad Barnum, Associated General Contractors (AGC), noted that he is a member of the 2030 RTP Working Group and Citizen’s Advisory Committee for Transportation. He stated that while AGC has not taken an official position on the RTP, he encouraged the Board to move forward with the public process.

Bob Leiter, City of Chula Vista, stated that he is a member of both the 2030 RTP Working Group and the Congestion Management Program (CMP) Working Group. He expressed concern about the integration of the RTP and the CMP. He stated that the RTP and CMP
need to focus on existing and mid-term deficiencies created by new growth, in addition to the long-term system needs. He suggested that greater funding priority be given to transportation projects that serve infill and smart growth developments, and that project funding should be subject to the completion of sub-regional corridor studies that link land use and transportation planning. Mr. Leiter expressed concerns about implementing regional development impacts fees, and asked that reference to these regional fees be removed from the RTP. He also supported moving up the phasing of roadway and transit improvements serving the South Bay area in the RTP.

Robert Hoffman, a resident of San Diego, commented that he feels the 2030 RTP is not an effective plan.

Jim Schmidt, a resident of La Mesa, stated that the RTP is a good plan. He supports the SR 76 widening project because it was included in the original TransNet program, and spoke in support of widening SR 67 to Ramona.

Kathleen Ferrier, Walk San Diego, spoke in support of additional funding in the RTP for pedestrian and bicycle projects. She suggested making two percent of the RTP funding available for these purposes, and suggested that SANDAG require implementation of the recently adopted pedestrian design guidelines as a condition of transportation project funding.

Tina Zenzola, Walk San Diego, distributed a handout summarizing pedestrian-related traffic fatalities. She suggested making two percent of RTP funding be made available for pedestrian and bicycle improvements, making better use of SANDAG’s pedestrian design guidelines, and involving pedestrian and bicycle advocacy groups in development of the State of the Commute report proposed in the 2030 RTP.

Board members discussed the summary of pedestrian-related traffic statistics and requested more information about the applicable geographic areas and the incidence of fatalities/incidents per capita.

Andy Hamilton, Air Pollution Control District, spoke in support of various RTP components, including the Smart Growth Incentive Program, the extensive HOV/Managed Lane system, improving transit service, doubling existing funding levels for bicycles and pedestrian improvements, and the State of the Commute reporting. He suggested evaluating and including additional pedestrian programs in the RTP, such as Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Transit. He expressed concern that the SANDAG regional travel demand model is under-predicting transit mode share, and suggested incorporating the findings of an MTDB market demand study in the model.

Beth Fischer, Pardee Homes, spoke in support of completing the I-5/SR 56 freeway to freeway connectors. She suggested including the I-5/SR 56 connector improvements in both the Revenue Constrained Plan and Reasonably Expected Revenue scenarios, and accelerating the funding and project completion to 2008.

Karen King, NCTD, commended the SANDAG Board and staff on developing the Draft 2030 RTP and for working closely with NCTD on the Plan’s transit recommendations. She noted
that the NCTD Board of Directors would be considering the RTP at an upcoming meeting. She stated that NCTD’s Planning Committee comments included providing public transit service between Riverside County and North San Diego County in one of the funded scenarios, expanding discussion of the intent to double track the Oceanside-Escondido Rail and extend it to North County Fair, and making the Oceanside-Escondido and Coaster commuter rail lines eligible for the grade separation funding identified in the RTP. She also expressed support for the proposed funding to improve local bus (Blue Car) service in the Plan.

Harvey Goodfriend, Citizen Advisory Committee and 2030 RTP Working Group member, stated that he appreciates staff’s hard work on the Plan, but believes that the 2030 RTP should be considered an interim plan for local purposes. He distributed a handout to Board members outlining his concerns. He feels that the Plan needs to better link land use and transportation planning, including addressing affordable housing and receiving local jurisdiction support. He stated that further information was needed about whether the Plan’s transit and HOV recommendations would improve mobility, and questioned whether greater funding priority should be placed on local street and road improvements. He suggested placing more emphasis on private sector transportation solutions, goods movement needs, and managing resources more efficiently, including expanding opportunities for teleworking.

Board members discussed the connection between land use and transportation, and noted that in addition to the RTP, the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) would help better link land use and transportation planning efforts.

Kathy Keehan, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, expressed support for the Plan’s vision and policy goals and demand management strategies. She suggested that two percent of RTP funding be dedicated to bicycle and pedestrian needs.

The Board discussed the recommendations for increasing funding for bicycle improvements. A Board member suggested developing a phased improvement plan to identify project priorities, and another member supported dedicated resources for better maintenance of existing bicycle facilities.

Walt Brewer, a resident of San Diego, complimented staff’s work on developing various transportation alternatives as part of the 2030 RTP development. He expressed concern, however, that even with the implementation of the recommended Plan improvements, there would be more miles of congested freeways and average work trip travel time would be longer. He suggested reprioritizing the Plan’s improvements to better address congestion and average travel time issues.

Karen Scarborough, Quality of Life Coalition, commended the 2030 RTP for beginning the implementation of the Regional Transit Vision (RTV) approved earlier by the Board. She stated that her organization feels that transportation and transit in particular are inextricably linked with other quality of life components in the RCP.

Maureen Aitken, San Diego resident, supported providing better public transit services to residential areas in the region, as new communities are planned and developed. She advocated for providing more funding for neighborhood bicycle and pedestrian
improvements, and expressed support for programs such as Safe Routes to School and school pooling.

Toni Bates, MTDB, stated that MTDB management and staff are very pleased with the 2030 RTP, including the emphasis on multimodal transportation and better integrating transportation and land use. She stated that the Plan includes MTDB’s priorities and that the MTD Board would be asked to endorse the Plan at a meeting the following week.

Lynne Baker, Environmental Habitat League, supported designating the 2030 RTP as an interim plan for local purposes. She expressed support for evaluating shorter term strategies to relieve congestion. She stated that the challenge to addressing the need to improve highways in the unincorporated areas is providing the capacity enhancements without promoting urbanization of rural areas. She suggested that the region develop alternative design standards for rural highways that better accommodate rural characteristics.

Pat Partin, North County Economic Development Corporation, expressed support for including SR 76 in the Revenue Constrained Plan, and stated that her organization appreciates SANDAG’s efforts to hold RTP public workshops in other areas besides downtown San Diego.

Renatta Mulry, Bexen Press, expressed support for providing better north-south connections between I-5 and I-15 in the North County area and improvements aimed at relieving traffic congestion.

It was noted that a North-South Facility Study was included in SANDAG’s FY 2003 work program, and would begin shortly after the adoption of the 2030 RTP.

**Action**: Imperial Beach – Del Mar. A motion was made, and second, to close the public hearing on the Draft 2030 RTP and Draft EIR. Yes - 14. No - 0. Absent - 5 (El Cajon, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos). The motion passed unanimously.

**ADJOURNMENT** – 12:20 p.m.
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of December 6, 2002

The regularly scheduled meeting of the San Diego Association of Governments Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Ron Morrison. Committee members in attendance were Mickey Cafagna, Ramona Finnila, Dick Murphy, Ron Roberts, and alternates Dick Ramos and Lori Pfeiler.

CONSENT ITEM (1)

1. RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT AN INTEGRATED COASTAL OCEAN OBSERVATION SYSTEM (DISCUSSION)

Staff outlined the report on the Scripps Institute of Oceanography’s regional effort to establish an integrated coastal ocean observation system, and indicated the system builds upon existing local efforts and seeks funding established through recent water quality legislation.

Councilmember Finnila informed the Committee of a project underway measuring the amount of plastics in the ocean and the availability of a video about the project. She asked what venues were available to inform people of this project. Staff is working with the staff from the City of San Diego Mayor’s Clean Water Task Force and the County’s Project Clean Water to determine the appropriate venue.

Action: The Executive Committee voted to approve the Resolution to Support an Integrated Coastal Ocean Observation System in Southern California.

2. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS/COMMENTS

Public Speakers:

Jim Schmidt spoke regarding the need for the ability to use a 55% vote for a TransNet extension, and provided an informational handout. He stated that the State Constitution currently requires a two-thirds vote for a transportation sales tax increase or measures like the TransNet extension. He announced that he will be working on this issue.

Gary Gallegos reported that SANDAG’s consultant D.J. Smith is assisting staff with this effort.
REPORTS

3. **2003 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM (Debra Greenfield) (APPROVE)**

Counsel outlined the report on the legislative program for next year for review and approval by the Executive Committee, and referenced the priorities.

Members discussed amending page five under Housing item 18, to include “moderate income housing” along with low income housing, consolidating items 18 and 20, to support legislation that facilitates an increase in the supply of housing for all income groups, and moving item 28 to the high priority list.

*Action:* The Executive Committee voted to approve recommendation of the 2003 legislative program to the Board of Directors, with amendments to combine the housing recommendations and make them more specific, and to move item 28 up to a high priority item.

4. **SB1703 TRANSITION ITEMS (Debra Greenfield) (DISCUSSION)**

A. **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TRANSITION**

Counsel reported that this is the last meeting of the SANDAG Executive Committee as currently constituted under the Joint Powers Agreement. Pursuant to SB 1703, commencing with the next Executive Committee meeting on January 10, 2003, the Executive Committee will be comprised of the following voting members: the Chairman (representing South County), the Vice Chairman (representing North County Inland), a City of San Diego Board Member (selected by the City of San Diego), the County of San Diego Board Member, a Board Member from North County Coastal (selected by the Board members from this subregion), and a Board member from East County (selected by the Board members from this subregion).

Members discussed amending the methods of selection to Policy Advisory Committees to include a provision for a tie-breaker, such as selection by the Chair if a consensus from the members of the subregion could not be reached.

B. **OPERATIONS POLICY FOR NEW AGENCY**

Counsel outlined the Operations Policy for a New Agency, referencing the list of Board and Policy Advisory Committee responsibilities.

Members discussed items that appeared more operational. The issue of responsibilities and process for establishing a uniform fare structure will be subject to some of the finer details that will be in the transition plan.

*Action:* The Executive Committee voted to approve recommendation of the Operations Policy for the New Agency for Board approval in January.
C. BYLAW PROVISIONS

Counsel reported that staff is in the process of rewriting the bylaws, deleting old provisions that are not needed, and adding those that are required by SB 1703 and necessary to the agency. Counsel indicated the new Bylaws should be designated as interim, and should be reviewed and modified as the transition takes place.

Members discussed compensation changes based on a survey of similar agencies, meeting schedule adjustments, increasing the financial contract authority for the Executive Director and Committees, the possibility of increased number of closed sessions, and the appointment process for Policy Advisory Committees.

Action: The Executive Committee voted to approve the Bylaws Provisions with an amendment to set contract authority limits at $50,000 for the Executive Director and $250,000 for the Executive and Transportation Committees, subject to an increase to $100,000 and 500,000 respectively, in six months.

D. AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO BRING ON STAFF POSITIONS FROM THE TRANSIT AGENCIES TO IMPLEMENT SB 1703

Gary Gallegos recommended deferring this item to a future meeting.

5. FY 2004 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET - SCHEDULE OF EVENTS AND REVIEW PROCESS (Leslie Campbell) (INFORMATION)

Gary Gallegos introduced new Finance Director, Leslie Campbell.

Ms. Campbell outlined the FY 2004 Overall Work Program and Budget - Schedule of Events and Review Process. She indicated there are some challenges facing the organization relating to the new agency transition.

6. REVIEW OF DRAFT BOARD AGENDA FOR DECEMBER 20, 2002 (APPROVE)

Gary Gallegos reported that item #21, relating to the unconstrained plan for MOBILITY 2030, may not be ready for the December meeting and suggested deferring it to the January meeting.

Action: The Executive Committee voted unanimously to approve the draft Board agenda for December 20, 2002 with an amendment to defer item #21 to the January Board meeting.
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of December 12, 2002

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Vice Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal). Committee members in attendance were Mickey Cafagna (North County Inland), Art Madrid (East County), Dick Murphy, (City of San Diego), Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), and alternates Ron Morrison (South County), and Hal Martin (North County Inland). Ex-officio members in attendance were Judy Ritter (NCTD), Karen King (NCTD), Bob Emery (MTDB), Tom Larwin (MTDB), and Pedro Orso-Delgado (Caltrans).

CONSENT ITEMS (1-2)

1. APPOINTMENT OF I-5/I-805 SOUTH BAY TRANSPORTATION STUDY TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (APPOINT)

The purpose of the I-5/I-805 South Bay Transportation Study is to develop a coordinated, multimodal transportation improvement program for the Interstates 5 and 805 corridors from State Route 54 to the United States/Mexico border. The study is scheduled to begin in early 2003.

Action: The Transportation Committee appointed a technical working group to assist in the I-5/I-805 South Bay Study.

2. CHANGE IN TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING DATE AND TIME (APPROVE)

It has been proposed that all SANDAG Policy Advisory Committee meetings be held on Fridays. This would require a change in the Transportation Committee’s regular meeting date. The Executive Committee discussed this at its last meeting and thought that the Transportation Committee meeting time should be extended to three hours. If approved, Transportation Committee meetings would be held on the third Friday of each month from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Judy Ritter, NCTD, and Bob Emery, MTDB, suggested adding a second regular meeting each month. They noted that the Transportation Committee would have additional transit responsibilities under the new consolidated agency. The Committee discussed the need to remain flexible to handle the new agency responsibilities. It was agreed that additional Transportation Committee meetings could be added on the first Friday of each month in the future, if needed.

Action: The Transportation Committee approved changing the regular meetings to the third Friday of each month from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m., beginning in January 2003.
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS / COMMUNICATIONS

Robert Hoffman stated that SANDAG’s working groups should include members with technical expertise in transportation. He stated his opinion that the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Stakeholders Working Group is not qualified, because its members do not have technical experience.

REPORTS

4. SAN DIEGO-CORONADO BRIDGE TOLL REMOVAL CONGESTION RELIEF MEASURES AND STATE ROUTES 75/282 PROJECT STUDY REPORT (INFORMATION)

Staff provided an update on the work of the State Route 75 Congestion Relief Working Group and implementation of the congestion relief measures presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors in April 2002. Most of the short-term measures have been completed or are ongoing, such as transportation demand management (TDM) efforts. The mid-term relief measures, estimated to take six months to two years to complete, were studied in a Project Study Report (PSR) developed by Caltrans for the major rehabilitation of State Routes 75 and 282 (3rd and 4th Streets). The PSR evaluates traffic calming measures, such as curb extensions, lane width reduction, enhanced landscaping, enhanced pedestrian crossings, transit stop improvements, and drainage improvements.

Caltrans has not identified funding to move from the PSR to the Project Report/Environmental Document phase. All of the PSR improvements are estimated to cost $6.5 million to implement. The City of Coronado has recommended contributing $2 million of its $8.5 million toll revenue account toward this next phase of the project, and has set aside the remaining account revenues for long-term congestion relief measures.

Committee members asked why some of the short-term relief measures were not implemented within six months. Staff responded that providing preferential parking for carpoolers at large private employers was a suggestion of the Navy, but has not yet been fully supported by Coronado. Improving the 3rd Avenue/Alameda drainage for better transit access could not be accomplished in the short-term. Fixing the drainage problem requires major grinding of the roadway to allow the natural gas buses to negotiate the area. For security reasons, re-establishing the bus stop on base at Naval Air Station North Island (NASNI) has not yet been accomplished. Coronado, the Navy, and MTDB are continuing to work on resolving this issue.

Councilmember Monroe, City of Coronado, stated that it was Coronado’s understanding that the mid-term congestion relief measures would be fully funded and completed by the end of 2002. He was surprised that many of the measures would need more time for evaluation. The Transportation Committee discussed the time frame for the mid-term relief measures. It was anticipated that the mid-term measures would take between six months and two years to accomplish. Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans, stated that Caltrans is committed to identifying and advancing the individual relief measures that may be implemented more quickly.
5. CENTRAL I-5 CORRIDOR STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS (RECOMMEND)

Staff provided an overview of the Central I-5 Corridor Study and the recommendations forwarded to the Transportation Committee by the Central I-5 Policy Working Group. The study evaluates access needs to San Diego International Airport (SDIA), the Port of San Diego marine terminals, the downtown ballpark, and other major activity centers in the study area as well as north-south mobility needs through the corridor. The study has been coordinated with other planning studies, such as the Airport Master Plan and redevelopment plans for the area. A freeway deficiency plan required for the downtown ballpark development will be produced as a separate report (based on the study). The deficiency plan is expected to be submitted to SANDAG in April 2003.

Staff summarized the recommended access improvements to major activity centers in the study area. These improvements would provide better access to the Old Town Transit Center, SDIA, and the 10th Avenue and National City Marine Terminals. Staff reviewed the recommendations to improve north-south mobility through the corridor. Three mobility alternatives were analyzed: (1) Transit/TDM/Transportation Systems Management (TSM); (2) Parallel Arterials; and (3) Freeway Capacity Enhancement.

While the study found that the Transit/TDM/TSM and Parallel Arterials alternatives would improve corridor mobility by providing better transit service and removing short trips from the freeway, enhancing the freeway capacity in the Central I-5 corridor also was needed. Therefore, the recommended improvement plan is a composite of the three alternatives. A major component of the plan is the Collector-Distributor (C-D) system for the Centre City. This concept combines many of the existing ramps into a set of roadways parallel to I-5 to remove the traffic conflicts of vehicles merging on and off the freeway. The C-D system would allow another freeway lane in each direction for general purpose traffic through the corridor.

Staff stated that the preliminary cost of the recommended improvement plan totals more that $1.1 billion. The Central I-5 Policy Working Group prioritized the improvements into three phases, consistent with the three financial scenarios included in the Draft 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Revenue Constrained Plan would include $172 million of access improvements to the Old Town Transit Center and the two marine terminals.

The Reasonably Expected Revenue Plan would include airport access and parallel arterial enhancements, interchange and ramp modifications, a high occupancy vehicle (HOV)/bus lane on Pacific Highway, and the C-D system and freeway widening north of SR 94. Together, these total an additional $527 million. The remaining $270 million included in the Unconstrained Revenue scenario includes the remaining I-5 mainline widening, and the C-D system south of SR 94. Staff stated that the recommendation is to incorporate the Central I-5 Corridor Study recommendations, including the phasing of the proposed projects, into the 2030 RTP.

A Committee member asked whether a monorail alternative in the center median was evaluated. Councilmember Morrison, who chaired the Central I-5 Policy Working Group, replied that while the study did not specifically look at a monorail, the Trolley parallels the freeway in the corridor. Even with increased Trolley service, the study identified the need for improvements to I-5 capacity.

The Transportation Committee discussed whether the additional lanes on I-5 should be designated as HOV lanes. It was noted that the Draft 2030 RTP included I-5 HOV lanes immediately north and south of the Central I-5 Corridor. Some felt that the lack of HOV lanes in the central corridor would
create a gap in the HOV system. Staff responded that the lane improvements could be listed as either HOV or general purpose lanes in the 2030 RTP, subject to further study. Staff stated that more detailed analysis of the impacts of HOV lanes in this stretch of I-5 was needed, given the numerous ramps and the large numbers of vehicles merging on and off the freeway through Centre City. The Committee suggested that the lanes could be available as HOV lanes in the peak periods and as general purpose lanes in the off-peak.

A Committee member discussed whether the 10th Avenue Marine Terminal access improvements should be included in the Revenue Constrained Plan. Some Committee members were concerned with potential visual impacts of raising roadways near residential areas and resulting community impacts. Councilmember Morrison stated that the working group discussed this issue extensively. The recommended improvements would serve multiple purposes, providing access to the marine terminal as well as the downtown ballpark, convention center, and Centre City, and removing truck traffic from the Barrio Logan community.

Committee members asked whether approving the staff recommendation today would preclude adjusting the projects in the 2030 RTP at a later date. Staff replied that approving the Central I-5 project recommendations would not preclude the Committee from modifying the project priorities. The current 2030 RTP schedule calls for the Committee to review RTP responses and comments in January 2003 and changes to the RTP in February 2003. The specific projects could be identified by the Committee in January 2003 at the latest.

**Action**: The Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors incorporate the recommended plan of improvements from the Central I-5 Corridor Study, as amended by the Transportation Committee, into the 2030 RTP. The amendment includes designating the proposed lanes on I-5 as HOV lanes, subject to future detailed studies.

**6. PROPOSED STATE BUDGET CUTS — POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM IMPACTS (INFORMATION)**

Staff reported on the Governor’s proposed State budget cuts in response to predicted State General Fund shortfalls. Included in the proposed cuts is the deferral of the Proposition 42 transfer of General Fund revenue to transportation purposes ($1.1 billion in FY 04), and the deferral or cancellation of the repayment of the $500 million loan to the General Fund from the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP). The proposed statewide cuts puts at risk up to $395 million of TCRP funding for various transportation projects in the San Diego region.

Staff summarized seven potential actions strategies described in the staff report in response to the Governor’s proposed state budget cuts. These range from reprioritizing projects, to seeking additional transportation revenue sources, to doing nothing. (Note: See Item #19 on the December 20, 2002 Board agenda.)

Staff reported on recent information from Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC), which identifies a potential of up to a $4 billion shortfall in the current 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This could mean cutting projects out of the 2002 STIP (FY 2003 to FY 2007) or extending the five-year STIP to reprogram projects over a longer period of time. New STIP funds may not be available in the upcoming 2004 and 2006 STIP cycles. Given a $4 billion shortfall, the earliest that new STIP funding may be available is in the later years of the 2008
STIP (i.e., FY 2012 or FY 2013). The potential loss of TCRP and STIP funding could jeopardize several ongoing transportation projects in the region.

The Transportation Committee suggested expending as much of the TCRP funds on the ongoing projects as possible over the next few months. The Committee also directed staff to begin immediately contacting San Diego’s delegation in Sacramento to discuss the specific impacts to the region, and to work with them to develop viable strategies to address the funding cuts.

Staff stated that more information about the proposed budget cuts is expected to be provided at the January 2003 CTC meeting. Staff will keep the Committee and the SANDAG Board apprised of additional information as it becomes available.

Following discussion of this item, Councilmember Monroe asked the Transportation Committee to look into a proposal by the City of Thousand Oaks to change the way maximum speed limits for local roads are established. This would require a change to state law. Staff responded that this issue could be addressed with the December 20, 2002 SANDAG Board agenda as part of the 2003 Legislative Program agenda item.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
The regularly-scheduled meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland). Committee members in attendance were Patty Davis (South County), Scott Peters (City of San Diego), and Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), along with alternates Judy Ritter (North County Inland), and Ron Morrison (South County). Ex-officio members in attendance were Gene Pound (Caltrans), Susanah Aguilera (DOD), Leon Williams (MTDB), and Bill Chopyk (SDUPD). Councilmember Maggie Houlihan (City of Encinitas) and Bob Leiter, representing the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, also were in attendance.

CONSENT ITEMS

1. ACTIONS FROM NOVEMBER 1, 2002 MEETING (INFORMATION)

2. REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE SCHEDULE FOR 2003 (APPROVE)

3. WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (APPROVE)

   Action: The Regional Planning Committee approved the consent agenda.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

   There were no public comments or communications.

REPORTS

5. STATUS OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT EFFORTS

   a. Introduction of Public Involvement Consultant and Overview of Program (INFORMATION) – Staff introduced Greg Brooks, Vice-President of Jane Mobley Associates (JMA), based in Kansas City, Missouri, and the local subcontractors, Doug Perkins and Lisa Sutherland of Pacific Gateway Group, as the public involvement consultants for the RCP. Mr. Brooks provided a brief overview of the public involvement work program for the RCP.

   b. Selection and Appointment of Stakeholders Working Group Members (APPROVE) – Chair Holt Pfeiler and Vice-Chair Davis distributed a slate of candidates for the Committee’s consideration to serve on the Stakeholders Working Group. The Chair
emphasized that the slate attempts to balance criteria, geography, and the number of highly-qualified candidates. The Working Group will not have any alternates.

**Action:** The Committee approved the slate without any changes (Attachment).

c. **Final Schedule for Subregional Roundtables (INFORMATION)** – A handout was distributed with revised dates for the first round of Subregional Roundtables. Chair Holt Pfeifer noted the dates and stressed the importance of public participation in the planning process. The roundtables will be held on the following dates:

- **North County Inland** January 23, 2003, Escondido
- **City of San Diego** February 3, 2003, Council Chambers, pending Mayor approval
- **East County** February 19, 2003, La Mesa
- **North County Coastal** February 20, 2003, Encinitas
- **South County** February 26, 2003, Chula Vista
- **County of San Diego** To Be Determined

6. **REGIONAL VISION AND CORE VALUES FOR RCP (DISCUSS / APPROVE)**

Earlier this year, the Committee developed a preliminary vision statement and core values based on smart growth that could be used as the basis for the RCP, with the understanding that the vision would be tested and refined through the public involvement program. The Committee reviewed and discussed alternative short and long versions of the vision. Comments included:

- The vision should be concise.
- The vision should be instantly understandable and link issues together, for example, “Making the region a better place to live, work, and play.”
- The vision should resonate with people, and have meaning.
- It should include the words “quality of life.” It should refer to being a good place for families.
- The vision needs to be simple and direct, and should contain a verb. It should promote a healthy environment and an outstanding quality of life for everyone, not just families.
- The vision should reflect communities working together to reach regional goals.
- It should emphasize healthy natural environments.

**Action:** Staff will work with the public involvement consultant to reflect the Committee’s direction and to use effective discussion tools at the Subregional Roundtables to obtain public input on the vision and core values.

7. **INTRODUCTION OF OUTLINE ON URBAN FORM COMPONENT OF THE RCP (COMMENT)**

A presentation was made on the draft outline of the Urban Form component of the RCP, which will be developed in two tiers: spatial distribution and urban design. The Urban Form component will serve as the foundation of the RCP with regard to where and how the region grows, and the kinds of incentives and tools that can help implement smart growth. Comments reflected the importance of addressing aesthetics, local community character, and visual quality in this chapter, and the recognition that this chapter will provide the link between the RTP and the RCP, especially in terms...
of developing criteria for allocating the $25 million smart growth incentive fund outlined in the 2030 RTP.

8. INTEGRATION OF THE 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION)

A presentation was made on MOBILITY 2030, the draft 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which currently is out for public review and comment. The integration of the RCP and RTP will be an in item at SANDAG’s Board Retreat in January. Comments included:

- The land use assumptions in the RTP do not reflect enough “smart growth;” too much of our future growth is exported to Riverside County and Baja California under the assumptions.
- The RCP should reflect how we want our region to grow, not just the land use assumptions that are probable. This should be a primary topic of discussion at the Board Retreat.
- The land use assumptions in MOBILITY 2030 are more ambitious than existing trends. Under existing trends, we export twice as many units out of the region into Riverside and Baja California. As we plan for the future, we need to knock those numbers down even further.
- The problem in this region is the lack of housing. Even doctors are opting not to live here because of our rising housing prices.
- Other regions have addressed the transportation/affordable housing problem by rewarding cities on the basis of per-bedroom of affordable housing.
- The Committee’s challenge is to look at a more aggressive smart growth land use scenario, and then convert that scenario to implementation at the local level.
- Local jurisdictions need to increase their densities in transit corridors. The bottom line is that the status quo is not providing enough housing.
- Since the draft RTP is based on the smart growth “light” set of assumptions (existing general plans with some smart growth commitments), it should be considered an interim plan for local purposes. Over the next year, the goals should be to bring the land use assumptions in the RTP and the RCP into conformance, and explore more equitable ways of funding transportation infrastructure improvements in the region that provide incentives for smart growth.
- We need to build more housing around our employment centers, not just our transit centers. Also, we need to institute more incentive programs for local communities that are implementing smart growth (e.g., County’s Urban Vision Award).

9. PROGRESS ON INFRASTRUCTURE ITEMS (INFORMATION)

Staff provided a progress report on the 4-step process of the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Plan (IRIP). The steps include: (1) An Infrastructure Evaluation Process; (2) An Infrastructure Needs Assessment; (3) Financing and Public Policy Options; and (4) The IRIP Strategy and Performance Monitoring. Staff is at Step 1 at this time – gathering information about each infrastructure area and organizing the information in the same way so each infrastructure area can be compared against one another. This is challenging because each infrastructure area has its own unique planning structure.

Once the infrastructure evaluation process is completed, the objectives of the next phase are to examine the existing and future regional capacity of each infrastructure set, and to determine, at
the subregional level, whether we are applying infrastructure expenditures to the locations where we want future growth to go. The third phase will examine financing and public policy options, especially reprogramming of funds (incentives) to achieve the land use policies envisioned in the RCP.

Councilmember Houlihan stressed the importance of incorporating green infrastructure into the analysis and decision-making process sooner rather than later, and requested a workshop on green infrastructure specifically for the San Diego region.

Bob Leiter emphasized that the study would examine regional and subregional deficiencies for the present and 2030, not just focusing on how we solve today’s problems, but future challenges, as well.

10. ADJOURNMENT AND UPCOMING MEETINGS (APPROVE)

Action: The Committee approved the next meeting date for January 17, 2003 from 11 a.m. - 1 p.m. with SANDAG’s Borders Committee, followed by a special session on the Regional Housing Needs Statement. There will be no meeting in February due to the Subregional Roundtables.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
## MEMBERSHIP OF REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP
(APPROVED BY SANDAG’S REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE ON DECEMBER 6, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marla Hollander, Leadership for Active Living, San Diego State University</td>
<td>Susan Carter-Robert, All Congregations Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Salisbury, League of Women Voters, San Dieguito River Park Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Rose Davis, Indian Voices, Native American Advisory Board, Council of American Indian Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna Spehn, SD County Taxpayers Association, Quality of Life Coalition, SD Dialogue, The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Paula Forbis, Environmental Health Coalition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Stepp, San Diego County Farm Bureau</td>
<td>Tom Scott, SD Housing Federation, San Diego Housing Coalition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borders</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Gonzalez-Luna, Maquiladora Association, Tijuana Economic Development Council</td>
<td>Michael Stepner, SD Economic Development Corporation, AIA, C-3, SD Council of Design Professionals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Redevelopment/Infill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brad Barnum, Associated General Contractors, SD Regional Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Claire Carpenter, The El Cajon Collaborative, Cajon Valley Education Foundation, East County Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gatzke, – Alliance for Habitat Conservation</td>
<td>Marco LiMandri, New City America, Little Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business/Economy</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hom, Asian Business Council, Chula Vista Planning Commission</td>
<td>Juliananne Nygaard, citizen, former City of Carlsbad Councilmember, Chair of NCTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Stockwell, East County Economic Development Council, El Cajon Women’s Club</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase, SD Coalition for Transportation Choices, SD Earthworks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janet Anderson, Sierra Club, Desert Protective Council</td>
<td>Jim Bell, Ecological Life Systems Institute, Mayor Murphy’s Environmental Task Force, Regional Energy Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Baker, Endangered Habitats League, Housing Action Network</td>
<td>Carol Bonomo, Cal State San Marcos, SANDAG’s I-15 Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Tucker, Fallbrook Land Conservancy, SD Land Conservancy Coalition, San Luis Rey Watershed Council</td>
<td>Dutch Van Dierendonck, Ramona Community Planning Group, SD County DPLU GP 2020 Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Pezzoli, UCSD, Regional Workbench Consortium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BORDERS COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of November 15, 2002

The regularly scheduled meeting of the San Diego Association of Governments Borders Committee was called to order by Vice Chair Patricia McCoy (South County). Other members in attendance were Crystal Crawford (North County Coastal), Hal Martin (North County Inland) and Ralph Inzunza (City of San Diego); and alternates Judy Ritter (North County Inland), Phil Monroe (South County), and Dick Ramos (East County). Ex-Officio members in attendance were Gene Pound (Caltrans), Jim Turner (SDCWA), Francisco Anza (Mexico), Kevin Viera (Riverside County), and COBRO Chair Elsa Saxod.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
   
   Vice Chair Patricia McCoy welcomed the Committee members and guests to the meeting, and asked for self introductions.

2. MEETING SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 18, 2002
   
   The Borders Committee approved the October 18, 2002 Borders Committee summary with one change regarding attendance.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS
   
   Vice Chair McCoy announced an upcoming meeting that she plans to attend of the Comision Estatal de Servicios Publicos de Tijuana, the water and wastewater operating agency in Tijuana, on November 21st at San Ysidro Middle School, and invited others to attend.

CONSENT ITEMS (4 and 5)

4. COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (INFORMATION)
   
   COBRO Chair Elsa Saxod was available to report and answer questions.

5. STAFF REPORT (INFORMATION)
   
   The Borders Committee approved the consent agenda items 4 and 5.


REPORTS

6. **CHAIR AND MEMBERS REPORTS (INFORMATION)**

Vice Chair McCoy reported on the Border Tour that the Committee Members participated in.

7. **BORDERS VISIONING PROCESS (Crystal Crawford) (DISCUSSION)**

The Committee began its Visioning process by hearing from Scott Anders, San Diego Regional Energy Office (REO), who presented the Committee with an overview of the Sustain San Diego visioning project. Mr. Anders noted that the REO entered an International Energy Competition whose purpose is to stimulate new ideas, approaches, concepts, and design in urban planning. Key issues to be dealt with include energy, water and wastewater, transportation, land use, housing and urban design, by-product management, and governance.

After Mr. Anders concluded his presentation, the Committee members discussed their ideas for the future of San Diego’s borders. Chair Crawford pointed out that this committee’s views and feedback on the Regional Planning Committee’s vision and core values will be discussed at a joint meeting of both Committees in January. Committee members identified many important issues and concepts to be considered. Issues of importance included:

- Communication
- Economic parity
- International trade
- Economic development
- Jobs/housing balance
- Seamless transportation systems
- Binational or shared infrastructure projects

Important concepts that surfaced include:

- The notion that the San Diego region has more in common with Baja California than it does with the state and federal government. The idea of the “borderlander” was raised.
- The actions of people and non-governmental organizations on either side of the border must be considered since they are the segments of society that are on the cutting edge and will determine the way the region grows.
- As the population changes, so will the region’s notion of itself.
- The importance of understanding cultural differences and developing respect for them.
- The need for defining sustainability, and encouraging sustainable development.
- The notion that common interests will guide economic progress.
- The potential for a new type of border agency beyond SANDAG, to include both Mexico and the United States.
- Better cross border cooperation is needed to help improve the economy in Mexico as well as Imperial County.
Committee members echoed the concern that Orange County thus far has not been involved in the Borders Committee and, therefore, there is a gap in perspective from that border.

**Action:** Staff will take the Border Committee’s comments, and develop a list of core values to bring back to the next meeting for review.

8. **THE SAN DIEGO TRANSPORTATION ALLIANCE (Elsa Saxod) (INFORMATION)**

COBRO Chair Elsa Saxod gave a presentation on the San Diego Transportation Alliance. Her presentation included such statistics as the number of border crossings, ports of entry hours of operation, and the number of trucks traveling to and from Mexico. The San Diego Transportation Alliance has made recommendations regarding border crossing procedures and the dynamics and infrastructure needs of the region’s ports of entry.

9. **CROSS BORDER TRANSPORTATION FORECASTING MODEL (Elisa Arias) (INFORMATION)**

Staff provided a brief overview of the cross border transportation forecasting model. The model is being used as a tool to evaluate proposed ports of entry or expansion of existing ones, forecast traffic volumes on the main highways that connect ports of entry, and to provide input to border-wide planning studies. Staff mentioned that SANDAG recently received two awards for this model. SANDAG also would like to update the model to include enhanced 2030 cross border projections and plans from Tijuana.

10. **NEXT MEETING TOPICS, DATE, AND LOCATION (INFORMATION/APPROVE)**

The full Board has moved its December meeting to December 20. It was suggested that the time of the December meeting be changed to 2:00 p.m. Staff will present the Borders Committee with a meeting schedule for 2003 at that meeting.

**Action:** The Borders Committee approved changing the December meeting time to 2:00 p.m.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

Committee members expressed interest regarding the passage of the sales tax extension measure in Riverside County, and asked to hear from the Riverside representative on this issue. The Committee also expressed concern about a disconnect in I-15 corridor planning.

Garry Bonelli, SANDAG, reported that the sales tax extension is to be discussed at the retreat in January when the Board will receive a presentation from the Executive Director of the Riverside County Transportation Commission.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director
LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (LTA) PROJECTS REQUIRING MORE THAN $1,000 OR THREE DAYS STAFF TIME

Local Technical Assistance (LTA) policy guidelines require that all projects involving more than three days staff time be reported to the Board of Directors.

1. City of Chula Vista—Public Opinion Survey

The City of Chula Vista has requested SANDAG’s assistance in conducting a telephone-based public opinion survey. The survey results will provide information about residents’ priorities and baseline data against which to measure changes in residents’ satisfaction with City services. SANDAG does not have the trained staff or facilities to conduct a telephone survey. Therefore, a Request for Proposals (RFP) will be developed to select a qualified survey research firm. SANDAG will coordinate the RFP process, work with City staff and the consultant to prepare the questionnaire, and oversee the consultant’s work to ensure quality control. Consultant costs cannot be determined until the completion of the RFP process. However, the estimated SANDAG costs for this project are $3,500. With the LTA deduction of $1,000, the cost to the City of Chula Vista will be $2,500 (plus consultant costs).

Project Manager: Leslie Walker, (619) 595-5379; lwa@sandag.org

2. Cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside—Transportation Modeling

The Cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside are collaborating on developing a customized subarea transportation model. Jurisdiction staff will review and update land use, traffic counts, and street network information. SANDAG will then calibrate the model and prepare future year forecasts. This collaborative model will be used by both jurisdictions and SANDAG in future transportation modeling efforts, resulting in consistent traffic forecasts, maps and reports. The total estimated cost of this project is $5,000. With the LTA deduction of $1,000, the cost to be shared equally by the Cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside is $4,000.

Project Manager: Mike Calandra, (619) 595-5629; mca@sandag.org

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Karen Lamphere, (619) 595-5355; kla@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #102 and Reimbursement by the Requesting Agency
NON-DISPOSAL FACILITY AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENTS

Recommendation

It is the recommendation of SANDAG’s Integrated Waste Management Technical Advisory Committee, the Citizens Advisory Committee, and staff that the SANDAG Board of Directors recommend the San Diego County Non-disposal Facility and Household Hazardous Waste Elements to the County Board of Supervisors for its consideration.

Introduction

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), as the Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force for the San Diego Region, reviews and forwards comments on the Non-disposal Facility Element and the Household Hazardous Waste Element to the County of San Diego. The two elements being reviewed at this time apply only to the County unincorporated area of the region. SANDAG’s Waste Management Technical and Citizen’s Advisory Committees have reviewed and commented on the Elements and recommend approval in accordance with the AB 939 process for preparation and amendment of Elements of an Integrate Waste Management Plan.

Background

In 1990, SANDAG was designated as the Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force (LTF) for San Diego County. The role of the LTF includes reviewing and commenting on proposed solid waste projects and on amendments to local jurisdictions’ waste management plans. Additionally, as specified by AB 939, the LTF also is responsible for identifying regional solid waste issues of concern; determining the need for regional solid waste facilities and strategies; facilitation of multi-jurisdictional markets for recyclable materials; and facilitation resolution of conflicts or inconsistencies between source reduction and recycling elements. The role of the LTF is held by the SANDAG Board of Directors, with the assistance of two advisory committees: the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). The TAC includes a representative designated by the city manager from each jurisdiction in San Diego County. The CAC is comprised of membership from public interest groups and industry representatives.

Signed into law in 1990, AB 939, or the “California Integrated Waste Management Act,” requires each jurisdiction to develop and implement plans to reduce the amount of waste it sends to landfills by 25% by 1995 and by 50% in 2000, using 1990 as the base year.

The five components of the Integrated Waste Management Plan are; Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE), Non-disposal Facility Element (NDFE), Countywide Siting Element, and the Countywide Summary Plan. The first three elements cover only the unincorporated county areas. The Countywide Summary Plan must be updated every five years. The last Integrated Waste
Management Plan was approved by the California Integrated Waste Management Board in June 1997, affirming the region’s compliance with state law at that time.

**Discussion**

1. **Non-disposal Facility Element (NDFE)** – The California Public Resources Code (PRC), requires that every California city and county prepare and adopt a Non-disposal Facility Element (NDFE) for all new non-disposal facilities, and any expansion of existing Non-disposal facilities that will be needed to implement local Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs). A Non-disposal Facility is defined as any solid waste facility required to obtain a state solid waste facility permit except a disposal facility or a transformation facility.

The County determined that an amendment of the NDFE was necessary due to changes in county demographics, increase in quantities of waste since 1995, privatization of the solid waste management system in the county, permitted disposal capacity, changes in funding sources for administration, the number of facilities managing solid waste in the county, and the implementation of diversion programs and other developments.

The biggest change in the NDFE structure since the 1994 amendment was the divestiture of solid waste landfills by the County with resultant privatization, and the complete privatization of land filling in the unincorporated County. The proposed NDFE amendment identifies the non-disposal facilities that have closed since the last NDFE of 1994, and describes the currents system: one urban material recovery facility (MRF), seven urban combination MRF/transfer stations, one urban recycling center, eight rural transfer stations, and several composting facilities. These non-disposal facilities will serve as the County’s core facilities to achieve its waste diversion goals.

2. **Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE)** – The County’s Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) has been prepared to comply with AB 939 requirements. It provides a framework for achieving the goal of providing residents of the unincorporated areas with safe and convenient means of disposing household hazardous waste, thereby preserving the environment, and eliminating potential public health risks. The HHWE specifies how the unincorporated County will safely collect, recycle, treat and dispose of household hazardous waste generated by households in the jurisdiction. Examples of household hazardous waste include thousands of consumer products that can fall into this classification, however there are six general categories: household cleaners, automotive products, home maintenance and improvement products, yard and garden products, electronics, and miscellaneous items. The most notable change throughout the document since its last update is the inclusion of electronics, especially cathode ray tubes (CRTs) in television and computer monitors, as a hazardous waste item.

The next step in the process is to forward this report to the County Board of Supervisors as a part of its consideration of the NDFE and HHWE.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Nan Valerio,
(619) 595-5365; nva@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #5.11
PROGRESS REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Introduction

This report summarizes the current status of major highway, transit, arterial, traffic management and transportation demand management (TDM) projects in SANDAG’s five-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). The TransNet one-half cent local sales tax and other local, state, and federal sources fund the projects. The projects contained in this report have been previously prioritized and are included in the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Attachment 1 – “TransNet Program” – indicates sales tax revenue available for allocation was $17.6 million in November 2002, bringing the fiscal year total to $78.8 million. Revenue for the fiscal year is 1% higher than it was last fiscal year at this time. An increase in the construction cost index for the last quarter, however, offset these revenues. The California Highway Construction Price Index is currently 5% higher than last year at this time. Revenue available for allocation since the inception of the TransNet Program totals $2.08 billion.

Highway Projects

Attachment 2 – “Highway Projects” – provides basic cost and schedule information on the major highway projects in the San Diego region. The accompanying map (Attachment 3 – “Major Highway Projects”) locates these projects.

Caltrans opened bids for the I-15 Widening between Miramar Way and Mira Mesa Boulevard (project #14). Construction is scheduled to be complete by late 2004.

Transit and Bikeway Projects

Attachment 4 – “Transit and Bikeway Projects” – provides basic cost and schedule information on the major transit and bikeway projects in the San Diego region. The accompanying map (Attachment 5 – “Major Transit and Bikeway Projects”) locates these projects.

Public review for NCTD’s Oceanside Station Parking Structure (project #58) draft environmental document was completed. Conceptual design also was completed. This project is scheduled to be open for use December 2005.

MTDB certified the environmental document for the Sabre Springs Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Station (project #56). Completion of the environmental document for the Rancho Bernardo and Del Lago BRT stations is scheduled for June 2003. Right of way acquisition activities are now underway, with scheduled completion by August 2003.

Arterial and Freeway Interchange Projects

Attachment 6 – “Arterial and Freeway Interchange Projects” – provides cost and schedule information on the major arterial and interchange projects in the San Diego region. The accompanying map (Attachment 7 – “Major Arterial and Interchange Projects”) locates these projects.

Chula Vista opened bids for the Palomar Street Widening (project #73). Completion of construction is scheduled for late 2003.
Traffic and Demand Management

Attachment 8 - “Traffic Management Projects” – provides cost and schedule information on the major traffic management projects in the San Diego region. The accompanying map (Attachment 9 - “Major Traffic Management Projects”) locates these projects.

Caltrans finished the design of one of the two Changeable Message Signs (CMS) projects (project #115). This project will install three CMS’s on I-8 and one on SR 94. Installation of these CMS’s is scheduled for late 2003.

Attachment 10 - “Transportation Demand and Incident Management” – summarizes monthly activities in those functional areas. Attachment 11 - “Freeway Service Patrol Assists” – summarizes the number of assists by the Freeway Service Patrol. Attachment 12 - “Vanpool Program” – summarizes the number of daily vanpool origins by major area.

SANDAG’s Vanpool Program participation rate continues to increase, growing 34% percent in the last year, from 172 vanpools to 231 vanpools. Vanpools from outside San Diego County represent 45% of all vanpools, and have more than doubled over the past year from 50 to 103 vanpools. Each vanpool eliminates an estimated 18 home-work trips. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs reduced an estimated 13,310 pounds of smog forming pollution last month, bringing the fiscal year total to 64,682 pounds reduced, an increase of 25% over last year at this time. Since July 1, 2002, the Freeway Service Patrol has assisted over 24,000 motorists, an increase of 12% over last year at this time.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments (12)

Key Staff Contact: José A. Nuncio, (619) 595-5619; jnu@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in the TransNet, STIP-RIP, RSTP, and CMAQ Programs.
### TransNet Program - November 2002 Progress Report

#### Attachment 1

**TransNet Allocations Fund Disbursements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program &amp; Recipient</th>
<th>TransNet Allocations</th>
<th>Fund Disbursements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This Month</td>
<td>FY To Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BICYCLE ELEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Agencies</td>
<td>$83,333</td>
<td>$416,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$83,333</td>
<td>$416,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALKABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Agencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGHWAY ELEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programwide</td>
<td>5,851,403</td>
<td>26,112,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,851,403</td>
<td>$26,112,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT ELEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly/Disabled (Various Agencies)</td>
<td>58,514</td>
<td>261,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>4,166,045</td>
<td>18,591,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDCTDB</td>
<td>1,626,844</td>
<td>7,260,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,851,403</td>
<td>$26,112,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL STREET &amp; ROAD ELEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>186,381</td>
<td>832,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>362,063</td>
<td>1,615,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>49,478</td>
<td>222,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>16,279</td>
<td>74,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>180,185</td>
<td>805,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>126,470</td>
<td>565,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>259,214</td>
<td>1,157,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>51,647</td>
<td>232,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>116,311</td>
<td>520,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>54,503</td>
<td>245,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>107,208</td>
<td>479,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>324,841</td>
<td>1,449,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>109,939</td>
<td>492,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>2,373,972</td>
<td>10,579,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>119,149</td>
<td>533,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>106,055</td>
<td>474,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>34,214</td>
<td>154,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>170,991</td>
<td>764,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1,102,503</td>
<td>4,914,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,851,403</td>
<td>$26,112,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSNET PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This Month</th>
<th>FY To Date</th>
<th>Program To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$17,637,543</td>
<td>$78,755,446</td>
<td>$2,053,418,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,068,231</td>
<td>$43,682,593</td>
<td>$2,080,919,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) TransNet Allocations consist of tax allocations from the State plus interest earnings.
2) Disbursements include cash disbursements and bond proceeds. Debt service costs are not included.
# Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route - Description</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 I-5 Realignment</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Nov-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Ave POE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation in San</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysidro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I-5/ I-805 Merge</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Jan-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening Genesee Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Del Mar Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I-5 Widening</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Apr-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Northbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar Heights Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Via de la Valle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I-5 Widening</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Nov-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Northbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Bay Dr to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I-5 Widening</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Mar-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th Street to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I-5 HOV/General</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar Heights Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Vandegrift Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I-5 Noise Barriers</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I-5/ SR-56</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West to North and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South to East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I-5/ SR-78</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Sep-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen North to East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I-8 Widening</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Aug-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eastbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Street to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 SR-11 4-Lane</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Border Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 I-15 Widening</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Jan-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Southbound)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friars Road to I-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 I-15 Managed</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Dec-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes South Segment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-163 to SR-56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 I-15 Widening</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Dec-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Mesa Blvd to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramar Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 I-15 Widening</td>
<td>Design &amp;</td>
<td>Apr-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Rd to SR-56</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 I-15 Managed</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Dec-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes Middle (stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 South of 15/56 to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 I-15/ SR-56</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Oct-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Widening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 I-15 Managed</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Dec-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes Middle (stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 15/56 to Camino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del Norte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 I-15 Managed</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Dec-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes Middle (stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Camino del Norte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Duenda Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 I-15 Managed</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Dec-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes Middle (stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Duenda Road to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Hodges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TransNet funded projects in **bold**.  
Underlined items changed from last report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route - Description Limits</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>Phase Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes Middle (stage 5) Highland Valley Road to Centre City Pkwy</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Dec-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes North Segment Centre City Pkwy to SR-78</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Dec-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-52 4-Lane Freeway SR-125 to Cuyamaca St</td>
<td>Design &amp; Right of Way</td>
<td>Nov-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-52 4-Lane Freeway Cuyamaca St to SR-67</td>
<td>Design &amp; Right of Way</td>
<td>Apr-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-54 and SR-125 HOV Lanes I-805 to SR-94</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Oct-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-56 4-Lane Freeway Black Mtn Rd to Camino Ruiz</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-56 4-Lane Freeway Camino Ruiz to Carmel Country Rd</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Jul-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-76 4-Lane Conventional Highway Melrose Dr to Mission Rd (S13)</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Jun-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-76 Intersection Improvements Olive Hill Road</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Restoration SR-76 Corridor</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Sep-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-78 Widening (Eastbound) El Camino Real to College Blvd</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Oct-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94 Capacity Enhancement I-5 to SR-125</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94 Noise Barriers City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94/ SR-125 Interim Connector West to North</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94/ SR-125 Connectors West to North and South to East SR-125 Frwy Widening</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-125 6-Lane Freeway Grossmont College Dr to Navajo Rd</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Jul-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-125 6-Lane Freeway SR-94 to Troy Street</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mar-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-125 6-Lane Freeway Troy Street to Jamacha Rd</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Sep-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-125/ SR-54 6-Lane Freeway San Miguel Rd to Briarwood Rd and Elkelton Blvd (Gap &amp; Connector)</td>
<td>Design-Build</td>
<td>Dec-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TransNet funded projects in **bold.**
*Underlined items changed from last report.*
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## Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route - Description</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limits</strong></td>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 SR-125 4-Lane Toll Highway SR-905 to San Miguel Rd</td>
<td>Design-Build Dec-04</td>
<td>$400,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 SR-905 4-Lane Freeway I-805 to U.S./Mexico Border</td>
<td>Environmental Jan-04</td>
<td>$261,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 SR-905 Construct Interchange Siempre Viva Rd</td>
<td>Construction Dec-04</td>
<td>$31,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$4,406,744,000</td>
<td>$2,236,413,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TransNet funded projects in **bold.***

*Underlined items changed from last report.*
## Transit and Bikeway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title Description / Limits</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Completion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cost Estimate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 San Ysidro Station Construction</td>
<td>Dec-03</td>
<td>$19,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 East Village Stations Construction</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
<td>$29,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Mission Valley East LRT I-15 to Baltimore Drive Construction</td>
<td>Dec-04</td>
<td>$431,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Mid-Coast Balboa LRT Old Town to Balboa Ave Design</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>$116,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Nobel Drive Station New Coaster Station Design</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Sorrento Valley Station Parking Lot Expansion Construction</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 I-15 Bus Rapid Transit Centers Sabre Springs, Rancho Bernardo Del Lago Environmental</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td>$51,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Encinitas Coaster Station Parking Lot Expansion Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Oceanside Station Parking Structure Environmental</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td>$9,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Oceanside - Escondido LRT Coast Hwy to Valley Pkwy Design</td>
<td>Mar-03</td>
<td>$351,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Coastal Rail Double Track Corridor Level EIR Environmental</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Oceanside-Escondido Bikeway Design</td>
<td>Mar-03</td>
<td>$10,208,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 North Coastal Bikeway Design</td>
<td>Mar-03</td>
<td>$25,456,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 San Diego Bayshore Bikeway Construction</td>
<td>Mar-03</td>
<td>$7,398,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Escondido-San Diego Bikeway Mission Valley Segment Design</td>
<td>Feb-04</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,068,962,600</td>
<td>$807,937,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TransNet funded projects in **bold**.

Underlined items changed from last report.
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### Arterial and Freeway Interchange Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location - Description</th>
<th>Sponsoring Agency</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
<th>Programmed Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
<td>Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Extend South Melrose Drive</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Design &amp; Right of Way</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Widen Rancho Santa Fe Rd</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Sep-04</td>
<td>$39,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Olympic Parkway/ I-805 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Mar-03</td>
<td>$21,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Widen Palomar Street</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Design &amp; Right of Way</td>
<td>Jan-03</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Palomar Street/ I-805 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Coronado Tunnel</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Jun-04</td>
<td>$295,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Widen Jamacha Road</td>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>$4,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Manchester Ave/ I-5 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-05</td>
<td>$27,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Widen Bear/ East Valley Pkwy</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td>$13,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Nordahl Road/ SR-78 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Aug-03</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Widen Plaza Blvd</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Nov-03</td>
<td>$9,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Extend Rancho Del Oro Drive</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
<td>$6,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Rancho Del Oro Dr/ SR-78 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Nov-05</td>
<td>$34,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Widen Espola Road</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Feb-05</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Extend Carroll Canyon Rd</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Dec-03</td>
<td>$11,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Friars Rd/ SR-163 Interchange</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-05</td>
<td>$15,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Genesee Ave/ I-5 Interchange</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Jun-04</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 Clairemont Mesa Blvd/SR-163 Interchange</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
<td>$8,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Genesee Ave Widening</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Design &amp; Right of Way</td>
<td>Apr-03</td>
<td>$2,733,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 El Camino Real</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
<td>$18,457,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TransNet funded projects in **bold.**

*Underlined items changed from last report.*
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## Arterial and Freeway Interchange Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location - Description</th>
<th>Sponsoring Agency</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 Las Posas Rd/ SR-78 Interchange</td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
<td>$20,200,000</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Rancho Santa Fe Rd</td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Dec-03</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Widen Mission Gorge Rd</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Lomas Santa Fe Dr/ I-5 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>$20,600,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 Widen West Vista Way</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Aug-04</td>
<td>$7,700,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 South Santa Fe Ave</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>$34,900,000</td>
<td>$34,900,000</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Bradley Ave/ SR-67 Interchange</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Nov-04</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 Los Coches/ I-8 Interchange</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Aug-03</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TransNet funded projects in bold.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underlined items changed from last report.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

December 2002
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110 CCTV Incident Identification System</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>$15,500,000 $15,500,000 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5: I-15 to I-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8: I-5 to SR-163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-75: I-5 to Orange Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94: I-5 to I-805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 CCTV Incident Identification System</td>
<td>Construction Jul-04</td>
<td>$11,200,000 $11,200,000 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8: SR-163 to Mission Gorge Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15: I-8 to SR-163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805: I-8 to SR-163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 CCTV Incident Identification System</td>
<td>Construction Feb-03</td>
<td>$10,800,000 $10,800,000 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15: SR-163 to SR-56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-163: I-8 to SR-163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805: SR-163 to Balboa Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 CCTV Incident Identification System</td>
<td>Design Oct-04</td>
<td>$9,000,000 $9,000,000 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15: SR-94 to I-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805: SR-94 to I-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 Changeable Message Signs</td>
<td>Design Mar-04</td>
<td>$1,200,000 $1,200,000 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5: 3 Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Changeable Message Signs</td>
<td>Design Dec-02</td>
<td>$1,700,000 $1,700,000 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8: 3 Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94: 1 Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 Ramp Meters (Northbound)</td>
<td>Environmental Apr-04</td>
<td>$7,700,000 $7,700,000 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5: Coronado Ave to E Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 Ramp Meters (Northbound)</td>
<td>Environmental Feb-03</td>
<td>$9,200,000 $9,200,000 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805: Otay Valley Rd to E Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 Traffic Monitoring Systems</td>
<td>Environmental Jan-03</td>
<td>$6,500,000 $6,500,000 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5, SR-52, SR-94 and I-805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals                                          |                        |                          |
| Cost Estimate                                   | $72,800,000            |
| Programmed                                      | $72,800,000            |

CCTV: Closed Circuit Television Camera
Underlined items changed from last report.

December 2002
### Transportation Demand and Incident Management

#### December 2002 Progress Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This Month</th>
<th>Last Month</th>
<th>Fiscal Year To Date</th>
<th>Last Fiscal Year To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Trips Reduced</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>108,578</td>
<td>491,804</td>
<td>419,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduced</td>
<td>4,791,637</td>
<td>5,066,419</td>
<td>23,286,378</td>
<td>18,568,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounds of Smog-forming Pollution Reduced</td>
<td>13,310</td>
<td>14,074</td>
<td>64,682</td>
<td>51,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Fuel Consumption</td>
<td>261,195</td>
<td>276,175</td>
<td>1,269,358</td>
<td>1,012,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Auto Fees</td>
<td>$2,338,319</td>
<td>$2,472,413</td>
<td>$11,363,752</td>
<td>$9,061,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Vanpools</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool Passengers</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies in RideLink Subsidy Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Locker Members</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed Ride Home Participants</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>9,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incident Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assists</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>24,301</td>
<td>21,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Changeable Message Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Broadcasts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Duration (total minutes)</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>8,032</td>
<td>30,960</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Incident Advisories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig Alerts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig Alert Duration (total minutes)</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>19,317</td>
<td>18,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors - Policy or Business Meeting</td>
<td>Board of Directors - Business Meeting</td>
<td>Regional Planning Committee</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Normally second Friday, 10:15 a.m. – noon)</td>
<td>(Normally fourth Friday, 9 a.m. – noon)</td>
<td>(Normally first Friday, 11 a.m. – 1 p.m.)</td>
<td>(Normally second Friday, 9 a.m. – 10 a.m.)</td>
<td>(Normally third Friday, noon – 2:30 p.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2003</td>
<td>January 24, 2003</td>
<td><em>January 17, 2003</em> (Joint meeting with Borders Committee 11:00 am-1:00 pm; RPC until 1:30 pm)</td>
<td>January 10, 2003</td>
<td>January 17, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>November 7, 2003</em> (First Friday)</td>
<td><em>November 21, 2003</em> (Third Friday)</td>
<td><em>November 7, 2003</em> (12-2 pm, Following Board Policy Meeting)</td>
<td><em>November 7, 2003</em> (First Friday)</td>
<td><em>November 14, 2003</em> (Second Friday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>December 5, 2003</em> (First Friday)</td>
<td><em>December 19, 2003</em> (Third Friday)</td>
<td><em>December 5, 2003</em> (12-2 pm, Following Board Policy Meeting)</td>
<td><em>December 5, 2003</em> (First Friday)</td>
<td><em>December 12, 2003</em> (Second Friday)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Changes to normal schedule due to holidays shown in bold
- Board Meetings on the second Friday of each month will take place as needed based on the schedule
- August meetings will be held if needed
REVIEW OF TRANSITION ITEMS: INTERIM BYLAWS

Recommendation
It is the Executive Committee’s recommendation that the Board of Directors accept for distribution the Interim Bylaws and endorse the inclusion of additional policy recommendations contained herein for amendment into in the Board’s Policies in January.

Introduction
On January 1, 2003, the current SANDAG Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) will terminate and no longer govern the organization. Instead, SANDAG will be a statutorily created agency under SB 1703. As a result of the change in structure, new Bylaws should be prepared. The new Bylaws will incorporate necessary provisions of the JPA that should carry over for operational purposes, delete outdated or unnecessary provisions of the current Bylaws, incorporate new provisions as necessary and appropriate, and ensure consistency of the Bylaws with SB 1703. The new Bylaws should be designated as interim, and will be reviewed and modified as appropriate at the time the initial and subsequent transfer of transit responsibilities occur. This will give the Board about six months before the initial transition to determine if the interim Bylaws are adequate to meet its needs.

The Executive Committee has reviewed the recommended Bylaw changes and amendments to the Board’s Operations Policies (governing the responsibilities of the Board, Policy Advisory Committees and Chair) that have policy and procedural implications. A set of changes that are recommended by the Executive Committee have emerged and are listed below. The purposes for establishment of many of these policies are to recognize the addition of significant responsibilities for the organization and allow greater efficiencies in its operations without sacrificing the prerogatives of the Board.

Discussion

Elections and Appointment
- All City and County of San Diego Board and Policy Advisory Committee appointments – December or January
- Subregional Policy Advisory Committee appointments – January, Chair to serve as tie-breaker
- Chair and Vice Chair elected annually at June Board meeting to take office July 1
- Policy Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs appointed by SANDAG Chair in July
- Vacancies filled as they occur in the same manner as original appointments
- A formal notice and meeting process for subregional appointments be established
- Chair and Vice Chair may serve as ex-officio members of Policy Committees

Policy Committee Attendance and Voting
- A formal attendance and voting process for Policy Committees be established

Delegation of Financial/Contract Authority
- Up to $50,000 to Executive Director
- Up to $250,000 to Executive Committee for any budget item
- Up to $250,000 to Transportation Committee for transportation items
Executive Director and Transportation Committee report to the Executive Committee (in their capacity as budget committee) as needed

Executive Committee reports on all to Board of Directors

In six months the Board consider increasing the amounts delegated by at least double these amounts

The amounts not be exceeded serially

Delegation of Authority to Chairperson

Authorize delegation of authority to Chair for action on categories of items approved by the Board and consistent with Board approved criteria

Examples: Requests for co-sponsorships of conferences, proclamations

Compensation

Institute a Board and Policy Advisory Committee compensation plan which recognizes the transition of significant additional transit responsibilities to the agency and compensates the Board and committee members fairly. The proposal would compensate the Board similar to MTD and other agencies with similar responsibilities. In addition to any compensation mandated by state law for Board meetings, the following rates are recommended:

1. Board meetings or official meetings representing Board – $150
2. Policy Committee meetings - $100
3. Limit on total number of paid meetings per month (Board and Policy Committee) – up to 4 for Board members other than Chair and Vice Chair, up to 6 for Chair and Vice Chair (given extra travel and responsibilities)
4. Additional compensation for Board Chair – $500 per month
5. Additional compensation for Board Vice Chair – $250 per month

Regular Board and Policy Committee meetings to occur on Fridays unless the Chairperson of the Board or Policy Committee determines that an exception is warranted

Closed Session Items

Closed session items will be taken up by the Board unless timeliness requires consideration of any closed session item by the Executive Committee or transportation items by the Transportation Committee. This policy should be reviewed upon subsequent transition of transit agency responsibilities.

Name Change

The Executive Committee suggests that the Board consider the name of the agency.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Debra Greenfield, (619) 595-5366; dgr@sandag.org
ARTICLE I

NAME AND PURPOSE

Section 1
The name of this Organization shall be the San Diego Association of Governments (hereinafter referred to as SANDAG).

Section 2
The purposes of this Organization are as set forth in SB 1703 (Chapter 743 of the Statutes of 2002), as established by state and federal law, and as approved by the Board of Directors. The primary purpose for which this organization is created is to engage in regional cooperative comprehensive planning, programming and where authorized implementation thereof, and to assist the member agencies.

ARTICLE II

DEFINITIONS

The following terms shall have the meanings ascribed to them within this section unless the content of their use dictates otherwise:

a. “Region” shall mean that territory physically lying within the boundaries of San Diego County.
b. “Regional Board” shall mean the Regional Planning and Growth Management Review Board.
c. “Population” of any Member Agency shall mean that population as defined in SB 1703.
d. “Fiscal Year” shall mean that year beginning July 1, and ending June 30.
e. “Member Agencies” shall mean the cities within San Diego County and the County of San Diego collectively.
ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION

Section 1

Membership in this Organization shall be as provided in state law and these Bylaws.

Section 2

a. All powers of this Organization shall be exercised by the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors may choose to delegate several of its responsibilities from time to time in accordance with Board policy.

b. Only the duly selected official representative(s), or in his or her absence, his or her duly selected alternate or alternates, shall be entitled to represent his or her Member Agency in the deliberations of the Board of Directors.

c. When changes occur, names of the official representatives and alternates shall be communicated in writing to the Organization by each participating Member Agency.

Section 3

There shall be at least four standing committees which shall be known as policy advisory committees with the membership set forth in SB 1703.

a. The procedure for City and County of San Diego and subregional appointments to the policy advisory committees shall be established by Board policy. In the case of the subregional appointments, the policy shall ensure a noticed, formal process wherein all regular Board members from each subregion are provided an opportunity to participate in the selection process.

b. Procedures for policy advisory committee attendance and voting shall be established by Board policy. The policy shall ensure the formal delineation of the voting membership at each meeting.

c. The Board Chair and Vice Chair may serve as ex-officio non voting members of the policy advisory committees.

d. The Board Chair shall select the chair and vice chair of all policy advisory committees except the Executive Committee, annually in July. When serving on the Executive Committee the Board Chair and Vice Chair shall serve as the Chair and Vice Chair of the Executive Committee.
Section 4

The Board of Directors shall have the authority to appoint all additional committees or working groups and may provide for the appointment of alternates to these committees.

a. Additional standing committees may be appointed by the Board of Directors as may be required to carry out general and continuing functions and may be abolished only upon specific action by the Board of Directors.

b. Ad hoc specialized subcommittees or working groups may be appointed by the Board of Directors as the need arises to accomplish specific tasks. The policy advisory committees may appoint working groups to advise them. Upon completion of its assignment, each ad hoc subcommittee or working group shall disband.

Section 5

In addition to any compensation mandated by state law for Board meetings, the following rates shall apply.

a. For attendance by Board members, or alternates in their absence, at Board meetings, $150 per meeting.

b. For official meetings or events attended by Board members representing the Board, $150 per meeting or event.

c. For members and alternates of policy advisory committees, $100 per meeting.

d. The limit on the total number of paid meetings for Board and policy advisory committee members or alternates per individual is four meetings per month. For the Board Chair and Vice Chair the limit is six meetings per month.

e. The Chair of the Board shall receive additional monthly compensation of $500 per month.

f. The Vice Chair of the Board shall receive additional monthly compensation of $250 per month.

ARTICLE IV

MEETINGS

Section 1

a. A quorum for a meeting of the Board of Directors shall be as provided for in state law.

b. A quorum shall be required for the conduct of any business of a committee. No business shall be conducted by a committee without a quorum. A sample majority of the appointed members of a committee shall constitute a quorum. All decisions by a committee shall be by simple majority of the quorum.
Section 2

Parliamentary procedure at all meetings shall be governed by Roberts Rules of Order except as otherwise modified by state law or these Bylaws. The Secretary shall forward written notice of the meetings of the Board of Directors and each Standing Committee, stating the time, location, and the agenda of business to each Member’s Agency and to the respective members and alternates of the Board of Directors or the Standing Committees, not less than five days prior to meetings, except that such written notice of regular Board of Directors’ meetings may be forwarded by first class mail or other appropriate means not less than seven days prior to such meeting.

Section 3

All meetings of SANDAG, including without limitation regular, adjourned regular, and special meetings of the Board of Directors, shall be called, noticed, held and conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act (commencing with Section 54950 of the California Government Code). Closed session items should be heard by the Board of Directors unless timeliness requires consideration by the Executive Committee or, for transportation matters the Transportation Committee.

Section 4

The Board and committees shall meet according to the following schedule:

a. The Board of Directors and policy advisory committees shall hold their regular meetings on Fridays unless otherwise determined from time to time by the Board of Directors or policy advisory committee. Regular meetings of the Board of Directors shall be held at least monthly, normally on the fourth Friday morning of the month at the offices of the Organization or at other locations within San Diego County. Special meetings of the Board of Directors or policy advisory committees may be called from time to time by their respective Chair.

b. Other committees shall meet whenever called by their respective Chair.

ARTICLE V
OFFICERS AND THEIR DUTIES

Section 1

The Board of Directors and standing committees shall have as officers a Chair and Vice Chair, who are members of their respective Board or committees. The Executive Director shall be the Secretary of the Board and each standing committee.

a. The Chair shall preside over Board and committee meetings, and have general supervision of Board and committee affairs. The Chair shall sign all official documents when directed to do so by the Board and committees respectively.
b. The Vice Chair shall perform the duties of the Chair in his or her absence and perform any duties that the Chair may require.

c. In the event of the absence of both officers of the Board of Directors or other standing committee, the quorum of members present shall elect a Chair Pro Tempore to preside for that meeting. The Secretary, with a quorum present, shall call the meeting to order and preside during such election of a Chair Pro Tempore; he or she shall immediately relinquish the chair upon completion of the election.

Section 2

The Board may delegate authority to the Board Chair for action consistent with Board approved criteria on categories of items.

Section 3

Election of officers of the Board of Directors shall be held annually during the regular June meeting.

Officers for the Board of Directors shall be elected in the following manner:

a. The Chair shall appoint a three-person nominating committee at the regular May meeting who shall submit nominees for the Board offices in writing for mailing to Board members. Additional nominations for any office may be made by Board members at the June meeting.

b. The officers shall be elected by a majority of the votes including weighted votes of those Board members present.

c. All officers shall be elected for a term of one year and shall serve until their successors are elected. They shall begin their term of office at the close of the annual June meetings.

d. In the event that the Board member who has been elected Chair or Vice Chair is no longer a member of the Board of Directors, the office shall be considered vacant.

e. Any vacated office of Chair or Vice Chair shall be filled at the next regular Board meeting by nominations from the floor, and a majority of votes from the members present.

Section 4

a. The Board of Directors shall appoint an Executive Director who shall hold office until he or she resigns or is removed by the Board of Directors. The Executive Director shall be the chief executive officer of SANDAG. The Executive Director shall have charge of all projects and property of the Organization and shall file with the Director of Finance of SANDAG an official bond in the minimum amount of $100,000 or such larger amount as the Board of Directors specifies, guaranteeing faithful performance of his or her duties. The Executive Director will be responsible to the SANDAG Board of Directors as set out in the Administrative Rules and Regulations for the administration of SANDAG’s business, including: (1) development of program objectives, definition, directions and priorities; (2)
management of SANDAG programs and coordination of staff and support services; (3) the development of financial support programs for SANDAG activities; (4) the recommendation and submission of an annual SANDAG program budget to the Board of Directors; and (5) execution of the adopted personnel, purchasing, and budgetary systems. The Executive Director shall perform such other and additional duties as is necessary to carry out the objectives and function of SANDAG and as directed by the Board of Directors.

b. Any additional staff support services provided by Member Agencies or others shall be coordinated by the Executive Director.

c. The Executive Director is hereby enabled to promulgate an administrative manual, governing the administrative procedures of the Organization.

ARTICLE VI

FINANCIAL

Section 1

The Board of Directors shall approve a preliminary budget no later than April 1 of each year. The Board of Directors shall adopt a final budget no later than June 1 of each year. A copy of the preliminary budget when approved and a copy of the final budget when adopted shall be filed with each Member Agency.

Section 2

Responsibility for supplying funds for that portion of the budget for SANDAG which is to be supplied by the Member Agencies, as adopted by the Board of Directors, shall be divided among the Member Agencies based on their population with each Member Agency including within its budget as funds to be supplied to SANDAG that sum of money determined by taking the ratio its population bears to the total population of the region and multiplying it by that portion of the approved budget to be supplied by the Member Agencies. Payment of this determined sum of money shall be made by each Member Agency by July 15 of each year. If payment by a Member Agency has not been made by September 1 of each year, that Member Agency shall no longer vote as a member of the Board of Directors. A delinquent Member Agency will be allowed to vote when full payment has been made, including interest computed from July 15 at the established legal rate.

Section 3

The Director of Finance of SANDAG shall establish and maintain such funds and accounts as may be required by good accounting practice, state and federal law, and these Bylaws. The books and records of SANDAG in the hands of the Director of Finance shall be open to inspection at all reasonable times by representatives of the Member Agencies. The Director of Finance of SANDAG within 120 days after the close of each fiscal year shall give a complete written report of all financial activities for each fiscal year to Member Agencies.
Section 4

The Director of Finance of SANDAG shall receive, have the custody of, and disburse SANDAG funds upon the warrant or check-warrant of the Finance Manager pursuant to the accounting procedures developed under Section 3 above, and shall make the disbursements required to carry out any of the provisions or purposes of the Organization. The Director of Finance of SANDAG may invest SANDAG funds in accordance with state and federal law. All interest collected on SANDAG funds shall be accounted for and posted to the account of such funds.

Section 5

Delegation of authority from the Board of Directors for financial/contracting approvals and stipulations of any nature, to serve as a limitation applicable to a particular job or program (not to be exceeded on a serial basis), shall be as follows:

a. Up to $50,000 to the Executive Director, subject to increase by Board action.

b. Up to $250,000 to the Executive Committee for any item, subject to increase by Board action.

c. Up to $250,000 to the Transportation Committee for transportation items, subject to increase by Board action.

d. The Executive Director and Transportation Committee shall report contract approvals to the Executive Committee as needed. The Executive Committee shall report contract approvals to the Board of Directors at least quarterly.

ARTICLE VII

RELATIONSHIPS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

Section 1

The functions of the Board of Directors and policy advisory committees shall be established by Board policy. The Board of Directors may delegate functions to the policy advisory committees as it deems appropriate.

Section 2

The Board of Directors shall provide guidance to committees and working groups. The Board may advise Member Agencies on the coordination of general plans, or on the resolution of conflicts between the general plans of agencies in the San Diego region.
Section 3

Conflicts between governmental agencies should be resolved among the affected agencies. In matters affecting more than one local government, and where requested by the affected agencies, the Organization shall have the authority to hear and make recommendations on appeals if the conflicts are not resolved to the satisfaction of each affected agency. Regional plans should serve as the guideline for the resolution of conflicts.

Section 4

Each action taken by the Organization which requires implementation shall include designation of the agency or agencies directly responsible for such implementation.

Section 5

The general and specific references to construction authority of SANDAG in SB 1703 shall be interpreted as applicable solely to the responsibilities set forth in Article 4 thereof.

ARTICLE VIII

ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD

In addition to the purposes and powers set forth by law and these Bylaws, pursuant to Proposition C, a countywide measure approved by the voters in 1988, SANDAG is designated and shall serve as the Regional Planning and Growth Management Review Board.

Section 1

The issues the Regional Board shall address shall include, but not be limited to: quality of life standards and objectives; holding capacities; growth rate policies; growth phasing; regional land use distribution; growth monitoring; open space preservation; significant regional arterials; transportation system management; transportation demand management; siting and financing regional facilities; fiscal abilities and responsibilities; consistency of regional and local plans; and regional growth management strategy.

Section 2

Member Agencies may be requested, and have agreed, to determine (“self-certify”) the consistency of the pertinent elements of their general plans with regional plans. Upon request by a member agency, the Regional Board will review these self-certifications, and make comments and recommendations regarding consistency. Where determined by the Regional Board to be appropriate, the Regional Board shall use SANDAG’s Conflict Resolution Procedure for resolving disputes among Member Agencies. The Regional Board shall adopt rules to establish the self-certification process.
ARTICLE IV

INFORMATION AND EVALUATION

Section 1

a. The Organization shall disseminate information concerning its work program and activities. The required information system should be organized and categorized so that it will continue to allow full and efficient use of information by the public and private sectors.

b. Adequate provision for citizen participation shall be provided as required by law and as directed by the Board of Directors.

c. The Board shall perform an annual evaluation of the Organization’s goals, purpose, structure, and performance, directed toward continually improving the planning, coordination, and implementation process.

ARTICLE X

AMENDMENTS

Section 1

The Board of Directors shall be responsible for making all amendments to these Bylaws.

a. Proposed amendments may be originated by the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee, or any member of the Board of Directors.

b. Each proposed amendment shall be considered by the Board of Directors and a copy thereof forwarded by the Secretary to the official representative of each Member Agency, his or her alternate and the Agency itself, at least 20 days prior to the meeting at which such proposed amendment will be voted upon.

c. Amendments to these Bylaws shall require the vote of a majority of the Member Agencies which also represents at least 51% of the weighted vote of Member Agencies.
2003 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Recommendation

It is the Executive Committee’s recommendation that the Board of Directors approve the attached 2003 legislative program.

Introduction

Each year the Executive Committee recommends action on the legislative program for the next calendar year to the Board of Directors. The program will continue to include existing policies and proposals for federal and state legislation and suggest new proposals to deal with emerging SANDAG issues. The program highlights the highest priority and high priority items for 2003. The underlined items are new proposals. The purpose of the program is to provide a guide and to set priorities for staff and your legislative advocates in developing and responding to state and federal legislation and administrative action.

Staff predicts a busy year. In the area of transportation, at the federal level, TEA-21 reauthorization and obtaining additional TEA-21 funding is the highest priority. At the state level, the goal and the recommended highest priority in the program is to obtain enhanced opportunities statewide and locally to increase funding for transportation projects, including increased authority to extend existing sales tax programs by a majority vote. Many regional transportation agencies and commissions will be working on acceptable approaches to accomplish this goal as a priority in the upcoming session.

In recognition of the Board’s new transit responsibilities, for the first time it is recommended that the legislative programs (attached) of the transit boards be incorporated into the SANDAG program, with SANDAG serving to coordinate the multi-agency program.

Growth management continues to be a subject to be addressed statewide. Infrastructure financing is a companion to this topic. Given the budget deficit, holding on to current revenues may be the most optimistic goal.

Discussion

Board and staff will meet with members of the state legislative delegation to brief them on important aspects of the program. Also, a detailed briefing for the federal legislative delegation will occur in Washington in March.

Finally, the Transportation Committee requested that the Board add an item to the program supporting repeal of the 85 percentile rule for establishing speed limits on local roads and leaving the authority within local government.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Debra Greenfield, (619) 595-5366; dgr@sandag.org
I. **HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEM**

1. Support/Co-Sponsor legislation and/or initiatives that would authorize local sales taxes or other new revenue sources for transportation projects and purposes to be approved by a majority vote.

II. **HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS**

2. Participate in the development of a unified statewide position on TEA-21 reauthorization in accordance with adopted Board policy, and support ongoing implementation of the TEA-21 legislation with a focus on obtaining discretionary funding from the new programs established in TEA-21 including:
   a. Border Infrastructure/National Corridor Planning and Development Program funding for:
      - SR 905, I-5
      - SR 11 (Connect to 3rd Border Crossing)
      - Virginia Avenue
      - Car Sharing/Station Car Programs
   b. New starts program funding
   c. Freight Rail Programs (SD&AE Railroad Project and San Diego portion of LOSSAN corridor)
   d. Clean Fuel Bus Program (Transit Operators)
   e. Job Access and Reverse Commute Program "Welfare to Work" (Transit Operators)
   f. Federal funding for transit to implement ADA services
   g. Value Pricing Pilot Program for I-15 Managed Lanes value pricing project implementation and pre-implementation/feasibility studies for other Managed Lanes proposals included in 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.

3. Oppose revisions to state transportation programming and funding reform legislation not consistent with Board policy and SB 45. Oppose legislative appropriation of State Highway Account Funds for specific programs and projects which would reduce the amounts available for the State Transportation Improvement Program.

4. Support, in coordination with the transit operators, efforts to identify additional transit operating funds in response to near-term operating shortfalls and long-term needs to implement the Regional Transit Vision and to support the implementation of Smart Growth strategies.

5. In cooperation with MTDB and NCTD, seek to obtain the annual appropriation levels needed to meet the federal funding commitments identified in the Full Funding Grant Agreements for the Mission Valley East project and the Oceanside-Escondido project.
6. Oppose the appropriation of, or cuts in, city/county revenues by the State of California for purposes of balancing or enhancing the state budget. Monitor budget impacts on the regional transportation program and projects and oppose or seek mitigation for such impacts.

III. OTHER ITEMS

A. REGIONAL PLANNING

Shoreline

7. Support and encourage federal and state legislative initiatives providing funding sources that can be used locally and regionally to preserve, enhance, replenish beaches and preserve and enhance other shoreline environmental resources, such as nearshore reefs and lagoon inlets.

8. Develop the legal framework and funding source for establishing a long-term management plan for shoreline and nearshore coastal resources which will enable on-going beach restoration efforts in the San Diego region.

Habitat

9. Seek federal and state funding for land acquisition and management, biological monitoring, and habitat restoration to implement Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) and preserve sensitive habitats.

10. Continue to seek federal funding for the development of HCPs pursuant to regional multi-species/habitat conservation planning efforts including obtaining appropriations from the Department of the Interior and Resource Agency’s FY 2004 budgets to continue the next steps in the HCP efforts, especially detailed preserve implementation strategies and implementation of habitat tracking and monitoring programs.

11. Continue to monitor federal and state endangered species legislation and policies which would enhance implementation of HCPs.

12. Support legislation that provides incentives to regions that develop regional conservancies or plan collaboratively to achieve conservation and planning goals on a regional basis.

Smart Growth/Regional Comprehensive Plan

13. Monitor and respond to all legislation proposing restructuring of regional governance and authority in accordance with Board policies and positions related thereto. Oppose the creation or expansion of new single-purpose regional agencies.

14. Support federal and state initiatives that provide funding for local agencies to implement smart growth and affordable housing initiatives, and to amend general plans and provide necessary infrastructure improvements that are consistent with smart growth principles. This would include incentives that discourage sprawl, encourage compact growth, mixed use development, better transit connections and walkable communities.
15. Review and advise on all legislation relating to growth management, regional planning, and fiscal reform in light of existing Board policy or new policies, and as related to the preparation and implementation of the RCP.

**Housing**

16. Monitor and participate in activities related to legislative and administrative reform of state housing element law.

17. Sponsor and/or actively support legislation that provides full state recognition of the SANDAG housing element self-certification program, and consider extending or eliminating the program sunset.

18. Pursue rewards for local jurisdictions that meet housing production goals.

19. Support regional fair share allocations of all state and federal housing funds.

20. Monitor, **sponsor** and/or support state and federal legislation that
   a. promotes and/or provides additional funding (preferably a permanent source) for low and moderate income housing, and
   b. facilitates an increase in the supply of housing for all income levels

21. Support federal legislation that would establish a National Housing Trust Fund.

**Solid Waste**

22. Monitor and support legislation to assist the region in cooperatively carrying out the goals and objectives of the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939), including statewide programs to increase source reduction, recycling and market development, including implementation of household hazardous product advanced disposal fees (ADFs), increased efficiency and local flexibility in the planning process, and improvements to the facility siting process.

**Water Supply**

23. Continue to evolve SANDAG/CWA strategy to implement recent legislation that establishes local land use and water availability interrelationships.

**Storm Water**

24. Support federal and state funding to assist the copermitees (eighteen cities, County of San Diego and San Diego Unified Port District) and Caltrans, MTDB and NCTD, in implementing the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit.
Energy

25. Support and respond to energy legislation in accordance with the Legislative Principles to Achieve Energy Security recommended by the San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO) based on the SANDAG Regional Energy Strategy.

Public Finance

26. Continue to aggressively pursue and support fiscal reform initiatives that enable regions to formulate fiscal strategies within the existing state structure.

27. Continue to oppose unfunded federal and state mandates on local government, and support legislation which would prohibit the passage of legislation which imposes new unfunded mandates.

Borders

28. Promote federal and state legislation that would encourage both the United States and Mexico acting within the existing governmental structure to fund improvements in the border area that would promote binational trade and enhance binational relations and increase funding for border inspection agencies. Projects of national and international significance should be funded by the federal government. Seek state funds to conduct a joint binational study of the ports of entry, transportation, and environmental conditions at the border. Funding for database development and joint database projects also should be sought. Support legislation enhancing border security and reducing border wait times.

29. Support additional and continuing funding for interregional partnerships.

B. TRANSPORTATION

Funding - Federal

30. Monitor Congressional actions related to adhering to the guaranteed funding levels established in TEA-21 and support increased annual appropriation levels up to the maximum amounts authorized in TEA-21. Support increased funding above TEA-21 from new or increased Federal sources. Support legislation providing flexibility and control at the regional level streamlining the project delivery process.

31. In cooperation with the City of Coronado, support their efforts to obtain federal discretionary funding for the SR 75 Tunnel project, and state legislative authorization to achieve congestion relief programs recommended by the SANDAG Board if necessary.

32. Pursue continuation of Value Pricing Pilot Program and federal authorization to toll interstates in reauthorization of TEA-21. Pursue changes in pilot program, including (1) increasing the maximum length of time that the pre-implementation and implementation phases of a project can receive funding from 3 to 5 years; (2) increasing the total number of cooperative agreements the Secretary may enter into with states or local government or public authorities from 15 to 30; (4) including language that encourages both facility-based and non-facility-based pricing projects, (5) authorizing FHWA to use pilot program funds for outreach, monitoring and evaluation.
33. Obtain state and federal funding for rail doubletracking, grade separations, and other capital improvements to benefit commuter, intercity, high-speed and freight rail operations in the region.

**Funding - State**

34. Support increased funding by the state for transportation purposes, particularly through increasing/indexing the gas tax or other means as appropriate. Support legislation authorizing regional agencies to implement user fee programs to fund transportation improvements identified in the Regional Transportation Plan.

**Planning and Operations**

35. Monitor efforts related to High-Speed Rail legislation including potential funding proposals so that the region can evaluate and determine consistency of the project with regional transportation plans and program.

36. Support state and Southern California region action pertinent to improvements in the LOSSAN corridor including an equitable disposition of inter-city rail (Amtrak) and commuter rail coordination and responsibilities. Ensure that the LOSSAN rail corridor is properly and correctly defined in the reauthorization legislation.

37. Seek changes to the federal planning related provisions as part of the TEA-21 reauthorization process, including changing the long-range plan update process from three to five years and eliminating unnecessary provisions such as the requirement for MPO’s to publish a list of obligated projects.

38. Obtain financial and legislative support to improve the flow of goods through our marine terminals with an integrated improvement program of grade separated facilities facilitating both rail and truck movements. The program would include improved access to/from Interstate 5, expanded capacity along the entire I-5 corridor, and the potential use of high occupancy vehicle lanes by trucks during the off-peak periods to improve travel times and reliability.

39. Build upon the region’s experiences in the conceptualization, development, and field testing of innovative technologies to maximize the use of existing roadway infrastructure. Future intelligent transportation systems deployments would benefit from the prior, successful applications of intermodal transportation systems management for Southern California and automated highway systems along the San Diego Interstate 15 Express Lanes.

40. Support legislation and/or administrative reforms to streamline the Caltrans, FHWA, and FTA project delivery process including actions to promote effective implementation of Proposition 35.

41. Support legislation that would provide tax credits to employers who voluntarily subsidize commuter benefit programs for their employees. This would include employers who subsidize transit passes and vanpool fares, and carpool and telework costs; particularly if such tax credits would encourage employers to hire people transitioning from welfare to employment.

42. Monitor the Safe Routes to School program and other related bills for consistency with efforts of the Walkable Communities Advisory Committee and for opportunities to assist in implementation
of concepts developed by the Committee. Support funding for walkable communities infrastructure in the context of regional Smart Growth strategies.

43. Support opportunities to closely coordinate with Tribal Governments on issues including, but not limited to, impacts of Indian gaming on transportation facilities. Specifically, support legislation calling for dedication of a fixed percentage of funds paid into the Indian Gaming special Distribution Fund and allocation of those funds to the county of origin for the purpose of mitigating off-reservation impacts to local governments caused by Indian gaming. Tribal governments should be afforded the opportunity to consult with the County on expenditures for this purpose.

44. Support efforts to provide for enriching the public involvement and outreach for disadvantaged and non-traditional communities.

45. Support repeal of the 85 percentile rule for establishing speed limits on local roads.

C. INCORPORATION OF TRANSIT BOARD LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS

46. Where not inconsistent herewith, incorporate by reference the legislative programs of the transit boards as set forth in the attached reports from MTDB and NCTD.

D. OTHER

47. Monitor federal and state outer continental shelf (OCS) activities and oppose any actions which are inconsistent with Board policy.

48. Support legislation or an executive order which would provide funding of framework geographic information system (GIS) databases. The funding would facilitate the development of additional GIS information and meet requirements to place it in the public domain.

49. Encourage and support the design, testing and full implementation of the American Community Survey (ACS). ACS will provide detailed demographic information for jurisdictions and other geographic areas throughout the decade and is designed to eliminate the need for a long form in the 2010 census. Also, encourage and support the Census Bureau’s efforts to improve the completeness and accuracy of its Master Address File and the TIGER file (the digital map used to collect and report census and ACS data).

50. Support funding for an on-going statewide program for the acquisition and development of high resolution digital imagery. This funding would support a wide range of regional and interregional planning efforts, including those in the areas of transportation, environmental and habitat monitoring, and growth management.

51. Support legislation or an executive order to produce labor market information that identifies the emerging economic drivers (employment clusters) in the California economy.
Attachments #2 and #3 to the Agenda Item #16 may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347
Introduction

SANDAG, in partnership with Caltrans, the City of San Diego and the San Diego Unified Port District, has completed the Central I-5 Corridor Study. The study area extends from Sea World Drive to State Route 54 in the south, and from the coast eastward to Interstate 805. The focus of the study was on improved access to and from Interstate 5, along with improved north-south mobility through the entire corridor. This planning study provides the blueprint for future access and mainline improvements related to Interstate 5 in the Centre City area.

On November 21, 2002, the Policy Working Group for the Central I-5 Corridor Study reviewed the draft final report and the recommended plan for the corridor. With minor revisions suggested by the Policy Working Group, the recommendations were forwarded to the Transportation Committee for action at their December 12, 2002 meeting.

The Transportation Committee agreed to send the recommendations of the Central I-5 Policy Working Group onto the Board of Directors, with one modification. The Committee asked that HOV lanes be shown for entire Central Interstate 5 Corridor, pending future feasibility analysis for the section north of SR-15. The Committee also asked that staff review project priorities, where the recommended Revenue Constrained scenario includes improved access to the Tenth Avenue marine terminal, as well as to the National City marine terminal and Old Town Transit Center. Outside of the Revenue Constrained scenario, additional improvements in the corridor include ramps to the airport, freeway widening and interchange improvements, and a consolidated ramp system for Centre City San Diego.

Discussion

Initially, two individual studies were evaluating better freeway access to San Diego International Airport (Lindbergh Field) and the Port of San Diego marine terminals. Combined into a comprehensive evaluation of the whole Central I-5 corridor, the study examined the short-term and long-term freeway, arterial and transit needs in view of the various master plans and proposed projects in the area. New master plans have been developed for Lindbergh Field north of downtown, and for the commercial marine terminals to the south. Other recent or in-progress developments in the area include expansion of the Convention Center, reuse of...
the Naval Training Center, the North Embarcadero Plan, the Ballpark, and numerous large developments downtown. The recommended plan for the corridor emphasizes improved transit, higher use of parallel arterials, and freeway enhancements. Improved transit relies on implementation of the Regional Transit Vision, along with better access to the Old Town Transit Center. Roadway projects focus on ground access improvements for the major activity centers and mobility improvements throughout the corridor.

Attachment 1 is the text of the Executive Summary from the draft Central I-5 Corridor study report. Attachment 2 is the table of the project recommendations from that Executive Summary, which has been updated to reflect Central I-5 Policy Working Group and Transportation Committee actions. The table is broken into the various components of the plan, the improvements, their purpose and/or benefit, estimated cost, and comments about the project or any future considerations. Attachment 3 shows the general location of the projects in the corridor.

A major component of the plan is the Collector-Distributor (C-D) system for the Centre City. Located adjacent to the downtown S-curve, the concept combines many of the existing ramps into a set of roadways parallel to I-5. Most of the conflicts of traffic trying to enter and exit the freeway would be moved to the parallel facilities, and impacts to the main lanes would be minimized. The existing auxiliary lanes could then be used for additional through lanes. While recommended at this time by the Policy Committee, the plan does note that additional study is necessary to better define the right-of-way and community impacts.

Another major component of the plan is a more direct freeway connection to the Tenth Avenue marine terminal. A viaduct or bridge would connect I-5 traffic to/and from the north directly to Harbor Drive, serving the Tenth Avenue marine terminal, the Convention Center, Barrio Logan and East Village. It would provide a new grade separated access route, avoiding rail conflicts. Presently shown north of the Barrio Logan community, more detailed studies should evaluate alignments to minimize impacts to existing land uses, including Logan Elementary School on the south side of Sigsbee Street.

At the same time the Central I-5 Corridor Study is concluding, the Centre City Development Corporation is in the early stages of an update to the Centre City community plan. The Barrio Logan community may soon begin a similar process. Any detailed implementation studies for the concepts recommended in the Central I-5 Corridor need to be coordinated with these community plan updates and any other planning studies in the corridor.

The draft final report is out for comment until December 30, 2002. In January 2003, staff will bring back a final document to the Transportation Committee. During this comment period, staff will meet with the Central I-5 technical group to resolve any outstanding issues or recommendations. The results of these meetings will be reported to the Transportation Committee.

Breakdown for Different Levels of Funding in the RTP

The overall cost estimate for the proposed corridor projects is $1.148 billion. This includes the higher estimate of $180 million for the missing I-5/I-8 connectors. The draft final report initially broke all of the corridor projects into two simple phases, but the Policy Working Group added a third phase in order to accommodate the three funding scenarios (Revenue Constrained, Reasonably Expected, Unconstrained) in the 2030 RTP. Given the potential impacts of the southern half of the Collector–Distributor system in Centre City, the Policy Working Group approved the following phasing to align with the proposed funding amounts in the Draft RTP:
1. The Revenue Constrained Plan totals $170 million for the corridor. Projects include all of the marine terminal improvements, and the Rosecrans Street Old Town Transit Center access ramp.

2. The C-D system south of SR 94, the associated missing SR 94/I-5 connectors, and $140 million of the $240 million I-5 widening would be moved into the Unconstrained Plan.

3. The remaining recommended corridor projects are in the Reasonably Expected Scenario of the Mobility Plan, which totals $700 million for the corridor.

Freeway Deficiency Plan for the Ballpark and Ancillary Development

The Freeway Deficiency Plan for the Ballpark and Ancillary Development was originally intended to be a chapter of the Central I-5 Corridor Study. The Policy Working Group directed that the Deficiency Plan be produced as a stand alone document, although it will still be based on the results of the Corridor Study. The Deficiency Plan, the first of its kind in the region, will go through a different approval process than the Corridor Study. It will be adopted first by the participating agencies before submittal to the SANDAG Board of Directors for acceptance. The separation of the two documents allows the Corridor Study to move forward now, with more time to develop the Deficiency Plan for action later in 2003.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Michael Hix, (619) 595-5377; mhi@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3.02
Central I-5 Corridor Study
DRAFT FINAL REPORT

E.0 Executive Summary

The Central I-5 Corridor Study was conducted under the direction of SANDAG and Caltrans, with key participation by the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC), the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) and the Cities of San Diego, National City and Chula Vista. The Central I-5 Corridor Study has developed a package of short and long-range actions to reduce traffic congestion on freeways, interchanges and arterials that provide regional access to Centre City and other key activity centers.

A Policy Committee, composed of staff and elected officials from local agencies and jurisdictions, met at key points during the study process to provide direction and guidance. Meetings with technical staff from the agencies and jurisdictions were also convened at periodic points in the study process to review analysis findings at a more technical level of detail.

E.1 Background and Purpose

The Central I-5 Corridor is bounded on the north by Sea World Drive, on the south by SR 54, on the west by the San Diego Harbor, and on the east by I-805. The corridor study area included all of Centre City San Diego, as well as Lindbergh Field, the Old Town Transit Center, and the 10th Avenue and National City marine terminals. The study area south of Division Street is in National City, with the remainder in the City of San Diego. Figure E-1 displays the corridor study area.

The primary issues that lead to initiation of this study were related to access and mobility. The economic vitality of the Central I-5 Corridor, and the region as a whole, is strongly tied to the ability to efficiently move people and goods. The I-5 corridor is a major route for the movement of goods through the region and provides local truck access to San Diego’s marine terminals, freight yards and air freight terminals. Lindbergh Field serves as the primarily destination for all passengers and goods arriving to or departing from the region by air. The Port of San Diego’s 10th Avenue and National City marine terminals provide the primary destination for goods arriving and departing by sea. The Old Town Transit Center is an important regional bus and rail transfer facility. Each of these facilities are important to the economic future of the San Diego region. In addition, downtown San Diego serves as the region’s center for commerce, banking, government and related activities. Providing access in a manner which minimizes delays and congestion will be key to maintaining and enhancing the role of these major regional activity centers.

E.2 Study Process

Key components of the Central I-5 Corridor Study include the identification of ground access improvements to Lindbergh Field, the Old Town Transit Center, and the marine terminals at 10th Avenue and National City, as well as overall access improvements to the Centre City. In addition, the study included a primary focus on the enhancement of mobility throughout the corridor and specifically on the I-5 Freeway. Addressing each of these components necessitated a structured iterative analysis framework to facilitate a balanced consideration of both access and mobility improvement options.
Figure E-2 displays the analysis framework for the Central I-5 Corridor Study. As shown, individual focused access improvements were first identified for the marine terminals, the airport, and the Old Town Transit Center. These improvements were then tested within the context of the corridor-wide mobility alternatives. Various modifications and/or refinements to the focused access improvements were necessary to ensure acceptable operations on corridor freeway and surface streets, and minimize negative impacts on the overall mobility performance of the alternatives.

The Corridor Mobility Improvement Alternatives included a range of improvement types with a focus on enhancing overall corridor mobility as follows:

- **Transit/TSM/TDM Alternative** – Includes low cost roadway operational improvements throughout the corridor, along with an extensive set of transit improvements.

- **Parallel Arterials Alternative** – Includes improvements to adjacent arterials with enhanced connections to facilitate utilization.

- **Freeway Capacity Enhancement Alternative** - Includes improvements on the corridor’s freeway system with the intent of maximizing capacity and mobility.

The evaluation of the alternatives facilitated the identification of preferred improvement components within each of the above alternatives, for combination into a preferred and recommended transportation improvement program for the study corridor.

**E.3 Activity Center Access Requirements**

A set of improvements were identified which focus on improving access to the airport, the 10th Avenue and National City marine terminals, and the Old Town Transit Center.
San Diego International Airport (Lindbergh Field)
The growth in air passengers and related activity in and around the airport has centered attention on accessibility to the airport from the surface transportation system, with a focus on the following issues:

- Lack of direct freeway access
- Increased traffic congestion in and around the airport
- Limited bus service
- Lack of direct service via regional rail facilities (trolley, Coaster, Amtrak)
- Additional access requirements associated with potential new north terminal
- Increasing traffic generation/congestion associated with future developments in vicinity of the airport.

Extensive coordination with Port of San Diego airport planning staff was undertaken in the evaluation of feasible access improvement options. Recommended improvements to the airport include enhanced access to/from I-5, with primary emphasis on new ramp connectors.

Marine Terminals
Trucks and related traffic from both the 10th Avenue and National City Street marine terminals use the I-5 freeway, with local access provided via surface streets. Congestion on I-5 can often impede access to the terminals and delay the movement of imported goods from terminals to markets, and of exported goods from producers to the terminals. Poor access can make the marine terminals less competitive with other ports. In addition, the I-5 segment between SR 94 and SR 54 has several low-capacity interchange configurations, with poor heavy-vehicle access.

The access issues associated with the terminals are also affected by adjacent land uses. The 10th Avenue Marine Terminal is an industrial pocket surrounded by extensive commercial development and an adjacent neighborhood. The National City Marine Terminal is surrounded by industrial land uses, with future redevelopment plans for conversion to commercial development.

10th Avenue Marine Terminal - The most immediate need at the 10th Avenue Marine Terminal is for grade separation of Caesar Chavez Parkway (Crosby Street) over the freight tracks. The existing access routes also require an at-grade crossing of the trolley tracks, with the likelihood of increased rail volumes in the future.

National City Marine Terminal - The primary need at the National City Marine Terminal is to increase the capacity for trucks going north on I-5. Two I-5 freeway interchanges, at Bay Marina Drive (24th Street) and Civic Center Drive/Harbor Drive, are located near the marine terminal. Neither of these interchanges has the geometry or traffic capacity to route trucks efficiently from the terminal to the freeway system. At Bay Marina Drive (24th Street) the back-to-back left-turn lanes between the ramp signals limit the storage length and cause spill over into the through lanes. The City of National City would also like to reduce truck traffic on Bay Marine Drive between I-5 and Harrison Avenue to improve the ambience of the area.

Another key issue of concern by National City relates to pedestrian circulation in the vicinity of the I-5/Bay Marina Drive interchange and adjacent redevelopment parcels.

Old Town Transit Center
Access to the Old Town Transit Center is constrained by the lack of direct freeway access, localized congestion on the adjacent surface arterial streets, and the at-grade railroad crossing at Taylor Street.
E.4 Corridor Mobility Requirements

The I-5 freeway currently exhibits significant and recurring congestion in both the AM and PM peak periods. With corridor travel demands projected to grow by over 20% over the next 20 years, congestion will increase, resulting in slower freeway speeds and an increase in associated delays.

Congestion along the I-5 freeway is generally a factor of the following:

1. Areas of capacity constraint wherein traffic flows exceed the carrying capacity of the freeway, as depicted by volume/capacity (v/c) relationships. The resulting high traffic densities restrict traffic flows, limit the ability to change lanes, and result in degraded travel speeds. Locations where capacity is reduced due to lane drops and termination of auxiliary lanes can be particular problems.

2. Merge and diverge conflicts at ramp junctions. At ramps, heavy volumes of merging vehicles entering the freeway traffic flows can create turbulence in these traffic flows. Approaching freeway vehicles must often shift lanes to the left to avoid this turbulence. Diverging vehicles at exit ramps also create turbulence, as exiting vehicles move right and through vehicles move left to avoid potential turbulence.

3. Deficient spacing between entry and exit ramps and corresponding poor weave section operations. The various weave merge and diverge movements cause “turbulence” which constrain traffic flows.

PM peak hour traffic flows will continue to be a constrained in the southbound direction generally between Pacific Highway in the north and 24th Street in the south. Major bottlenecks in the “S curve” through the downtown area occur due to merging and diverging traffic and heavy traffic flows to the South Bay. In a similar manner during the AM peak hour, northbound congestion due to heavy traffic flows out of the South Bay and various conflicts with merging and weaving traffic will continue to be a problem.

E.5 Recommended Plan

The Recommended Plan represents a comprehensive program consisting of the preferred access and mobility improvements. Key components and features of the Recommended Plan are summarized in Table E.1.

One of the more significant features of the Recommended Plan is the Centre City Collector-Distributor System. The I-5 S-Loop carries some of the heaviest traffic volumes of any segment of I-5. Due to a lack of continuity in the adjacent surface street system, many shorter trips are forced to utilize I-5 because of the lack of alternatives. The concept of a collector-distributor system includes new parallel roadways linking and interconnecting the various on-and off-ramps which serve the Centre City. The intent is to encourage a more orderly and efficient distribution of trips to minimize impacts on the I-5 freeway.

The following points summarize the basis for the Recommended Plan:

- A set of preferred focused access improvements were identified which have been shown to improve activity center (airport, marine terminals, Old Town Transit Center, and Centre City) access and reduce relative levels of congestion in the immediate vicinity of the activity centers.

- The Transit/TSM/TDM alternative was shown to significantly increase transit utilization throughout the corridor and specifically the Centre City. The transit alternative would have
measurable beneficial impacts on overall corridor mobility and on I-5 freeway operations, but would not reduce the need for roadway improvements.

- The enhancement of Parallel Arterials was shown to reduce freeway vehicle miles of travel (VMT), improve freeway operations, and provide alternative routings in case of major freeway congestion and/or freeway incidents.

- The various ramp modifications and Centre City Collector-Distribution System were shown to address existing freeway design deficiencies, improve access to/from Centre City, and improve overall freeway operations and safety.

- Widening of the I-5 freeway was found to be necessary to reduce mainline congestion and to adequately serve projected future year travel demands.

The Recommended Plan includes a comprehensive set of corridor improvements incorporating a variety of multi-modal options focused on improving access to key activity centers and enhancing overall mobility within and throughout the limits of the corridor. However, a number of issues related to the recommended improvements remain unresolved, such as the missing SR 94/I-5 freeway ramp connectors and the southern portion of the Centre City Collector-Distributor System. These are also identified in Table E.1 and are recommended for further consideration in subsequent studies. It will also be important that the recommendations from the Central I-5 Corridor Study coordinated with other planning efforts in the corridor including the update of the Centre City Community Plan.

Lastly, a preliminary phasing concept has been developed indicating a potential sequence for implementation of identified improvements, as detailed further in Chapter 6.0 of the Final Report.
### Draft

**Central I-5 Corridor Study**

**Summary of Recommended Plan**

(As modified by Transportation Committee, 12/12/02)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Component</th>
<th>Recommended Improvements</th>
<th>Purpose/Benefit</th>
<th>Cost /Phasing ($Millions) *</th>
<th>Comments/Future Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mainline I-5 Widenings | • Widen to 8+2 HOV between Sea World Drive and I-15  
• Widen to 10+2 HOV between I-15 and SR 54                                            | Increases capacity of I-5 mainline and provides continuous HOV facility.        | $240.0 ($100 in MP, $140 in UP) | Requires substantial ramp modifications to enable utilization of existing auxiliary lanes for widening. Northern HOV pending further feasibility study. |
| New I-5 Auxiliary lanes | • I-5 SB from Harbor Drive to Bay Marina Drive  
• I-5 SB from Eighth Street to Cleveland Avenue  
• I-5 NB from Bay Marina Drive to Harbor Drive  
• I-5 NB from Seventh/Eighth Street to Division Street  
• I-5 NB from SB I-15 Connector to National Avenue | Improves weaving distances and merge/diverge operations at ramp junctures.      | $30.0 (MP)                   |                                                                                                  |
| Old Town Transit Center Access | Pacific Highway HOV lanes/Dedicated Bus lanes between I-5 overcrossing and Laurel Street | Improves HOV and bus access to OTTC.                                             | $26.0 (MP)                  | Would require widening of Pacific Highway. Possible extension into Centre City and/or to Harbor Drive for access to airport. |
|                        | New Rosecrans Street off-ramp from I-5/I-8 interchange                                     | Improves access to OTTC from WB I-8                                             | $4.0 (RC)                   |                                                                                                  |

* 2030 RTP PHASING:

RC – REVENUE CONSTRAINED PLAN  
MP – MOBILITY PLAN  
UP – UNCONSTRAINED PLAN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Component</th>
<th>Recommended Improvements</th>
<th>Purpose/Benefit</th>
<th>Cost /Phasing ($Millions) *</th>
<th>Comments/Future Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Access</td>
<td>New I-5 on-/off-ramps between north I-5 and Pacific Highway</td>
<td>Improves freeway access to south terminal area</td>
<td>$55.0 (MP)</td>
<td>Coordinate with Old Town Avenue and Washington Street I-5 interchange improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modify existing Pacific Highway Viaduct to provide on-/off-ramps between south I-5 and the airport</td>
<td>Improves freeway access to south terminal area</td>
<td>$40.0 (MP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geometric improvements at Laurel Street/Pacific Highway intersection</td>
<td>Improves traffic flow between EB Laurel Street and NB Pacific Highway</td>
<td>$20.0 (MP)</td>
<td>Reach mutually acceptable design for improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geometric improvements at Laurel Street/Harbor Drive intersection</td>
<td>Improves traffic flow between SB Harbor Drive and EB Laurel Street</td>
<td>$10.0 (MP)</td>
<td>Reach mutually acceptable design for improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Avenue Marine Terminal Access</td>
<td>New I-5 on-/off-ramps between north I-5 and Harbor Drive</td>
<td>Improves freeway access to marine terminal over the Trolley</td>
<td>$123.0 (RC)</td>
<td>Further study of alignment alternatives required to minimize potential community impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elevate Harbor Drive/Caesar Chavez Pkwy intersection to provide access over the railroad/trolley</td>
<td>Improves access to Harbor Drive and eliminates at-grade rail crossings</td>
<td>$15.0 (RC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elevate Harbor Drive/28th Street intersection to provide access over the railroad/trolley</td>
<td>Improves access to I-5/28th Street interchange and eliminates at-grade rail crossings</td>
<td>$22.0 (RC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2030 RTP PHASING:

RC – REVENUE CONSTRAINED PLAN
MP – MOBILITY PLAN
UP – UNCONSTRAINED PLAN
## Draft
### Central I-5 Corridor Study
#### Summary of Recommended Plan
(As modified by Transportation Committee, 12/12/02)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Component</th>
<th>Recommended Improvements</th>
<th>Purpose/Benefit</th>
<th>Cost /Phasing ($Millions) *</th>
<th>Comments/Future Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National City Marine Terminal Access</td>
<td>Civic Center Drive Widening and Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Reduces impacts of truck traffic by increasing roadway capacity and improving of turn lane geometrics</td>
<td>$0.5 (RC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Marina Drive Widening, Intersection and Pedestrian Access Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduces impacts of truck traffic by increasing roadway capacity, improving turn lane geometrics.</td>
<td>$2.0 (RC)</td>
<td>Provide for improved pedestrian access via widened sidewalks along northside of I-5 under pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of Tidelands Avenue to Harbor Drive</td>
<td>Improves circulation and terminal access to Harbor Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.0 (RC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Marina Drive to SR 54 Ramp Connectors</td>
<td>Improves geometrics and merge/weave operations between freeway interchanges.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20.5 (MP)</td>
<td>Further review required of potential significant environmental impacts at the crossing of Sweetwater River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2030 RTP PHASING:

RC – REVENUE CONSTRAINED PLAN
MP – MOBILITY PLAN
UP – UNCONSTRAINED PLAN
## Draft

Central I-5 Corridor Study

Summary of Recommended Plan

(As modified by Transportation Committee, 12/12/02)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Component</th>
<th>Recommended Improvements</th>
<th>Purpose/Benefit</th>
<th>Cost /Phasing ($Millions) *</th>
<th>Comments/Future Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Interchange</td>
<td>Reconfigure Sea World Drive Interchange</td>
<td>Increases interchange capacity</td>
<td>$5.0 (MP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements and</td>
<td>New Connectors at I-5/I-8 Interchange with Pacific Highway Ramps</td>
<td>Provides missing freeway-to-freeway connectors; Provide new connectors to/from Pacific Highway to improve connectivity</td>
<td>$180.0 (MP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Modifications</td>
<td>Widen ramps at I-8/I-5 Interchange</td>
<td>Increases ramp capacity and improves traffic operations</td>
<td>$8.0 (MP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconfigure Old Town Avenue and Washington Street Interchange</td>
<td>Improves geometrics and merge/weave operations at freeway interface</td>
<td>$12.0 (MP)</td>
<td>Coordinate with new on-/off-ramps to Pacific Highway for airport access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconfigure First Avenue/Hawthorne Street Interchange</td>
<td>Improves merge/weave operations at freeway interface</td>
<td>$10.0 (MP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern part of the Centre City Collector-Distributor System (Fifth Avenue to SR 94)</td>
<td>Improves geometrics, eliminates short weaving distances, improves freeway operations and Centre City access.</td>
<td>$170.0 (MP)</td>
<td>Issue of potential closing of First Avenue southbound I-5 on-ramp requires further study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern part of the Centre City Collector-Distribution System (SR 94 to SR 75)</td>
<td>Improves geometrics, eliminates short weaving distances, improves freeway operations and Centre City access.</td>
<td>$123.0 (UP)</td>
<td>New SR 94/I-5 ramp connectors and the C-D System require further study to identify right-of-way and community impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2030 RTP PHASING:

RC – REVENUE CONSTRAINED PLAN
MP – MOBILITY PLAN
UP – UNCONSTRAINED PLAN
### Draft
Central I-5 Corridor Study
Summary of Recommended Plan
(As modified by Transportation Committee, 12/12/02)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Component</th>
<th>Recommended Improvements</th>
<th>Purpose/Benefit</th>
<th>Cost /Phasing ($Millions) *</th>
<th>Comments/Future Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Transit Services</td>
<td>Improved service frequencies along existing routes, new express bus/BRT routes, and improved station facilities</td>
<td>Reduces roadway demands and provides expanded travel and modal opportunities</td>
<td>To be determined by subsequent studies</td>
<td>Consistent with Regional Transit Vision (RTV) and MTDB Transit First studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Parallel Arterials</td>
<td>Improved signalization and intersection geometry along key sets of parallel arterials: • Pacific Highway and Harbor Drive • Kettner Boulevard and India Street • Centre City, National Avenue, Main Street, National City Boulevard</td>
<td>Enhances arterial connections. Increases utilization of surface streets for shorter trips. Provides alternative routings during freeway incidents/major congestion.</td>
<td>$20.0 (MP)</td>
<td>Focus on signal coordination and intersection geometrics improvements only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Management (TSM)</td>
<td>Implement Centre City TDM Programs</td>
<td>Promotes transit, rideshare, flextime, telecommuting. Reduces peak period travel demands and increase public awareness.</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Management (TDM) Strategies</td>
<td>Metering of Freeway On-Ramps</td>
<td>Minimizes merge conflicts and impacts on mainline operations</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced Signal Coordination</td>
<td>Improves traffic flow on surface streets</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2030 RTP PHASING:

RC – REVENUE CONSTRAINED PLAN
MP – MOBILITY PLAN
UP – UNCONSTRAINED PLAN
SCHEDULE FOR THE SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES ON THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP)

Introduction

SANDAG currently is preparing a Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) that will serve as the foundation for integrating land uses, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies within a smart growth framework for the San Diego region. The work program calls for a Draft RCP by December 2003, and a final RCP by June 2004. SANDAG’s Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation of the RCP.

The RCP work program incorporates significant public involvement and outreach activities into the planning process over the next year and a half, including three rounds of subregional workshops, monthly Stakeholder Working Group and Technical Working Group meetings, polling, peer-facilitated focus groups, environmental justice outreach, press and media, web pages, electronic newsletters, and presentations to local groups and organizations. Additionally, the Regional Planning Committee meets on a monthly basis, and the public is encouraged to attend and participate in those meetings.

The first round of subregional workshops, which will be held in January and February 2003, will provide a forum to initiate a discussion on the RCP with the region’s local elected officials, infrastructure providers, stakeholders, the public, and representatives from bordering areas, and to involve them early in the planning process to enhance local ownership of the RCP. The second round, proposed for June and July 2003, will provide a public forum to refine the concepts in the RCP and provide input on the key pieces of the plan. The third round of workshops, anticipated for the beginning of 2004, will serve as a venue to obtain public comments on the draft RCP.

The following is the schedule for the first round of the subregional roundtables.

- **North County Coastal**: Thursday, January 23, 2003, 6 – 8:30 p.m., Escondido City Hall
- **City of San Diego**: Monday, February 3, 2003, 2 p.m., upon confirmation with the City, City Hall
- **East County**: Wednesday, February 19, 2003, 6 – 8:30 p.m., El Cajon Community Center
- **North County Coastal**: Thursday, February 20, 2003, 6 – 8:30 p.m., Encinitas Community Center
- **South County**: Wednesday, February 26, 2003, 6 – 8:30 p.m., Southwestern Community College
- **County of San Diego**: To Be Determined

Board members are requested to mark their calendars and encourage their colleagues and other interested parties to attend the workshop(s) in their area. Invitations will be mailed shortly.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 595-5399; cgr@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #5.02
PROPOSED STATE BUDGET CUTS - POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM IMPACTS

Introduction

In response to the estimated shortfalls in the State General Fund, the Governor has recently proposed $10.2 billion in spending reductions through FY 2003-04. Of this total, $1.8 billion in Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) spending reductions are proposed from transportation revenue sources. In addition, decreasing revenues for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) are resulting in revised funding capacity which indicates up to a $4 billion shortfall through FY 2006-07.

Transportation Congestion Relief Program

As described in the attached memo from Smith, Kempton & Watts (Attachment 1), the Governor’s proposed cuts are focused primarily on eliminating funding provided through the TCRP. The Governor initially proposed this program in 2000, and it evolved into Proposition 42, which was approved by the voters earlier this year.

The TCRP program originally identified $482.5 million in specific project funding for projects in the San Diego region. Attachment 2 summarizes the status of these projects. The table shows that, of the $482.5 million, approximately $197.6 million (figures shown in table in bold) have been allocated by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Of these allocations, approximately $87.6 million have been expended. Expenditure data is through August 2002, and actual expenditures to date are likely to be somewhat higher. At this time, the CTC has suspended further TCRP allocations, and it is anticipated that this suspension will continue through the end of FY 2003-04.

Although staff is trying to obtain more specific information on the magnitude of the proposed cuts, the most conservative assumption is that any TCRP funds not already spent are subject to being lost. Cuts also are proposed in the formula subventions through the TCRP to cities and counties for local street and road improvements as well as to transit operators through the State Transit Assistance (STA) program. Preliminary estimates indicate cuts could total approximately $18.4 million (out of $95 million through FY 2006-07) for the Streets and Roads program and approximately $4.7 million (out of $45 million through FY 2006-07) for the STA program.

State Transportation Improvement Program

A recent review of the revenue assumptions that were made in building the 2002 STIP Fund Estimate indicates that they are too optimistic. Revenues are now estimated to be over $1.1 billion short of the planned levels over the next two years. This trend is projected to continue through the full five-year STIP period with a total revenue shortfall estimated to be over $4 billion between FY 2002-03 and FY 2006-07. Based on these projections, additional programming capacity may not be available until the 2008 STIP programming cycle. Typically, new programming cycles add funding capacity to the latter two years of the cycle, meaning new programming capacity may not be
available for projects until FY 2011-12 at the earliest. As an initial step, the CTC has suspended further STIP allocation through February 2003.

This analysis does not include the potential impacts from the $4 billion projected shortfall in the STIP through FY 2006-07. The prospect of delaying projects currently in the pipeline together with potentially not having additional STIP programming capacity for another ten years will likely require a combination of the strategies outlined below.

Potential Action Strategies in Response to the Proposed Cuts

There are several potential courses of action that could be followed in the near term to address the potential cuts in TCRP dollars. Some of these same strategies also can be pursued to meet the more long-term STIP shortfall issue. These strategies include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Put Projects on Life Support – This approach would involve adjusting remaining funding to try to keep all of the projects moving, but at a slower pace. Every effort would be made to provide enough funding to continue work on the current phase of each project, such as finishing the environmental phase or completing the design phase, while the search for alternative funding continues.

2. Back to the Drawing Board – This approach involves revisiting all funding decisions made on ongoing projects and reprogramming the un-expended funding (e.g., STIP, TransNet, STP, CMAQ, etc.) to the highest priority projects. Rather than keeping all projects alive, this approach could shift funding away from some projects entirely to allow for the completion of others.

3. Hit the Credit Card – If the State continues to consider the option of using Grant Anticipated Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) bonds to advance future federal funds for transportation improvements, it may be possible to pursue greater use of the GARVEE bond approach currently being sought for the I-15 Managed Lane project. This would involve shifting funds out of some currently approved STIP projects to meet debt service requirements.

4. TransNet Extension to the Rescue – A dramatic reduction of state funding could increase the pressure to address the 2/3 vote threshold at the state level and help build support for an extension of the TransNet Program. The additional bonding capacity created by an extension of the sales tax could allow for a combination of the first and third strategies (put projects on life support and hit the credit card) — making as much forward progress on the projects as possible through November 2004 and, if the extension is approved, bond as needed to accelerate project completion.

5. Print More Money – A crisis such as this may create one of the rare moments in time when the Legislature is willing to consider a gas tax increase, or an alternative transportation revenue increase. It may be possible to build a coalition of support to push for additional revenues to avoid the massive cuts in transportation revenue services being considered.

6. Call your Buddies – This approach involves informing San Diego’s delegation in Sacramento of the specific impacts to the region and their respective district stemming from these cuts and to work with them to develop viable strategies to address the funding cuts.

7. Sit in the Corner and Sulk – or the Do Nothing Alternative – This approach involves sitting back and letting the cuts fall where they may. Remaining funds
would be left on other, perhaps lower priority projects, and we would adjust our future plans to fit within whatever funding continues to flow.

As additional information on the proposed budget cuts becomes available, staff will keep the Board of Directors informed.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments (2)

Key Staff Contact: Craig Scott, (619) 595-5326; csc@sandag.org
MEMORANDUM

TO: All Transportation Clients

FROM: Mark Watts and D.J. Smith

DATE: December 6, 2002

SUBJECT: IMPACT ON TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS OF GOVERNOR'S SPENDING REDUCTION PLAN

Today the Governor announced his Mid-Year Spending Reduction Proposals totaling $10.2 billion over the two year span of 2002-03 and 2003-04. Of this amount, the Governor proposes funding suspensions, transfers and loan forgiveness in the transportation program totaling $1.8 billion. We have attached a copy of the transportation element of the Governor’s reduction plan and provided the full Reduction Plan for your convenience.

To assist the transportation community in fully understanding the impact on transportation programs, John Ferrera, Assistant Secretary of BT&H, Tony Harris, Chief Deputy Director of Caltrans and other Caltrans management provided a contemporaneous briefing this afternoon as the Governor was providing his detailed reduction plan.

Summary overview of proposed actions

- Suspend 2003-04 General Fund transfer to the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF). The Administration estimates that this will provide General Fund relief in the amount of $1 billion. This proposal will require legislative approval of 2/3s of both houses in a stand-alone bill.

- Forgive the scheduled 2003-04 General Fund loan repayment required under the current year restructuring of the Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) in the 2002-03 Budget Act. This will provide General Fund relief of $500 million in the current year. This is a forgiveness of the loan, not a deferral of the repayment.

- Transfer the estimated remaining present-day balance in the TCRF of $100 million to the General Fund in the current year.
• Defer the scheduled $50 million loan repayment from the TCRF to the State Highway Account (SHA).

• Eliminate $90 million of the remaining 2002-03 SHA funding for local streets and roads in the current year. This was the “hold harmless” portion for local governments of the restructuring of the TCRP over the past two years and is needed to offset the deferral of the $50 million repayment discussed in the above bullet.

• $25 million in minor cost savings through reversions and other transfers.

Discussion

The theme expressed by the administration representatives in characterizing these proposals is simply that all General Fund in transportation programs is being pulled out in light of the severity of the state budget crisis. They expressed that the CTC will be covering the overall status of transportation funds, including not only these proposals, but the effects of reduced levels of weight fees and federal aid in the SHA at the CTC meeting next week. They envision the CTC managing the effort to work with regions and locals to seek potential trade-offs of STIP funded projects to offset impacts on TCRP projects.

The forgiveness of the $500 million loan represents a net loss to transportation program resources as does the proposed suspension under Prop 42 of the $1 billion 2003-04 general fund transfer. Moreover, the elimination of the 2003-04 general fund transfer effects not only TCRP projects ($678 million in 2003-04), but it also reduces the STIP ($147 million), local road funds ($147 Million) and transit funds ($74 million) as well.

Three final observations:

(1) The elimination of the $90 million in local government “hold harmless” funding will have an immediate effect on local government contracts that are in the pipeline at the present time.

(2) Although $1.8 billion in general fund resources is proposed to be pulled out of transportation programs, it appears that the Administration sees no need to reduce staffing. They indicated that any capital outlay support adjustments that may be needed can be accommodated through attrition and a hiring freeze.

(3) The briefing panel was asked about the impact of these proposals on current construction contracts. They indicated that they believe there will be none, but that the concerns about faltering weight fees and federal aid affecting the SHA may result in a delay for projects in the current year that are not yet advertised.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>TCRP Programmed</th>
<th>TCRP Expended</th>
<th>00-01</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>TBD²</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Double Track Modifications, Grade Separations</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>10,236</td>
<td>11,316</td>
<td>Design/Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintenance Yard</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>In Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SD Transit Bus Acquisition, Fueling Facilities</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bids received/Some purchased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coaster Commuter Rail Train Set</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>13,079</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SR 94 Widening</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>East Village Access Improvements</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Oceanside - Escondido LRT⁵</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mid-Coast LRT</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>San Diego Ferry</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>Ship still in Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5/805 Merge</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-5/Lomas Santa Fe Road Interchange</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes Transit Elements</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>22,600</td>
<td>Enviro/Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes Freeway Elements</td>
<td>41,200</td>
<td>18,449</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>In Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SR 52 from SR 125 to SR 67</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>23,635</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 56 (Middle)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>10,832</td>
<td>10,813</td>
<td>10,757</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR 905 Freeway and Interchanges</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SR 94/SR 125 Interim W to N Connector</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SR 94/SR 125 Ultimate W to N &amp; S to E Connectors</td>
<td>58,729</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>24,829</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I-5/Virginia Avenue Realignment</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Oceanside Transit Center</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>482,500</td>
<td>87,631</td>
<td>70,198</td>
<td>113,603</td>
<td>135,318</td>
<td>74,116</td>
<td>17,690</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>24,829</td>
<td>36,746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Estimated Local Streets & Roads Component (Cities/County)³ | 95,194 | n/a | 31,461 | 11,133 | 7,000 | 11,400 | 11,400 | 11,400 | 11,400 |
| Estimated State Transit Assistance⁴ | 49,053 | n/a | 7,408 | 10,745 | 6,180 | 6,180 | 6,180 | 6,180 | 6,180 |

**Notes:**
1. Caltrans expenditure data to August 2002, does not include expenditures from September 2002 to date.
2. Year of expenditure has not been determined for certain components of project.
3. Amount for FY 2002-03 and FY 2004 are subject to be lost, based on Governor’s current proposal. Future amounts assume same level as FY 2003-04, though they are subject to change dependent on state sales tax revenues.
4. Amount for State Transit Assistance in FY 2002-03 is annualized based on first quarter distributions. FY 2003-04 distribution is subject to a $4.7 million reduction, based on Governor’s current proposal.
5. The $80 million in TCRP leverages an additional $152 million in federal funds as part of the Full Funding Grant Agreement.