AGENDA

Wednesday, January 29, 2003

3 - 5:30 p.m. Check-In at La Casa Del Zorro in Borrego Springs

4 - 5 p.m.
- BASICS FOR NEW BOARD AND ALTERNATE MEMBERS ......................................................... Page 4
  (Desert Star Casita)
  - What does SANDAG do and why?
  - What are your roles and responsibilities as a SANDAG Director, Board Alternate, or Policy Advisory Committee Member?
  - How do you get the most out of the agency for your jurisdiction and the region?
  - What is this retreat all about; what are the topics; and how do you get the most out of the retreat?

6 - 7 p.m.
- DINNER ......................................................... Page 17
  (De Anza Room)

7 p.m.
- RETREAT ORIENTATION ......................................................... Page 17
  (Butterfield Room)
  - “Update on Water Supply for the Region”
    Dan Hentschke, General Counsel, San Diego County Water Authority.
Thursday, January 30, 2003

8:30 – 9 a.m.  CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST
(Kiva Room)

9 – 9:45 a.m.  RETREAT PARTICIPANTS INTRODUCTIONS
(Kiva Room)

9:45 – Noon  TransNet AND ITS EXTENSION .............................................. Page 18
(Kiva Room)
   C
   • What are the processes needed to extend the program?
   • What are the public policy considerations?
   • Timing, approach, sales tax rate, and extension length?
   • What are the new expenditure plan development issues?
   • What are the next steps in the process?

Noon – 1:30 p.m.  LUNCH ................................................................. Page 23
(Rose Garden)

D
• “Sales Tax War Stories”
  Eric Haley, Executive Director, Riverside County
  Transportation Commission and
  Max Besler, Partner, Townsend Raimundo Besler and Usher.

1:30 – 4 p.m.  AGENCY CONSOLIDATION AND IMPLEMENTATION ...... Page 30
(Kiva Room)

E
• Agencies CEOs’ Perspectives
• Status of Transition
  - Transition Plans (Ron Morrison)
  - Partnerships (Judy Ritter)
  - Peer Review (Bob Emery)
  - What happens on July 1, 2003? (Ron Morrison)
• What is the role of the Transportation Committee? How much
  authority is delegated to the committee by SANDAG?
• How do we best work together (institutional working
  relationships)? Does the consolidated agency need a new
  name?
6:30 p.m.  DINNER ........................................................................................................ Page 49
(DeAnza Room)

F
- “Stop the Leaching of Money and Power Away from
  Local Government to State Government” – State-Local
  Fiscal Reform
  John Russo, President, California League of Cities and the
  City Attorney for the City of Oakland.

Friday, January 31, 2003

8 – 8:30 a.m.  CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST
(Kiva Room)

8:30 – 10:45 a.m.  PUTTING THE PUZZLE TOGETHER:
THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ......................... Page 50
(Kiva Room)
- How should the region implement the regional vision?
- How do we translate the vision into needed public policy
  strategies and investments?
- How do we integrate our local plans and policies with our
  vision for our transportation plans, other regional
  infrastructure needs and investments, our borders, our
  housing needs, and our quality of life?

10:45 – 11:15 a.m.  SANDAG EVALUATION AND PRIORITIES ..................... Page 58
(Kiva Room)
- Overall Work Program emphasis areas?
- Agency accountability – how to monitor, measure, and
  report on work products?

11:15 – 11:30 a.m.  PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS
(Kiva Room)

11:30 – 12:30 p.m.  LUNCH AND CHECK-OUT
(Rose Garden)

SANDAG Communications Director – Garry Bonelli – will serve as the retreat facilitator.
BASICS FOR NEW BOARD AND ALTERNATE MEMBERS

- What does SANDAG do and why?
  - What is SANDAG?
  - Who are the Board of Directors, Alternates, and Advisory Members?
  - How is the voting accomplished?
  - How do the four Policy Advisory Committees work?
  - What are our milestones in regional decision-making?
  - What are our major mandates and designations?
  - How does SANDAG use its flexibility and latitude?
  - What are our limitations?

- What are your roles and responsibilities as a SANDAG Director, Board Alternate, or Policy Advisory Committee member?

- How do you get the most out of the agency for your jurisdiction and the region?

- What is this retreat all about; what are the topics; and how do you get the most out of the retreat?
WHAT IS SANDAG?

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG, the San Diego Association of Governments, serving as the forum for regional decision-making. The Association builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.

On January 1, 2003, a new state law (SB 1703) consolidated all of the roles and responsibilities of SANDAG with many of the transit functions of the Metropolitan Transit Development Board and the North San Diego County Transit Development Board. The consolidation allows SANDAG to assume transit planning, funding allocation, project development, and eventually construction in the San Diego region in addition to its ongoing transportation responsibilities and other regional roles.

SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, councilmembers, and a county supervisor from each of the region's 19 local governments (with two representatives from the City of San Diego). Voting is based on membership and the population of each jurisdiction, providing for a more accountable and equitable representation of the region's residents. Supplementing these voting members are advisory representatives from Imperial County, Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit Development Board, North San Diego County Transit Development Board, the U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, and Baja California/Mexico. The Board of Directors is assisted by a professional staff of planners, engineers, and research specialists.

Two major initiatives are the $42 billion Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Monthly SANDAG and Policy Committee meetings provide the public forums and decision points for significant regional issues such as growth, transportation, environmental management, housing, open space, air quality, energy, fiscal management, economic development, and criminal justice. Agency Directors establish policies, adopt plans, allocate transportation funds, and develop programs for regional issues. Citizens as well as representatives from community, civic, environmental, education, business, and other special interest groups, and other agencies are involved in the planning and approval process by participating in committees as well as by attending workshops and public hearings.

During the past year, SANDAG made new strides in the areas of growth management, habitat conservation planning, traffic management, and criminal justice research, while continuing to provide regional planning leadership in the areas of transportation, housing, open space, recycling, and hazardous waste management. These interdependent and
interrelated responsibilities permit a more streamlined, comprehensive, and coordinated approach to planning for the region’s future without the need to create costly new government.

Each year, SANDAG adopts an overall work program and budget with federal, state and local funds to support the Agency’s regional responsibilities. The 2003 fiscal year budget, covering the period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003, totals $262 million.

In addition, SANDAG since 1982 has operated SourcePoint, a nonprofit corporation that offers specialized information services and analyses to private businesses, non-profit organizations, and other agencies. The corporation’s services include tailored growth projections, market studies, fiscal, and transportation analyses, demographic profiles, and much more. SourcePoint is managed by its own board of directors, composed of three locally elected officials from the SANDAG Board and two business leaders.

For more information about SANDAG, please visit our Web site at www.sandag.org.
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. The Association builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
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As of January 27, 2003
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County of San Diego
La Mesa
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SANDAG
Voting
January 2003

Voting Members

Number of weighted votes of 100 total
Agenda Item #6

Authorizing the Executive Director to take advantage of the Fluctuating Market for Debt-Reduction by Refinancing Bonds.

(Resolution RC2003-1)

Action: APPROVE

PASSED

Board of Directors Meeting, January 10, 2003

Y Yes  N No  A Abstain  NP – Not Present
NEW COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

SANDAG Board of Directors
Makes regional public policy

Executive Committee
Sets agenda; oversight for budget & work program; reviews grant applications; makes recommendations on legislative proposals; gives staff direction

Transportation Committee
Policy recommendations on planning & programming; strong focus and commitment to meet public transit needs

Regional Planning Committee
Policy recommendations on plan development & implementation

Borders Committee
Policy recommendations on interregional programs & projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Board of Directors – Policy or Business Meeting (Normally second Friday, 10:15 a.m. – noon)</th>
<th>Board of Directors – Business Meeting (Normally fourth Friday, 9 a.m. – noon)</th>
<th>Regional Planning Committee (Normally first Friday, noon – 2 p.m.)</th>
<th>Executive Committee (Normally second Friday, 9 – 10 a.m.)</th>
<th>Transportation Committee (Normally third Friday, 9 – noon)</th>
<th>Borders Committee (Normally third Friday, 12:30 – 2:30 p.m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Nov 7, 2003 (First Friday)</td>
<td>*November 21, 2003 (Third Friday)</td>
<td>*November 7, 2003 (12 - 2 p.m., Following Board Policy Meeting)</td>
<td>*November 7, 2003 (First Friday)</td>
<td>*November 14, 2003 (Second Friday)</td>
<td>November 21, 2003 (Following Board Meeting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dec 5, 2003 (First Friday)</td>
<td>*December 19, 2003 (Third Friday)</td>
<td>*December 5, 2003 (12 - 2 p.m., Following Board Policy Meeting)</td>
<td>*December 5, 2003 (First Friday)</td>
<td>*December 12, 2003 (Second Friday)</td>
<td>December 19, 2003 (Following Board Meeting)</td>
<td></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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Local governments create the Comprehensive Planning Organization (CPO) within the San Diego County administration under a state authorized joint powers agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Governor designates CPO as the Metropolitan Planning Organization to assure areawide coordination and to serve as the technical and informational resource for local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>State further designates CPO as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency; Airport Land Use Commission; and Areawide Clearinghouse for federal/state grant reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Local governments establish CPO as an independent Joint Powers Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>CPO develops &amp; adopts the first ever, comprehensive Regional Transportation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Lemon Grove becomes a city and joins CPO. CPO establishes the Criminal Justice Research Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>The Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program is started for member agencies. CPO helps establish the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS). CPO is jointly designated with the County to implement federal &amp; state Clean Air Acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>State designates CPO to prepare the Regional Housing Needs Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>CPO renamed the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Poway and Santee become cities and join SANDAG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>SANDAG creates SourcePoint as a nonprofit corporate subsidiary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Encinitas and Solana Beach become cities and join SANDAG. State designates SANDAG as the Regional Transportation Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Voters countywide pass Proposition A - the local ½ percent transportation sales tax measure. TransNet, the $3.3 billion program starts for highways, transit, local roads, &amp; bicycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Voters countywide pass an advisory measure calling for creation of a Regional Planning and Growth Management Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Agencies designate SANDAG as the Regional Planning and Growth Management Review Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Member agencies designate SANDAG as the Congestion Management Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>State designates SANDAG as the San Diego-Coronado Bridge Toll Authority. SANDAG helps form a five-county rail coalition, and purchases rail right-of-way from Santa Fe Railway for the 'Coaster' and the Oceanside to Escondido commuter rail service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1993
- *TransNet* opens SR52 East, widens SR54 in the South Bay, opens SR56 East in the North City area, and completes improvements to SR78/I-15 interchange in the North County.
- The Freeway Service Patrol begins under a cooperative arrangement among SANDAG, Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol.

1994
- SANDAG approves the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy.
- At the request of Caltrans, SANDAG assumes the management of Commuter Computer and transforms the operation into the RideLink service.

1995
- The San Diego County Water Authority joins SANDAG as an advisory member.
- SANDAG plays a major role in bringing together, and most importantly, holding together, all participants in the San Diego County Investment Fund.

1996
- SANDAG helps establish the San Diego Regional Partners in Homeownership.
- SANDAG starts the I-15 FasTrak™ Program to improve traffic flow, and expand bus and rideshare services in the corridor.

1997
- The National Institute of Justice cites SANDAG for its outstanding work on the Drug Use Forecasting program, which assesses drug use among people as they are booked into jail.
- *TransNet* provides more than half the funds for the Mission Valley West trolley line between Old Town San Diego and Qualcomm Stadium.

1998
- SANDAG’s Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) provides public forums for cross border planning in the areas of transportation, environmental management, education, water supply, and economic development.
- Halfway through the 20-year *TransNet* program, 68% of the highway projects, 55% of the transit projects, and 53% of the local street program are completed.

1999
- SANDAG dedicates $76.4 million in federal funds for traffic construction improvements along I-15 from Route 56 in San Diego, north to Route 78 in Escondido.

2000
- MTDB and NCTD join SANDAG as advisory members, and SANDAG joins the Joint Committee on Regional Transit.

2001
- Using $14.7 million in federal and state funds, SANDAG puts sand on badly eroded beaches from Oceanside to Imperial Beach.
- To provide traffic congestion relief, SANDAG approves an innovative $516 million financing package to advance the construction of major highway and transit projects.
- Working in close cooperation with MTDB, NCTD, and Caltrans, SANDAG approves the Regional Transit Vision with the goal of making public transit competitive with driving a car during rush hours.

2002
- SANDAG drafts a $42 billion, 30-year Regional Transportation Plan seeking to make public transit competitive with solo drivers during rush hours.
- On June 27, based on SANDAG action, the tolls are eliminated from the San Diego-Coronado Bridge.
- Directors decide to develop a Regional Comprehensive Plan by mid-2004 with the goal of reducing urban sprawl, lessening traffic congestion, providing more housing and more affordable housing, saving habitat and other natural resources, and bolstering the economy.

2003
- With the passage of state law (SB 1703), SANDAG becomes the consolidated regional agency on January 1. Transit planning, programming, project development, and construction will be consolidated into the regional agency during the next 13 months.
- Imperial County joins SANDAG as an advisory Board member.

As of 1/20/03
The Board of Directors carries out a variety of responsibilities which are either mandated by federal or state law or regulation, or delegated to SANDAG through local agreement. Some of the most important designations and most critical responsibilities are listed below.

OVERALL AUTHORITY

San Diego Regional Consolidated Agency (State)
Senate Bill 1703 created a consolidated agency on January 1, 2003 to strengthen how regional public policy decisions are made. The law mandates membership in the consolidated agency from the area’s 18 cities and county government. It consolidates transit planning, programming, project development, and construction into the new agency, leaving responsibilities for day-to-day operations with the existing transit operators. The transition plan for the initial transfer of planning and programming responsibilities of the transit boards must be completed by February 28, 2003 with the actual transfer occurring on or before July 1, 2003. A plan for the transfer of project development and construction will be completed by September 30, 2003 with the actual transfer occurring on or before January 30, 2004.

Regional Transportation Planning and Fund Allocation Agency (State)
Adopt Regional Transportation Plan (long range plan) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (five-year programming of state and federal transportation funds). Allocate Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds (¼ cent sales tax for transit support, approximately $100 million per year).

Metropolitan Planning Organization (Federal)
Allocate federal transportation revenues and meet comprehensive planning requirements of TEA-21 in order to be eligible for funds. Over $140 million a year directly allocated by SANDAG.

San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (State and Voter Approval)
Administer ½ percent sales tax (approximately $200 million per year) for transportation purposes.

Congestion Management Agency (State and Local)
Adopt congestion management plan and review local agency compliance.

Co-lead Agency for Air Quality Planning (Federal and State)
Carry out air quality planning mandates in cooperation with the APCD. Determine
conformity of transportation projects with air quality plan.

Regional Planning and Growth Management Review Board (Local and Voter Approval)
Develop and adopt a regional growth management strategy.

Integrated Waste Management Task Force (State and Local)
Recommend actions to member agencies regarding the major elements of the state-mandated Integrated Waste Management Plan.

Housing (State)
Determine each locality's share of the regional housing need and establishes performance criteria for self-certification of housing elements.

Areawide Clearinghouse (Federal and State)
Reviews projects with regional impacts under CEQA and NEPA.

Manages and Administers the North County Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (Local)
Undertaken on behalf of North County cities.

Other (Local)
Regional Criminal Justice Clearinghouse, Regional Census Data Center, Regional Information System development and maintenance, local planning activities pursuant to agreements with Navy, Caltrans, State Office of Planning and Research, MTDB, NCTD, APCD, CWA, the newly created Airport Authority, Cities and the County, and others; Local Technical Assistance (LTA) Program, SourcePoint.

OPERATIONAL

San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (State and Voter Approval)
Construct sales tax highway projects.

Toll Bridge Administration (State)
Decide San Diego-Coronado Bridge tolls and allocate excess toll revenues.

Freeway Service Patrol Administration (State and Local)
Provide service for stranded motorists on various highways.

Regional Transportation Demand Management Program Administration (Local)
Provide and administer regional program (Ridelink) consisting of carpool and vanpool programs, bike locker program and others.

I-15 Congestion Pricing and Transit Development Demonstration Program (State)
Implement program to allow single occupant vehicles in I-15 expressway for a fee.

Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Program (Local)
Administers the regional program in coordination with federal, state and local agencies.

FLEXIBILITY AND LATITUDE

1. SANDAG can be viewed as “a flexible extension of local government capable of being modified to carry out any appropriate function.” SANDAG can assume functions requested by its member agencies, and those established by federal and state law and regulation.
2. SANDAG is a good example of streamlined government. With one agency, it is able to respond to most of the federal and state mandates that apply to regions, and to most of the locally-generated mandates that have to be taken care of regionally.

3. Decision-making at SANDAG is by local governments acting together. Its decisions primarily affect allocation of revenues, physical development, and wide ranging environmental issues.

4. Good regional decisions, by definition, also must be good for the region’s local communities. The policy of using local elected officials to make regional decisions helps ensure that regional and local decisions are consistent and complementary.

LIMITATIONS

The limitations of SANDAG’s ability to carry out new or existing functions are:

1. Certain consolidated agency roles and responsibilities would require a change/modification to state law (SB 1703).
“UPDATE ON WATER SUPPLY FOR THE REGION”

Mr. Daniel Hentschke, General Counsel, San Diego County Water Authority

Much has been written and discussed about how the San Diego region can ensure its water supply future. Daniel Hentschke will offer retreat participants an insider’s perspective of the ongoing negotiations and potential implications.

Daniel Hentschke

Mr. Hentschke has served as general counsel for the San Diego County Water Authority since February 1998. Prior to joining the Water Authority, Mr. Hentschke was a partner with Brown, Diven & Hentschke, LLP, a law firm focusing on representation of public agencies and public finance. During that time, Mr. Hentschke served as the city attorney for the Cities of Oceanside (1991-1998), San Marcos (1987–1993) and Solana Beach (1986-1998). He also acted as special counsel for numerous cities and special districts. Mr. Hentschke served as assistant city attorney for Carlsbad (1979-1986) and as a deputy city attorney for San Diego (1997-1979). Mr. Hentschke was the president of the City Attorney’s Department of the League of California Cities (1995 – 1996). He is a member of the Legal Affairs Committee of the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) and has made numerous continuing education presentations for both the League of Cities and ACWA.
TransNet AND ITS EXTENSION

WHAT ARE THE PROCESSES NEEDED TO EXTEND THE PROGRAM?

A. Voter Importance/ Concerns/ Components
B. Plan and Ordinance Basics
C. Progress to Date
D. Our Goals and Objectives for the Program

WHAT ARE THE PUBLIC POLICY CONSIDERATIONS?

A. Many Petitioners/Limited Dollars
B. Ability to Explain the Plan
C. Plan has to Serve the Community and be “Balanced” for Thirty Years!
   1. Geographic equity
   2. Modal balance/travel improvements
   3. Interest group consideration/balance
   4. Policy/taxpayer safeguards
   5. Is it “visionary” or the same old thing?
   6. Does it make the overall quality of life better than it would have been?
      - less congestion, good operation and maintenance of existing large investments in transportation, improved planning, environmental mitigation, etc.

TIMING, APPROACH, SALES TAX RATE, AND EXTENSION LENGTH?

Basic Assumptions

In developing a new ordinance and expenditure plan for an extension of the TransNet program, a number of issues need to be addressed. As a result of previous discussions and prior voter research, several
key decisions and major assumptions on plan basics are presented. These include:

A. Timing:
The Board has set the November 2004 election as the target date to place the TransNet extension before the voters.

B. Approach:
The direction has been to move forward with the development of an expenditure plan that has the best possible chance of achieving the two-thirds vote threshold, while at the same time placing the highest priority in SANDAG’s legislative program on seeking legislation to allow for a reduction in the voter threshold on the same or earlier ballot in March 2004.

C. Sales Tax Rate:
Although SANDAG’s enabling legislation allows for up to 1 percent in ¼ percent increments, public opinion surveys have indicated that support declines rapidly on sales tax programs in excess of ½ percent. Particularly with a two-thirds vote threshold, the ½ percent has been assumed as the basis for the development of the expenditure plan.

D. Length of the Extension:
Voter research indicates that having an expiration date is important to the successful passage of sales tax extensions but that the number of years is not as important. Recent measures in Alameda, Santa Clara, and in November, in Riverside County have been successful at 30 years. An assumption has been made for expenditure plan development plan purposes that the TransNet extension will be for 30 years.

WHAT ARE THE NEW EXPENDITURE PLAN DEVELOPMENT ISSUES?

Building on these decisions and assumptions, this discussion should focus on the following issues to provide direction to the staff and consultants on the ongoing work of developing a new ordinance and expenditure plan:

A. Plan Review Requirement:
As the length of the ballot measure becomes longer, the chances of “getting it right” at the beginning become lower. For example, Riverside built a 10-year mandatory review into its measure allowing for a “mid-course adjustment” should regional priorities change over time.

- Should such a review be included in the TransNet extension?
- If so, should the review take place after 10 years? 15 years?
- Should amendments to the ordinance and expenditure plan require a two-thirds vote of the Board or some other form of a super-majority vote?

Voters and interest groups will want to make any changes more difficult to insure consensus and protect basic plan elements.

B. Maintenance of Effort Provisions:
Should a maintenance of effort (MOE) provision be included for each of the purposes to be included in the extension proposal? The original TransNet Ordinance did include a MOE requirement for the continued expenditure of local discretionary funds for transportation purposes based on FY 1985 data. This requirement primarily related to local jurisdiction
general fund or other discretionary fund expenditures for street and road purposes.

- Should the original MOE requirement be revisited, strengthened, or adjusted to include an escalation factor? The current MOE has not been adjusted since 1985 making it worth less and less each year in terms of the transportation investments that can be implemented. In addition, jurisdictions that were not contributing any discretionary dollars in the base year or that incorporated after 1985 currently have no MOE requirement.

- Should an MOE be included for transit financial performance? If additional funding is provided for transit operations, it may be desirable to include a minimum farebox recovery level, a maximum annual cost per mile increase, or some other performance-based measure(s) to ensure that the new funds are used to improve the level of service provided to the region.

C. Private Developer Funding:
It is important to voters and some interest groups that the sales tax extension not be viewed as a bailout for private development. The current TransNet measure includes a prohibition against using sales tax funds to replace any private developer funding that has been or will be committed to any of the projects in the expenditure plan. Building industry representatives strongly oppose the consideration of increased development fees to cover a share of the costs of regional transportation infrastructure needs arguing that fees in the region are already quite high and would work against efforts to promote affordable housing.

- Is the current ordinance language sufficient or does it need to be stronger in both auditing and terms and conditions?

- Should there be a requirement for local jurisdictions to establish a minimum level of traffic impact fees as a requirement for receipt of TransNet funds?

D. Environmental Mitigation Programs:
Environmental mitigation costs for the major capital projects in the current TransNet expenditure plan have totaled approximately 5 percent of the total construction costs of the project. Rather than burying these costs in the project totals, these costs could be highlighted as an explicit environmental component of the new measure. Rather than continuing the project-by-project mitigation approach, a major environmental program could be developed as part of the expenditure plan to establish a large-scale mitigation bank providing sufficient credits to mitigate the major transportation improvement projects included in the expenditure plan and potentially the other major projects included in the 2030 RTP.

A concept that the consultant has suggested would be the creation of a non-profit organization under SANDAG’s administrative wing that could be established to own and maintain the mitigation lands and funding could be provided for
acquisition as well as the ongoing management, maintenance and monitoring activities. This concept would be contingent upon agreement from the regulatory agencies in advance of the mitigation credits to be available for transportation project implementation. This is so future projects would be able to use the established credits and not be subject to additional mitigation requirements.

This mitigation banking concept would allow projects to be permitted more quickly, thereby saving time and money in future project implementation.

Other issues to be resolved include the level of funding for such a program, matching requirements from other local, state and federal sources, and what level of MOE would be appropriate.

- Should such an environmental program be further developed for potential inclusion in the expenditure plan?
- Are there other approaches to addressing environmental concerns that should be explored?

WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS IN THE PROCESS?

Rather than extending the TransNet program that is one-third highway, one-third transit, and one-third street and road formula approach, an alternative process is being considered. Given the two-thirds threshold requirement which did not exist when the program was passed in 1987, it is believed that a much more voter and local community friendly approach will be required in putting the expenditure plan together. The proposed approach is to build the expenditure plan on a sub-regional basis with specific projects and programs for each area.

The region would be broken down into six sub-regional areas and voter research would be conducted on this sub-regional basis with focus groups and public opinion surveys to determine what voters feel are the most important projects in each area. Local jurisdictions, transit operators, Caltrans, and a wide range of interest groups would be consulted as well. The resulting mix of projects could vary from area to area. To help manage this process, an ad hoc working group is proposed to be created consisting of a mix of Board members and other elected officials who are not only willing to put in a great deal of time, but be leaders in their local sub-region in explaining and strongly supporting the extension once it is on the ballot.

- Should the sub-regional approach be followed in the development of the expenditure plan?
- Should an ad hoc working group be established to guide the development of the expenditure plan with representatives from each sub-area of the county?
## MEASURE RENEWAL PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Dates</th>
<th>SANDAG Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2002 to February 2003</td>
<td>Community Outreach (private, small group meetings with opinion leaders, interest groups, etc.) / Public Education Programs focused on existing TransNet Program and long term transportation needs versus revenue limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By March 1, 2003</td>
<td>“Ad Hoc Sales Tax Extension Committee” is approved, organized, and meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2003 – June 30, 2003</td>
<td>Focus Groups begin; Six groups in six sub-areas with staff, ad hoc committee members, and consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October to November 2003 (could be accomplished earlier based on focus group progress)</td>
<td>Conduct Expenditure Plan Baseline Poll (focusing on key program / project options, remaining policy issues, and the testing of ballot language options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February to March 2004</td>
<td>Transportation Committee / Workshops on Draft Expenditure Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td>Conduct Plan “Refinement” Poll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March to April 2004</td>
<td>Final Expenditure Plan adoption process (to be completed after 55 percent vote threshold measure is decided, if on the Primary Ballot).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By April 2004</td>
<td>Plan adoption completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March or June 2004 Primary Election</td>
<td>Potential vote on Constitutional Measure to lower the voter threshold to 55 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediately After Final Expenditure Plan Process to November 2004</td>
<td>Public Education / Speakers Bureau Support relative to our &quot;explanation&quot; of the adopted Expenditure Plan and Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“SALES TAX WAR STORIES”

Eric Haley, Executive Director, Riverside County Transportation Commission and Max Besler, Partner, Townsend Raimundo Besler and Usher

Mr. Haley and Mr. Besler will discuss key issues for a successful ballot measure campaign. They will focus on the 69 percent approval result in Riverside County last November.

Eric Haley

Before joining RCTC, Eric Haley served at the San Bernardino Association Governments where his primary responsibility was legislative affairs, SCAG relationships, and cooperative efforts with local governments. During more than 10 years with the Southern California Association of Governments, Mr. Haley served effectively in much the same capacity. He earlier served as Staff Director for Congressman George Brown and is a former Riverside City Council Member. He served as founding Chairman of the Riverside Transit Agency, as a founding member of the Riverside County Transportation Commission, and a founding Board Member of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. He was educated at the University of California, Riverside.

Max Besler

Mr. Besler brings more than 20 years of experience in managing every aspect of political and public affairs campaigns. He directs statewide and local candidate campaigns, initiative campaigns, public opinion polling and grass roots organizing efforts at Townsend Raimundo Besler and Usher, one of California’s largest political consulting and public relations firms.

Mr. Besler has made a specialty of managing issue campaigns, particularly transportation sales tax campaigns, which his firm has conducted in California, Arizona, and Utah. Townsend Raimundo Besler and Usher has won nearly 85 percent of its campaigns. It has managed nearly half of the transportation sales tax campaigns waged in California, including successful transportation sales tax campaigns in Orange, Monterey, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego counties.
AGENCY CONSOLIDATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

- Agencies CEOs’ Perspectives
- Status of Transition
  - Transition Plans
  - Partnerships
  - Peer Review
  - What happens on July 1, 2003?
- What is the role of the Transportation Committee? How much authority is delegated to the committee by SANDAG?
- How do we best work together (institutional working relationships)? Does the consolidated agency need a new name?

Attachments

1. Overview of SB 1703 (PowerPoint) .... 31
2. Governance Structure of New Agency (chart) .........................35
3. Observations from the Peer Review Panel .........................36
4. Operations Policy for New Agency (Board and Transportation Committee) ........................................... 42
5. SB 1703 Transition Provisions (memo from general counsels NCTD, MTDB, and SANDAG) ...............44
OVERVIEW OF SB 1703

Presentation to
SANDAG

January 10, 2003

Organization & Governance

- New statutorily-created agency
- Successor agency to SANDAG, and to MTDB and NCTD for those functions transferred
- Adds 2nd City of San Diego member
- Adds representative from Imperial County as advisory member

---

Voting Procedures

- Board action (except for consent items) requires a majority of the members present and a majority of the weighted vote
- City of San Diego
  - gets one agency vote
  - 40 weighted votes
  - determines how to split votes

---

Policy Advisory Committees

- Four Policy Advisory Committees
- Board may delegate additional responsibilities to the Policy Committees
- No Board member may serve on more than two Policy Committees
Policy Advisory Committees

- Executive Committee – new structure, 6 voting members
- Regional Planning Committee - 6 voting members
- Borders Committee – adds Imperial County, 7 voting members
- Transportation Committee – adds MTDB, NCTD, & Airport Authority, 9 voting members

Transportation Committee

- Responsibilities include:
  - Meeting the public transit needs of the region
  - Setting funding criteria
  - Recommending transit funding levels
  - Undertaking transit responsibilities resulting from the consolidation

Administration

- Adopt bylaws and policies
- Create flexible contracting process
- Progress Report to Governor and Legislature by December 31, 2005, then every two years
- LAO to provide recommendations and report on effectiveness by December 31, 2004:
  - Governance structure
  - Transportation needs
  - Quality of life indicators
  - Scope and authority of the agency

Consolidation - Definitions

- Planning: conceptual development of transit services & projects, and integration of modes
- Programming: acquisition, prioritization, and allocation of funding
- Project Development: alternative analysis, environmental review & clearance and preliminary engineering
- Construction: final design, permitting, and building of all transit projects except MVE, Oceanside to Escondido, and projects with construction contracts in place before January 30, 2004
Initial Transfer - Status

- All public transit planning and programming responsibilities
- Does not include "local route planning and scheduling"
- Transition plan due by February 28, 2003
- Scheduled for SANDAG approval February 28
- Initial transfer no later than July 1, 2003

Subsequent Transfer

- Transfer of project development and construction responsibilities
- Transition plan due by September 30, 2003
- Subsequent transfer no later than January 30, 2004

Funding

- Funding coincides with transfer of responsibilities
- Transit boards continue to receive funding pursuant to:
  - TDA & State Transportation Assistance fund
  - Federal Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula funds
- Funds allocated to help the transit boards meet responsibilities recognizing historic funding levels & methods

Transition Plan Contents

- The transition plans must:
  - Define functional roles & responsibilities of the new agency and the transit boards
  - Define service & operational planning, programming, project development, & construction
  - Identify responsibilities being transferred & the financial resources
  - Acknowledge strong linkage between service planning & operations scheduling
New Agency Powers
- Prohibits operating public transit systems
- All land use powers held by SANDAG, MTDB and NCTD
- Authority to enter into individual agreements with MTDB or NCTD for consolidation of any and all functions except operation of public transit

Labor
- Transferred employees keep same or substantially equivalent classifications & salaries
- Employees suffer no loss of:
  - employment or reduction in wages
  - benefits
  - seniority
  - retirement benefits

Voter Approval
- The new agency may call an election regarding:
  - Governance of or matters related to the powers, privileges or duties of the new agency
  - Merger or complete consolidation of the transit boards
- Complete consolidation can only occur if:
  - Considered appropriate by the new agency, and
  - Approved the Legislature

OVERVIEW OF SB 1703
Questions?
NEW AGENCY BOARD

Voting Members:
18 Cities and County of San Diego
(2 Members for City of San Diego)
1 Vote Per Member Agency
Plus
Weighted Vote Population Based
with
Current Ex-Officio Members
(plus member from Imperial County)

One Appointment to Each Committee from the Six Geographic Areas

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
(6 Members)
Regional Agency Chair and Vice Chair as Appointments

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
(9 Members)

BORDERS COMMITTEE
(7 Members)

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
(6 Members)

North County Coastal
North County Inland
South County
East County
City of San Diego
County of San Diego

MTDB
NCTD
AIRPORT AUTHORITY

IMPERIAL COUNTY

As of 10/28/02 (lm)
What constitutes success in the planned consolidation?

1. Improved transit service; quality of travel experience
2. Bring more resources to transit, options
3. Streamline decision-making; increase responsiveness
4. Increase efficiency in service delivery, resource use
5. Increase sense of trust; shared sense of accomplishment

Capitalizing on the context in which consolidation is taking place

1. Transit planning and development in San Diego has been a highly regarded success; viewed as a model, nationally; provides an enviable basis for change. Consolidation provides an opportunity to build on success.

2. San Diego leaders are not alone; many major metropolitan regions are pursuing fundamental organizational change. Common theme is progress toward clarifying and separating:
   - Decision-making and management that is regional in scope and strategic in nature, from
   - Decision making focused on day-to-day operations and on-street service delivery.

Selected observations in Two (2) Areas

- Where the largest impacts and most positive outcomes will be found
- Considerations in "managing the merger"

1. The source of largest impacts and positive outcomes
   - Be mid to longer term; not immediate
   - Result in better integration of highway-transit decision-making
   - Result in better integration of transit services
   - Result in better integration of transit, land use/development, infrastructure decisions
a. A word about “efficiency”...
   - Internal, administrative cost saving is not the key focus; not immediately likely
   - Elimination of duplication through attrition is possible,…but
     - 200 people will be effected
     - Their employment conditions must not be made worse
     - The tendency will be to strive for the highest common denominator in job classification, pay, and benefits
   - Strategy: Be receptive to ‘highest common denominator’ solution to build harmony, a sense of value and shared purpose
   - “Efficiency” will come from:
     - Joint planning
     - More timely decision-making and service delivery
     - Improved transit service and increased travel options

b. Starting from position of strength (not crisis or failure)
   - There is a history of effective collaboration
   - There is experienced, creative, energetic staff
   - There have been a series of enviable successes
   - …Build on this tradition

2. Important issues in “managing the merger”
   a. Maintain respect for different “organizational cultures”
      - Planning organizations and operating agencies have very different cultures
      - The differences are borne out of different timeframes they must react to
      - Planning organizations focus = years/decades
      - Operating organizations focus = days / hours / minutes
      - Consolidation must include overt efforts to respect each culture, including an awareness of the “symbols” of each
      - Critical to respect the integrity of operating units and their need for local accountability

   b. The “Consolidated Agency” must adopt a new business “outlook/perspective”
      - It will be purchasing service from a series of providers
      - This market perspective implies certain expectations, requirements for success:
        - Define the product thoroughly
        - Monitor and report performance consistently (efficiency/service quality)
      - Ultimately, relate level of investment to quality/cost, i.e. build in incentives
c. Communication is critical on several levels
   - Open flow of information to all staff to reduce anxiety, uncertainty, reinforce common sense of purpose
   - Executive leadership should meet formally, regularly, changing venues
   - Eliminate inflammatory rhetoric ("takeover") and refer to "consolidation of shared functions"
   - Objective: build respect and trust at every step

d. Pay explicit attention to multiple individual functions and activities
   - Statute and Transition Plan-refer to planning, programming, engineering, construction
   - The categories signal intent, but are too broad
   - There are over 40 explicit functions or activities to move, retain or share
   - Ex.: Management of MTDB contract services may be focused
     - Options: Retain at MTDB or move to the Consolidated Agency
     - Consideration: don’t overload Consolidated Agency too soon; “walk before running”
     - Phase/stage shifts on some functions
   - Ex.: Human Resource management will be shared
     - Consolidated Agency must have a unified system (standards, practices, processes)
     - Operating agencies must have a HR function (hire, evaluation, grievances)
   - Agency staffs are already at work thinking through shifts at the function and activity level. Issue: be comprehensive; think through sequencing

e. Specific functions/activities
   - The Consolidated Agency must guide development of a system of “service standards”
     - The standards will vary by service type, market, geography
     - Clear definition of service quantity and quality are needed (using 8-10 traditional measures)
     - They will provide the basis for monitoring and reporting
     - They will test of how well the integrity of operation units is being respected
     - Consolidated agency must develop unified budget
   - The Consolidated Agency must have a unified budget
     - Essential to link capital program and budget to operation budgets
     - Ex.: eliminating a $1 million capital element to restore the capital budget may create a multi-million operating cost…
     - Ex.: changing operating policy may require added capital costs…
   - Consolidated Agency may restructure capital program to focus attention on regional, strategic trade-offs not just capital and operation needs
- Introduce broad categories level of investment: Preserve/maintenance, Operating improvements, Expansion
- Then look at priorities

f. Merger of staffs should be immediate and complete
   - Including single system of job classifications, pay scales and benefits
   - There will be inevitable problems and inconsistencies
   - Objective: Find and address them early; move on; don’t let anxiety, indecisiveness linger

g. As staff is reassigned
   - Significant problems can be avoided by:
     - Reassigning necessary support staff simultaneously
     - Transferring whole units wherever possible
   - Exceptions: retain construction/oversight of Mission Valley East with MTDB Board though staff may be transferred

h. Governance issues
   - Statute spells out Board, committee roles and structure
   - Assumes high level of autonomy, authority in the Transportation Committee; A good way to focus energy, effort on reaching agreement on critical decisions
   - Decisions will effect operations and construction, as well as capital programming and plans
   - Operating and construction decisions are time-critical, with millions of dollars at stake
   - Two requirements to consider:
     - Committee members must have thorough base of knowledge in transportation
     - Committee must work at a faster pace than monthly meetings allow
   - Suggestions:
     1. Immediate and regular off-site workshop/retreat for Transportation Committee members/alternates to build and sustain depth of knowledge
     2. Shorten meeting cycle to two weeks to assure responsiveness
     3. Meeting around the county to gain sensitivity and demonstrate openness
     4. Provide staff adequate latitude/authority to act on the Committee’s behalf in appropriate situations to maximize responsiveness.

Conclusions

- You are embarked on a fundamental change
- You are not alone; others are moving in the same direction
- Seek to continue a dialogue with peers throughout your and their process and progress.
Rita Geldert  
City Manager, City of Vista  

Prior to joining the city of Vista in 1995, Ms. Geldert had various positions with the cities of Dana Point, Merced, and Vacaville in California. She also was in management at Xerox for eight years. Ms. Geldert has a B.A. from California State University, Chico, and a Masters in Business Administration from U. C. Davis/Riverside. The city of Vista is located in the north county area of the San Diego region and has a population of 89,000 (2000).

Steve Heminger  
Executive Director, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)  
San Francisco Bay Area  

Prior to joining MTC in 1993, Mr. Heminger was Vice President of Transportation for the Bay Area Council, a regional public policy group. He also has served as a staff assistant in the California State Legislature and the U.S. Congress. Mr. Heminger received his M.A. degree from the University of Chicago and his B.A. from Georgetown University. MTC is the regional transportation planning and finance agency for the Bay area.

Art Leahy  
Chief Executive Officer, Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)  

Prior to joining OCTA in 2001, Mr. Leahy was General Manager for Metro Transit in the Minneapolis-St. Paul region. Prior to that he was with the MTA in Los Angeles and its predecessor agency in the bus and rail operations functions. Mr. Leahy has a bachelor’s degree in Political Science from California State University, Los Angeles, and a Masters in Public Administration from the University of Southern California. OCTA is the countywide transportation agency responsible for planning, financing, and coordinating freeway, street, and rail development; bus service; commuter rail service; paratransit service; and a host of other transportation related programs.
David Rowlands  
City Manager, City of Chula Vista

Prior to joining the city of Chula Vista in 1998, Mr. Rowlands was the City Manager in Antioch, CA. He also served as the County Administrator in Yolo and San Joaquin Counties and worked for Alameda County. Mr. Rowlands received his Bachelor of Arts, with a major in Political Science, from Westminster College, and a Masters in Public Administration from the University of Washington. The city of Chula Vista is located in the south bay area of the San Diego region and has a population of 191,000 (2002).

Bob Stanley  
Principal, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

Prior to joining Cambridge Systematics Mr. Stanley served as Executive Director of Policy and Programs at APTA. He also served in positions with the predecessor agency to the FTA and as a consultant with a transportation planning firm. Mr. Stanley has a B.A. from Colgate University and a Masters in Regional Planning from the University of North Carolina. Relevant to the Peer Review, he is the Principal Investigator for the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) project examining new paradigms in public transportation organizations.
OPERATIONS POLICY FOR NEW AGENCY
(Board and Transportation Committee Responsibilities only)

Board and Policy Advisory Committees Responsibilities

Shown below are responsibilities for the Board of Directors and Transportation Committee of the new Agency. Selected responsibilities are delegated by the Board to the Transportation Committee to allow the Agency to effectively address key public policy and funding responsibilities. All items delegated to the Policy Committees are subject to Board action upon request of any member.

Board Responsibilities

- Approve Regional Comprehensive Plan and plan components and other regional plans (e.g. Regional Energy Plan, MHCP, etc.)
- Approve Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and corridor studies
- Fulfill responsibilities of SB 1703 as consolidated agency
- Fulfill the responsibilities of the San Diego Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
- Approve programming of funds (TDA, CMAQ, STIP, etc.)
- Approve project environmental reports
- Approve Overall Work Program and Program Budget
- Approve amendments to the Budget and Work Program and authorize contracts with consultants for amounts equal to or greater than the amounts to be determined for administrative and policy committee authorization.
- Approve the annual legislative agenda
- Provide policy direction through Policy Development Board meetings
- Appoint Committees and Board officers
- Delegate responsibilities to Policy Advisory Committees and approve Committee actions. All items delegated to the four Policy Advisory Committees are subject to direct Board action upon request of any members.
- Delegate responsibilities to Board Chair consistent with Board criteria. Conference sponsorships and proclamations are hereby delegated subject to current or subsequently approved criteria.

Transportation Committee Membership and Responsibilities

The Transportation Committee shall consist of nine voting members with board members or alternates representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South
County and the mayor or a council member from the City of San Diego, a supervisor from the County of San Diego, a member of the Board of the MTDB appointed by the Board of the MTDB, a member of the Board of the NCTD appointed by the Board of the NCTD, and a member of the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority appointed by the airport authority.

- Provide oversight for consolidated transit responsibilities
- Provide policy oversight for transportation plans and corridor and systems studies
- Establish/approve transportation prioritization criteria
- Establish/approve policies and monitor “Use it or lose it” project funding
- Approve TDA Claim, RTIP, and STIP amendments
- Recommend funding allocations to the Board
- Approve transit operator budgets for funding
- Approve Short Range Transit Plan
- Consistent with the transition plans, approve regional fare policy
- Conduct public hearings as delegated by Board
- Approve contracts for transit up to amount approved by the Board (for expenditures outside Board approved budget)
- Advise Board on other transportation policy-level issues
- Recommend legislative program for transportation and transit

---

1 To ensure seamless transit service for the transit users of the region the consolidated agency, in consultation with the transit agencies, will be responsible for the development of a Regional Fare Policy. The Regional Fare Policy will incorporate a uniform fare structure, a transfer policy, and agreement for revenue sharing of regional tickets, tokens, and passes, while also allowing the consolidated agency to adopt specialized fare procedures for travel within each operator’s service area. Additionally, the consolidated agency will adopt a Comprehensive Fare Ordinance setting forth all fares for all operators, including their special fares.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition

FROM: Debra Greenfield, General Counsel, SANDAG,
Jack Limber, General Counsel, MTDB,
C. Michael Cowett, General Counsel, NCTD


INTRODUCTION

The three general counsels were asked to provide an analysis of the transition provisions of SB 1703. We here describe the provisions of the bill which relate to the development and implementation of transition plans.

There are no legal disputes among us as to the meaning of the Legislation. We acknowledge that as the transition plans are developed and implemented there will be numerous policy issues about which policy makers will exercise discretion. To the extent there are issues of interpretation, we believe the Legislation is sufficiently clear to provide policy makers appropriate flexibility and guidance to implement the transition without legal dispute. We believe a pertinent question for this Ad Hoc Working Group is whether it will continue to be involved during the whole transition period to help provide guidance on policy issues.

THE LEGISLATION

LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

There is an imperative need for comprehensive planning and implementation of regional transportation projects in the San Diego region. . . .

(b) Several separate limited-purpose transportation agencies have been established in the San Diego region, however, the San Diego region would benefit from coordinated and comprehensive planning by these agencies.

(c) In view of the limited powers of .... (SANDAG) to provide the needed comprehensive transportation planning and implementation without consolidation of certain responsibilities of the transit boards, the Legislature finds that consolidation of the planning, programming and project development, and construction activities of the various transportation agencies in the San Diego region will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of implementing needed
transportation infrastructure and services to provide for a focus on meeting the mobility needs of the region. (Section 132350.1(a, b and c).)

THE CONSOLIDATION PROVISIONS

The New Agency shall, in consultation with the Transit Boards, develop and implement two transition plans to transfer specific functions of the Transit Boards to the New Agency.

The Initial Transfer:

Transition Plan: February 28, 2003
Transfer: July 1, 2003
Functions Transferred:

. . . All public transit and other transportation planning and programming responsibilities, including, but not limited to, short and near-term operational and financial planning and program development of the Transit Boards . . . except local route planning and scheduling and local financial planning therefore . . . . All local, state, federal, and other funding available to carry out these responsibilities, shall be deemed to be funding of the New Agency. (Section 132353.1 and 132253.2(c).)

“Local route planning and scheduling and local financial planning therefore, would continue to be the responsibility of the Transit Boards in accordance with guidelines provided by the...New Agency. The initial transition plan would include development of guidelines, and would define local route planning.” (Section 132353.2(c).)

Applicable Statutory Definitions:

Planning: “. . . shall include, but not be limited to, conceptual development of transit projects and services and integration and coordination of all modes of transportation.”

Programming: “shall mean the acquisition, prioritization and allocation of funding of transit projects and services.” (Section 132353(c) and (d).)

The Subsequent Transfer:

Transition Plan: September 30, 2003
Transfer: January 30, 2004
Functions Transferred:
The project development and construction responsibilities of the Transit Boards and the financial resources therefore . . . . (Section 132353.2(a).)

Applicable Statutory Definitions:

Construction: “. . . shall mean the final design, permitting and building of all transit projects...[excluding] the Oceanside to Escondido Rail Project and the Mission Valley East Extension Light Rail Project, and other projects or those portions of projects which have a construction contract in place at the time of the subsequent transfer . . .” (Section 132353(a).)

Project Development: “. . . shall mean the alternative analysis, environmental review and clearance, preliminary engineering, and any other activities necessary to prepare for the construction of a transit project, as defined in the transition plans.” (Section 132353(a) and (d).)

Transition Plans:

The transition plans should "define the functional roles and responsibilities of the . . . New . . . Agency and Transit Boards and . . . service and operational planning; programming, project development and construction. The transition plans should acknowledge a strong linkage between service planning and operations scheduling." (Section 132353.2(b).)

Transfer of Other Functions:

At any time after the initial transfer, MTDB or NCTD could transfer any or all functions, personnel and funding except the responsibility to operate the transit systems. (Section 132353.2(d).)

Our Conclusions:

The likely legal issues raised by the consolidation provisions of the Legislation are the definitions. The definitions of "construction", "planning", "programming", and "project development", are contained in the Legislation and, with some limited exceptions, will become the responsibility of the New Agency. The definitions of "local route planning and scheduling" and "local financial planning", which are functions to be retained by the Transit Boards, are not contained in the Legislation and will be the subject of policy decisions in the transition plans of the New Agency and its guidelines. (Section 132353.2(c).) To the extent there are issues of interpretation, we believe the Legislation is sufficiently clear to provide policymakers appropriate flexibility and guidance to implement the transition without legal dispute.
FUNDING

The Legislation provides that the funding and certain responsibility to fund functions retained by the Transit Boards will remain with the Transit Boards. It, however, acknowledges that the New Agency has statutory discretion over much of the funding for the Transit Boards.

The Legislation provides that MTDB and NCTD "shall continue to be the claimant, applicant and grantee of all local, state and federal grants for functions and responsibilities which have not been transferred to the New Agency." Thus, MTDB and NCTD retain certain authority and responsibility for funding the functions retained by MTDB and NCTD which are not the subject of New Agency discretion. Those funds which are the subject of New Agency discretion such as 5307 Urbanized Formula funds should be allocated "in a manner which will help to enable to Transit Boards to meet their obligations and responsibilities recognizing the methodology and historic funding levels that have previously guided these funding decisions." (Section 132353.2(e).)

The Legislation provides that the New Agency and “MTDB and NCTD shall work together to obtain funds for transit projects and services. (Section 132353.2(f).)

THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The Legislation provides for four standing policy advisory committees including a transportation committee.

Composition:

Nine (9) voting members representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South County, the Mayor or Council Member from the City of San Diego, a supervisor from the County of San Diego, a member of the Board of MTDB and a member of the Board of NCTD and a member of the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.

Responsibilities:

Among its transportation responsibilities, "the transportation committee shall provide a strong focus and commitment to meeting the public transit needs of the San Diego Region, set transit funding criteria and recommend transit funding levels, and undertake transit responsibilities resulting from consolidation, as delegated by the Board." (Section 132350.2.)

Voting Procedure:

One member, one vote

Authority:

Take action "as delegated by the Board." (Section 132351.4(a)(2)(A)(B).)
The Legislation provides that the New Agency shall submit a report to the Governor and the Legislature by December 31 of odd numbered years beginning in 2005, regarding progress in carrying out the provisions of the Act. (Section 132352.6(a).)

The Legislation also provides that by December 21, 2004, the Legislative Analysts’ Office shall prepare a report to the Governor and the Legislature which shall evaluate and make recommendations on the New Agency on several areas including “effectiveness of the current government structure,” “the effectiveness in addressing the transportation needs of the region,” “the effectiveness of addressing quality of life indicators,” and the “Adequacy of the Scope and Authority for Regional Decision Making.” (Section 132352.6(b).)
“STOP THE LEACHING OF MONEY AND POWER AWAY FROM LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO STATE GOVERNMENT”
- STATE-LOCAL FISCAL REFORM

John Russo, President, California League of Cities and the City Attorney for the City of Oakland

Almost invisible, the state-local tax system in California is not well understood, even by people directly involved in the transactions. Yet, at the local level, the system is crucial to our ability to manage growth smartly, to provide enough homes for our residents, to maintain public services, and to sustain the region’s economy.

The current tax system has become an impediment to sustainable communities. It restricts the freedom of local governments to manage their own fiscal affairs, and thereby, destabilizes local governments. It impedes home construction and encourages cities to compete among themselves for the weakest contributors to economic prosperity - retail outlets.

In short, the current state-local fiscal arrangements adversely affect how our communities look, and even more important, how they work.

As the City of Oakland’s first elected City Attorney, Mr. John Russo has daily, hands-on experience with state-local fiscal relationships, and is currently serving as both the Chairman of the Fiscal Reform Task Force as well as President of the League of California Cities.

John Russo

John Russo was born and raised in Brooklyn, New York. He graduated with honors in Economics and Political Science from Yale University and earned his law degree from New York University School of Law.

John came to Oakland in 1987 and immediately became deeply involved in the life of his community. Among his many volunteer activities, he served as president of Friends of Oakland Parks and Recreation and treasurer of the East Bay League of Conservation Voters.

In June 1994, John was elected to the Oakland City Council, where he became the Council’s leading advocate for neighborhood empowerment, fiscal accountability and government reform. In his six years on the Council, John implemented community policing, developed the first balanced budget in a generation, authored Oakland’s open government law called the “sunshine” ordinance, and developed objective performance measures to improve accountability for City associates and departments.
PUTTING THE PUZZLE TOGETHER: THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The regions local jurisdictions and community leaders have asked SANDAG to embark upon a very ambitious comprehensive planning effort: the preparation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). This retreat session’s background information provides an overview and describes the potential components of the RCP, the need for the RCP, its core values and vision, and the RCP priorities as they have evolved in the Regional Planning Committee and Borders Committee meetings to date.

The RCP will need to integrate a number of key components into an overall vision and a set of strategies that will enable the local jurisdictions and the region to better prepare for the challenges and opportunities during the 30 years, or more. The key pieces that have been identified to date have been the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Borders and their related issues, infrastructure needs and financing, housing availability and affordability, our “quality of life,” and strengthening the tie between our local plans and policies and our regional plans and policies. Committee members suggested focus on four issue areas:

1. Implementing a regional vision
2. Integrating our Borders, both the surrounding counties and Mexico
3. Financing our regional infrastructure, and
4. Integrating the Regional Transportation Plan.

IMPLEMENTING A REGIONAL VISION?

The current RCP approach has a blend of both visionary and reality-based attributes; the Regional Panning Committee has identified a need for a plan that is visionary.

- How should the region implement the regional vision?
- How do we translate that vision into needed public policy strategies and investments?
- How do we integrate our local plans and policies with our vision for our transportation plans, other regional infrastructure needs and investments, our borders, our housing needs, and our quality of life?
in its approach (through a vision statement and core values) but still provides a set of strategies that will resolve the issues in a timely and realistic manner (components). The Committee members feel that the RCP should look well into the future, beyond today’s constraints, and become the tool for achieving “what we truly want to be,” to change our current course, and to avoid many of the self fulfilling prophecies of today’s plans and policies.

- Do the retreat participants agree that, although we have 19 individual jurisdictions, we are one region that needs a seamless plan?
- Do the retreat participants agree that our vision should include successful existing and future “smart growth communities” that are better prepared for future growth?
- Do the retreat participants agree that an incentive-based approach should be used to encourage and channel growth into these existing and future smart growth communities?

INTEGRATING OUR BORDERS, BOTH THE SURROUNDING COUNTIES AND MEXICO

Because our region is one of the most significant border regions in the world, and because our surrounding regions are growing much faster than we are, borders will be an important part of the RCP. SANDAG relies on the Borders Committee for advice on its approach to borders issues, relies on the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) for advice on its approach to binational border issues, on the I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP) for advice on its approach to Riverside border issues. The Regional Planning Committee and the Borders Committee had a joint meeting to discuss the approach for border issues as part of the RCP. The Borders Committee has identified six key issues to guide its work: jobs/housing balance, transportation and trade infrastructure, ports of entry, water supply, energy, and environmental protection and coordination.

- What border issues do the retreat participants think are critical to the regional vision?
- How can this RCP truly make a “mark” on borders issues?
- Are there other steps that should be taken to further involve our borders in the RCP process?

FINANCING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE

The Integrated Regional Infrastructure Program (IRIP) is designed to be completed in four phases. Staff is currently working on Phases 1 and 2 simultaneously, (inventory of infrastructure plans and a needs assessment), with a scheduled completion date of August 2003 for all ten infrastructure areas being studied. Phase 3, financing and public policy options to meet our infrastructure needs, is scheduled to be completed by October 2003. Phase 4 will produce an Integrated Regional Infrastructure Program (IRIP), including a financing strategy, public policy recommendations, and a performance monitoring process designed to evaluate our progress.

- Do the retreat participants agree that the incentives provided be in the form of public infrastructure and services necessary to achieve
successful existing and future smart growth communities?

- Do the retreat participants agree that the infrastructure and services in these smart growth communities should be improved and expanded by reprogramming infrastructure expenditures, amending public policies and, if needed, raising new revenue(s)?

- What actions should SANDAG take, especially as the MPO and transportation funding agency, to encourage better integration of local land use plans and policies with regional transportation plans and investments?

INTEGRATING THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

SANDAG has a draft RTP out for review and comment. The RTP is scheduled for adoption at the March 28th SANDAG meeting. One of the key RCP steps will be the integration of the adopted RTP. Currently, the adopted regional growth forecasts tie the existing local plans and policies, with some very modest “smart growth” enhancements in a few jurisdictions, to regional transportation networks and investments. The SANDAG committees have all agreed that the RCP needs to “move the rudder” to get us to where we want to be, as opposed to where current trends appear to be dragging us. Subsequent RTPs then could build upon the RCP to evolve the transportation plans and investment strategies as part of an iterative process for the next RTP.

- What should the local jurisdictions do to encourage a more effective connection of local land use plans and policies to the regional transportation plans and investments? to reduce and better manage demand...to make more efficient use of the existing transportation systems...and to
OVERVIEW OF THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

OVERVIEW

SANDAG has begun the preparation of a Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) which will foster dialogue and action that will enable us to better prepare for the future with our communities and strengthen how our local plans and policies connect to our bordering communities.

A key purpose of the Plan will be to strengthen the relationships among local and regional plans and policies, and land use and transportation, enabling the jurisdictions, as well as the region, to proactively plan for change. The RCP will build upon the region’s smart growth policies but it will be more than “smart growth.” It will clarify the vision for the San Diego region, define regional priorities, establish policies to address key regional issues, and set forth a public investment strategy for regionally-significant infrastructure. Additionally, the RCP provides an opportunity to establish a way to more effectively handle interregional and international land use and transportation issues.

A draft RCP is anticipated in December 2003, with a final RCP adopted by SANDAG by June 2004.

COMPONENTS

Based upon the current work, the Plan would include the following components.

- Vision and Guiding Principles
- Regional Priorities
- Chapters and Policy Options
  - Urban Form
  - Transportation
  - Housing
  - Ecosystems (Habitat, Water Quality, Air Quality, Sand Replenishment)
  - Borders (Baja California and Orange, Riverside, and Imperial Counties)
  - Public Facilities (Water Supply, Energy, Solid Waste)
  - Economic Prosperity
  - Environmental Justice/ Social Equity
- Regionally-Significant Infrastructure Needs and Financing Strategy
- A Call to Action (Implementation Strategies and Tools)
- Summary of Key Policies

NEED FOR THE RCP

Analysis shows that on a collective basis, our existing local plans and policies result in several significant disconnects at the regional level, including:

- Consumption of large amounts of undeveloped land – Current plans would consume far more land than a smart growth development pattern would. Smart growth would emphasize additional redevelopment and infill rather than consumption of vacant land.
- Development densities – Existing densities in the cities are relatively low, and planned densities on currently-vacant land are even lower. This pattern contributes to sprawl and can preclude the implementation of an efficient transit system.
• Imbalance between housing and employment capacity and locations – Current plans allow for more growth in employment than housing, contributing to higher housing costs, more interregional and longer commute trips, and more persons per household. Additionally, residential areas are largely segregated from employment centers, contributing to longer, more congested commutes.

• Infrastructure financing – Jurisdictions compete against each other for sales tax revenues, generally resulting in a process that isolates and encourages commercial development, too few homes, and sprawl development patterns. Additionally, our infrastructure systems compete against each other for investment, without a regional context to determine our priorities.

In addition, no adequate mechanism exists to handle transportation and environmental issues with our surrounding counties and the international border.

USE OF THE PLAN

At the local level, local agencies could use the Plan when updating local plans and policies. At the regional level, the Plan should prioritize the allocation of infrastructure funds toward urbanized areas that are more willing to support smart growth principles in accordance with the RCP, and toward areas where investments in public infrastructure are maximized. At the interregional level, the Plan could be used to address land use and transportation issues associated with our borders, particularly the growing imbalance between jobs and housing.

REGIONAL VISION AND CORE VALUES

The Regional Planning Committee has discussed the regional vision and core values on several occasions and agrees that the vision should be concise, instantly understandable, link issues together, resonate with people, and promote quality of life for everyone. The core values should expand on the vision, and serve as the guiding principles for each chapter. The regional priorities are based upon the vision and the core values, and serve as the basis for key policy options.

The following vision, core values, and regional priorities serve as starting points for the RCP, and will be tested and refined during the RCP workshops in January through March, and through other portions of the public involvement program. At its December and January meetings, the Borders Committee developed core values related to the interregional and international borders, that have been incorporated into the core values and regional priorities listed below.

Vision

“Make the San Diego region a better place to live, work, and play, with a healthy natural environment and an outstanding quality of life for everyone.”

Core Values

1. Our region will be a unique and dynamic place to live, embracing cultural diversity and promoting interregional understanding.

2. Our region will focus its future growth first into our cities, then into our unincorporated suburban communities adjacent to our cities, and finally into
our unincorporated village centers, preserving our rural and agricultural areas.

3. Our communities will be healthy places. They will have more mixed uses and better urban design. They will be walkable, have a distinct sense of place, and strive for greater equity.

4. The people that live in the San Diego region will have the ability to choose from a wider spectrum of housing types, closer to jobs, and have more affordable housing choices.

5. The region will have a coordinated transportation system that will supply a variety of options for getting about, better link our jobs and homes, provide more transit, walking, and biking opportunities, and efficiently transport cargo and goods.

6. Our ecosystems will be healthy. Our water and air will be clean. Our open space and habitat conservation systems will be preserved and maintained.

7. We will have a great variety of jobs, with the educational opportunities and the workforce to meet the demand for these jobs. Our wages will sustain our families’ standard of living.

8. Our infrastructure systems will be in place and will function appropriately, so that our quality of life will be measurably better.

9. Our region will pursue planning in a fair and equitable manner and will maintain active and honest communication with our neighboring counties, our Native American Tribal governments, the Republic of Mexico, and our military.

Regional Priorities

The Regional Planning Committee generally agrees that future growth should occur in the western third of the region, and that the RCP should lay out policies that make it easier to pursue additional redevelopment in existing urban areas. The Committee also agrees that there needs to be a variety of urban patterns in different places so that people have choices, and that the RCP needs to balance the economy, equity, and the environment.

1. Urban Form – Spatial Distribution and Urban Design
   - Reduce urban sprawl / Use land efficiently
   - Focus most future growth in urban areas (western third of region), close to existing and planned transportation networks
   - Create people-friendly places; walkable, mixed use communities
   - Evaluate impacts that different levels of smart growth or sprawl would have on the region’s livability and quality of life

2. Transportation – Regional, Interregional, International Transportation
   - Provide more transportation options (transit, walking, biking, carpooling, vanpooling) and reduce congestion in key corridors
   - Integrate the transportation infrastructure network with the other significant regional infrastructure systems
   - Build upon Mobility 2030: The Regional Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region, which emphasizes four primary components associated with achieving mobility (land use
connections, systems development, systems management, and demand management)

3. Housing – Availability, Affordability, Location, and Jobs-Housing Balance
   - Supply enough housing in relation to new jobs
   - Create additional regional/local funds for affordable housing
   - Locate new housing close to existing and planned jobs and transportation networks

4. Healthy Ecosystems – Connect and Fund our Habitat Preserve Systems, Resolve Housing and Transportation Conflicts, Ensure Clean Air and Water
   - Fund regional habitat preserve efforts
   - Establish policies to resolve potential conflicts with housing & transportation issues
   - Identify key ecosystem components and actions to insure a healthy environment (including minimizing air pollution and water quality/storm water runoff)

5. Economy and Public Facilities – Assure that Regional Infrastructure Systems and Public Facilities Needed to Improve our Quality of Life are Identified and Addressed through a Financing Strategy
   - Design a strategy that provides the opportunity for a rising standard of living
   - Design and implement a fiscal strategy for the San Diego region
   - Establish a regional infrastructure financing strategy that (1) provides for the implementation of key regional infrastructure systems and public facilities for transportation, habitat and open space, water quality, and other areas of significance, and (2) relies on a variety of funding sources, rather than on a single funding source.

6. Borders – Address Existing Challenges and Increase Future Opportunities for Collaboration with our Neighboring Counties, Tribal Governments, and International Border
   - Focus efforts in the areas of transportation, water, energy, environment, and housing.

INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISMS

No regional forum currently exists for discussing and prioritizing the allocation of regional infrastructure funds within the context of a regional comprehensive plan. The RCP will include an infrastructure needs assessment and a financing strategy. The financing strategy should place equal emphasis on financing transportation networks as well as other critical regional infrastructure systems, including water, energy, solid waste, and ecosystems as core constituents. Ultimately, the financing strategy should identify and include incentives to achieve the regional priorities. In addition to the financing strategy, the RCP will define implementation roles and responsibilities, and establish performance measures to assess implementation progress.

DECISION-MAKING STRUCTURE

Last year, SANDAG created the Regional Planning Committee to provide oversight for the preparation and implementation of the RCP. The Regional Planning Committee
receives input from two working groups: the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (local planning and community development directors), and the newly-created Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (stakeholders from throughout the region). In addition, SANDAG's parallel Policy Committees, the Borders Committee and Transportation Committee, prepare certain components of the RCP and provide guidance on the overall RCP.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND OUTREACH

Three series of subregional public workshops are anticipated. The first round of workshops will begin this January through March in an effort to seek input from stakeholders and policymakers on the region's vision and core values, and on the framework and structure of the RCP. The second round of workshops will be held in June and July 2003 to seek input on specific components of the RCP. The third round will occur after the Draft RCP has been released for review and comment in early 2004.

In addition to the scheduled workshops, and input from the various Working Groups, Policy Committees, and the SANDAG Board, the work program contains a number of actions and mechanisms designed to enrich public involvement, such as focus groups with peer facilitation, interactive technologies to be used at the workshops, environmental justice analysis and outreach, Web-based communications, and newsletters.
SANDAG EVALUATION AND PRIORITIES

FY 2004 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM

Each fiscal year, SANDAG develops an Overall Work Program (OWP) and associated program budget. This year, the work program is being restructured to reflect the agency consolidation under SB 1703 and includes projects from both transit operators.

This year’s challenge will be to enhance agency efforts by moving SANDAG from a primarily planning agency to an implementation agency, where projects are built.

EMPHASIS AREAS

Emphasis areas during fiscal year 2004 include:

- Completion of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, with emphasis on the development of an infrastructure needs inventory and financing strategies;
- Implementation of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Transit Vision, including performance monitoring and measurements;
- Preparation for the extension of the TransNet local transportation sales tax program;
- Implementation of state law (SB 1703) and the consolidation of transit functions; and
- Continued strengthening of our Borders work with surrounding counties, tribal governments, and Mexico.

In addition, SANDAG is working with the tribal governments to implement Native American needs.

MONITORING OUR PROGRESS

At their January 10, 2003 meeting, the Executive Committee discussed the need to monitor our progress in meeting the objectives outlined in our work program.

Executive Committee members have discussed this issue and have suggested setting goals for standards of each work element; making quarterly reports clear, concise and readable; identifying
completion goals in the quarterly reports; developing a marketing plan to educate the public on SANDAG; and presenting a State of the Region Report.

Part of the monitoring and measurement work will include an annual State of the Commute report prepared as part of the Regional Transportation Plan.