BOARD OF DIRECTORS
AGENDA

Friday, February 28, 2003
9:00 a.m.
SANDAG
401 B Street, 7th Floor
Downtown San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• FINAL DRAFT – MOBILITY 2030
• CONSOLIDATION – INITIAL TRANSITION PLAN
• AB 361: SAN DIEGO CONSOLIDATED TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
• HOUSING TRUST FUNDS

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE SANDAG BOARD MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG 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.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip which is located in the rear of the room and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The SANDAG Board may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed on SANDAG’s Web site at www.sandag.org under Meetings. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon on the Wednesday preceding the Friday SANDAG Board meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5300 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5300, (619) 595-5393 (TTY) or fax (619) 595-5305.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
+1. MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 24, 2003 BOARD MEETING | APPROVE
2. ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 13)
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 FEBRUARY 14, 2003 POLICY DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING | APPROVE
4. DISCUSSIONS AND ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES | APPROVE

+A. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (February 14, 2003)
+B. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (February 21, 2003) (This report will be faxed to all Board members by 2/25/03)
+C. BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (February 21, 2003) (This report will be faxed to all Board members by 2/25/03)

+5. INITIAL TRANSITION PLAN FOR CONSOLIDATION (SB 1703) (Gary Gallegos) | APPROVE
SB 1703 calls for the development of an initial transition plan to transfer planning and programming functions from MTDB and NCTD to SANDAG by February 28, 2003. The SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the draft Transition Plan – Initial Transfer report for distribution and comment on January 24, 2003. Approval of the initial transition plan is recommended. Utilizing the transition plan, NCTD and MTDB are developing implementation plans for transferring the initial functions.

+6. LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT REQUIRING MORE THAN $1,000 OR THREE DAYS STAFF TIME (Karen Lamphere) | 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 project covered in this month’s report is a transportation modeling project for the City of Coronado.
The Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides operating and capital revenue for the region’s public transit operators and funds non-motorized transportation projects. SANDAG is responsible for the apportionment of TDA funds, which are estimated to total $106,236,000 for FY 2004. SANDAG is required by law to notify prospective claimants by March 1 of each year. The Board of Directors is requested to approve Resolution 2003-25 adopting the FY 2004 Apportionment Schedule and issue the TDA Claim Guidelines for use in administering the program.

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 percent local sales tax and other local, state, and federal sources fund these projects.

The Shoreline Preservation Committee recommends that the Board accept funds from the coastal cities and authorize contracting for the eighth year of this ongoing beach and lagoon monitoring program. The recommendation also includes supplementing the basic monitoring program with SANDAG’s state and federal beach replenishment funds to monitor the Regional Beach Sand Project. This will be the third year of the four-year monitoring requirement of the project’s state and federal permits.

State law requires that the Board be provided a quarterly report of investments held by SANDAG. This report includes all money under the direction or care of SANDAG as of December 31, 2002, including funds of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission and SourcePoint.

The SANDAG Executive Committee in its review of the FY 2004 Overall Work Program recommends that the Board accept for distribution the full draft document for review and comment by local, state, and federal agencies and interested organizations and individuals.

This report provides a synopsis and actions based on the discussions during the retreat held on January 29, 30 and 31, 2003.
SUBREGIONAL POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS (Bob Parrott)

Attached for information is a list of (1) the membership on each of SANDAG’s four Policy Advisory Committees (Executive, Transportation, Regional Planning, and Borders); (2) the current Board Members and Alternates; and (3) the 2003 meeting schedule for the Board and Policy Advisory Committees.

PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

14. Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG. 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

A BOLD VISION FOR A BETTER FUTURE

This report highlights the accomplishments and challenges being addressed by the elected officials who represent this region’s 18 cities and county government while working together as SANDAG. This work is done in concert with our eight advisory members, interested citizens, and representatives of private and public civic, community, and special interest organizations.

APPOINTMENTS TO SOURCEPOINT

The Chair will nominate three SANDAG Board members and a citizen-at-large to serve on the SourcePoint Board. SourcePoint, a nonprofit corporation chartered by SANDAG, offers a broad range of services including economic and fiscal impact analysis, market feasibility studies, economic development strategies, transportation modeling, and geographic information system (GIS) services.

REPORTS

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE: AB 361 (KEHOE) – SAN DIEGO CONSOLIDATED TRANSPORTATION AGENCY (Gary Gallegos)

Assemblymember Kehoe has introduced a bill which would modify last year’s SB 1703 in a number of ways which have not been reviewed, endorsed or discussed with the Board prior to introduction. They relate to voter approval of a new governance structure, and the contents and process for development and adoption of a Regional Comprehensive Plan. Some of the items in the bill were similar to those requested by SANDAG last year. Others have not received approval of the Board. Given the magnitude of the transition process already underway, and the necessity to focus on its implementation during the coming year, it is recommended that the author commit to amending the bill consistent with SANDAG’s policies or that it be opposed.
+ 18. **PUBLIC HEARING:** **ORDINANCE CO-03-1 AMENDING ORDINANCE CO-87-1 (SAN DIEGO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN) REVISIONING THE EXPENDITURE OF TRANSIT FUNDS (2ND READING)** (Craig Scott)

Adoption of this item would amend Ordinance CO-03-1, the San Diego Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, to add bus capital facilities in the I-15 corridor as eligible expenditures under the “80% rail capital” share of the TransNet funds made available for transit purposes.

+ 19. **MOBILITY 2030: DRAFT FINAL REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN** (Joe Kellejian, Chair, Transportation Committee; Kim Kawada, SANDAG Staff)

The 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MOBILITY 2030, is the blueprint designed to address the mobility challenges created by our region’s growth. This long-range plan contains an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the transportation system in the San Diego region through the year 2030. At its January 24, 2003 meeting, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved modifications to the 2030 RTP. The changes have been incorporated into the Draft Final 2030 RTP for Board review. The Board is scheduled to certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), make a finding that the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP is in conformance with the State Implementation Plan for air quality, and adopt the Final 2030 RTP at its March 28, 2003 meeting.

+ 20. **HOUSING TRUST FUNDS** (Councilmember Patty Davis, Chair, Regional Housing Task Force; Rebecca Davis, SANDAG Staff)

Housing trust funds are distinct funds established by cities, counties and states that permanently dedicate a source of public revenue to support the production and preservation of affordable housing. At a Policy Development Board meeting last year on housing, the Board requested that staff return to the Board with information about housing trust funds and potential regional funding sources.

+ 21. **OVERVIEW OF THE SDG&E 20-YEAR ELECTRIC RESOURCE PLANNING** (Bob Resley, SDG&E Staff)

SDG&E has requested this opportunity to provide the Board with an overview of their 20-year electric resource planning process. A California Public Utilities Commission order has tasked SDG&E with developing a plan to address both supply-side and demand-side energy alternatives for the region. SDG&E is currently seeking widespread regional input as it prepares the 20-year plan to be filed with the State in April.

**Note:** There will **not** be a Policy Development Board meeting in March. The next Board meeting will be held on Friday, March 28, 2003.

The Executive Committee will meet Friday, March 14, 2003.

**ADJOURNMENT**
MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
January 24, 2003

Chairman Morrison called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:11 a.m.

Attendance was as follows:

**Voting Members**
- City of Carlsbad ........................................................................ Ramona Finnila, Mayor Pro Tem
- City of Chula Vista ...................................................................... Steve Padilla, Mayor
- City of Coronado ......................................................................... Phil Monroe, Mayor Pro Tem
- City of Del Mar ........................................................................... Richard Earnest, Deputy Mayor
- City of El Cajon ........................................................................... Mark Lewis, Councilmember
- City of Encinitas ......................................................................... Christy Guerin, 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 ..................................................................... Jerry Jones, Councilmember
- City of National City ................................................................. Ron Morrison, Councilmember
- City of Oceanside .......................................................................... Jack Feller, Councilmember
- City of Poway ................................................................................ Mickey Cafagna, Mayor
- City of San Diego (A) .................................................................... Dick Murphy, Mayor
- City of San Diego (B) .................................................................... Absent
- City of San Marcos .......................................................................... Corky Smith, Mayor
- City of Santee ................................................................................ Hal Ryan, Councilmember
- City of Solana Beach ................................................................. Joe Kellejian, Councilmember
- City of Vista .................................................................................. Judy Ritter, Councilmember
- County of San Diego ..................................................................... Greg Cox, Supervisor

**Advisory Liaison Members**
- County of Imperial ...................................................................... Absent
- Department of Transportation ..................................................... Pedro Orso-Delgado, District Director
- U.S. Department of Defense ......................................................... CAPT Christopher Schanze, Commanding Officer
- Mexico .......................................................................................... Francisco Anza, Deputy Consul General
- San Diego Unified Port District ..................................................... Jess Van Deventer, Commissioner
- San Diego County Water Authority ............................................ Hon. Bud Lewis, Director
- Metropolitan Transit Development Board .................................... Leon Williams, Chair
- North San Diego County Transit Development Board ................. Hon. Tom Golich, Board Member
Chair Morrison introduced new SANDAG Board member Mayor Corky Smith who is the primary representative for the City of San Marcos. He noted that Councilmember Patricia McCoy is now the primary representative for the City of Imperial Beach and welcomed back Deputy Mayor Richard Earnest, representing the City of Del Mar. Chair Morrison reminded the Board that there is a new voting system which will be used to record the Board member’s votes.

1. MINUTES OF BOARD MEETINGS (APPROVE)

A. DECEMBER 20, 2002

Action: Poway - Imperial Beach. The motion was made, and second, to approve the minutes of the Board Meeting of December 20, 2002. Yes – 13 (weighted vote - 71%). No – 0 (weighted vote - 0%). Absent – 3 (Lemon Grove, San Diego-B, Vista). Abstain – 4 (Chula Vista, El Cajon, San Marcos, County of San Diego).

B. JANUARY 10, 2003

Action: Poway - Escondido. The motion was made, and second, to approve the minutes of the Board Meeting of January 10, 2003. Yes - 14 (weighted vote - 93%). No - 0 (weighted vote - 0%). Absent - 3 (Lemon Grove, San Diego-B, Vista). Abstain - 3 (Carlsbad, San Marcos, Santee).

2. ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

None.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 6)

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

A. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (January 10, 2003)

B. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (January 17, 2003)

C. JOINT REGIONAL PLANNING AND BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (January 17, 2003)

D. BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (December 20, 2002)

4. PROGRESS REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS (INFORMATION)

5. FY 2004 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM (OWP) – DRAFT LIST OF PROPOSED WORK ELEMENTS (INFORMATION)

6. ANNUAL INVESTMENT POLICY UPDATE (Resolution 2003-21) (APPROVE)
Action: Poway – Imperial Beach. The motion was made, and second, to approve Consent Items 3 through 6. Yes - 17 (no weighted vote). No - 0 (no weighted vote). Absent - 3 (Lemon Grove, San Diego-B, Vista).

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

Clive Richard, a San Diego resident, encouraged the Board to have the courage and strength to say in closed session, at the retreat, what it cannot say in public. Chairman Morrison pointed out that the retreat is open to the public.

Mayor Smith (San Marcos) asked Mr. Richard for clarification on his points. Mr. Richard commented that he does not understand why the Board cannot speak candidly in an open forum without having to go to the desert.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a resident of San Diego, requested sponsors for the Multiple Sclerosis Walk that he’ll be participating in the weekend of April 4-5, 2003.

CHAIR REPORTS

8. SOLICITING INTEREST IN SERVING ON THE SOURCEPOINT BOARD OF DIRECTORS (INFORMATION)

SourcePoint is a nonprofit corporation created by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) for the purpose of providing regional information services and technical assistance to public and private organizations and individuals. The SourcePoint Board has five members; three members from the SANDAG Board, a member from the public at large and one member appointed by the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce. SANDAG members are appointed by the Chairman, approved by the Board and serve three-year terms. The public at large member is appointed by the Chairman; the Chamber of Commerce appoints their member and each serve a two-year term.

Chair Morrison noted that there is a vacancy on the SourcePoint Board of Directors. He suggested that any interested Board members contact him prior to next month’s meeting. The SANDAG appointments to the SourcePoint Board will be made at the February 28, 2003 meeting.

9. REPORT FROM THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON TRANSITION (INFORMATION)

Chairman Morrison briefed the Board on the last meeting from the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition held on January 21, 2003. Along with that meeting, a Peer Review Panel was held to discuss staffing and policy issues, and ideas and concepts for transitioning to the new regional agency.

Mayor Bud Lewis (San Diego County Water Authority) asked if SANDAG is responsible for approving the budgets of SANDAG, MTDB and NCTD. Staff responded that SANDAG will
work closely with both transit Boards to determine all parties needs. SANDAG holds the ultimate responsibility for the budgets, however, review of the budgets will have to be done in close consultation with the operators.

Mayor Smith (San Marcos) requested clarification on the mission of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition.

Chair Morrison explained that the purpose of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition is to provide policy guidance on the development and implementation of the transition plans for the consolidated agency. Mayor Smith requested minutes from all past meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition.

10. INITIAL TRANSITION PLAN: CONSOLIDATED AGENCY (ACCEPT FOR DISTRIBUTION)

Staff pointed out that at the last meeting, the Board was provided with an overview of SB 1703, and a transition plan was discussed. Based on direction from the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition, It is staff’s recommendation to distribute the initial transition plan for review and comment. The Transition Plan will be presented to the Board for approval at its February meeting, after a 30-day review period.

Councilmember McCoy (Imperial Beach) made the motion to approve the staff recommendation.

Vice Chair Cafagna (Poway) seconded the motion.

Mayor Madrid (La Mesa) requested that a glossary be included with this document to assist those that are not familiar with the subject.

Action: Imperial Beach – Poway. The motion was made and seconded to accept the Draft Transition Plan – Initial Transfer, for distribution and comment. Yes – 17 (weighted vote - 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote - 0%). Absent – 3 (Lemon Grove, San Diego-B, Vista).

11. 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS (APPROVE)

Councilmember Kellejian, Chair of SANDAG’s Transportation Committee, stated that the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MOBILITY 2030, has been out for public review since October 2002. Three public workshops were held before the end of the year, and the Board held a public hearing on the Plan on December 6, 2002. There are several modifications proposed to the Plan in response to comments received and further technical analysis by staff. Based on the Board’s actions today, a Draft Final 2030 RTP will be presented at the February 28, 2003 meeting. The Final 2030 RTP is scheduled for Board adoption at its March 28, 2003 meeting. The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) also is scheduled to be approved at the March meeting. The Transportation Committee voted last Friday to recommend that the Board approve the recommended modifications to MOBILITY 2030.

Staff highlighted the proposed modifications to the 2030 RTP, including changes to RTP funding assumptions.
Councilmember Kellejian (Solana Beach) noted that the Plan could be reviewed and/or amended as time goes on, and is required to be updated every three years. Staff pointed out that shortly after an RTP is adopted, work begins on the next RTP update in order to meet the three-year requirement.

Councilmember Kellejian asked staff to explain the rationale why the SR 76 widening from Mission to I-15 was not included in the 2030 RTP Revenue Constrained Plan. He asked what the impact would be on the current environmental document being prepared for SR 76, if this additional segment were included in the Plan. Staff responded that the issue is that Caltrans is well on the way in completing the environmental document for the SR 76 widening project from Melrose to Mission. If the piece from Mission to I-15 were added into the Plan, the resource agencies would require that the environmental document consider the entire project. The Mission to I-15 segment faces tough environmental constraints, and the resource agencies have questioned the need for this segment. Adding this segment in the Plan would likely delay the current environmental document by several years.

Councilmember Kellejian stated that the full SR 76 project is very important to the North County cities and staff needs to understand that they need to be diligent in moving forward with trying to complete this project. He added that the elected officials have an obligation to the voters that voted for Proposition A in 1987 – this is one of the remaining pieces of that obligation. Staff indicated that they are committed to both this project and SR 52.

Public Comment

Jimmy Knott, representing San Diego ADADT, a disabled activist/advocate group, stated that if the 2030 RTP is to work and have any validity, all of the local jurisdictions have to remove obstacles to mobility. Mr. Knott presented the Board with pictures highlighting areas in Carlsbad in which pedestrian access has been blocked.

Lynn Gardener, an Oceanside resident and Co-Chairman of the Oceanside Transportation Commission, asked the Board to think strongly about how the residents in Oceanside are affected in areas where the City of Carlsbad has put in barricades shutting off access to major arterials.

Joe Naiman, a reporter for the Fallbrook/Bonsall Village News, mentioned that he will write a story about the 2030 RTP. He noted that he has covered the Riverside Transit Agency’s public hearings about the upcoming Oceanside to Murrieta express bus service. He urged the Board to include this project in the RTP, since it would help benefit the San Diego regional transportation system.

Councilmember Feller (Oceanside) stated that the completion of SR 76 impacts all of the North County Cities, including Escondido, San Marcos, Oceanside, Vista, and unincorporated areas like Bonsall and Fallbrook.

Mayor Murphy (City of San Diego) made the motion to approve the staff recommendation for discussion. In addition, Mayor Murphy asked staff to explain why the widening of I-
15, from I-5 to SR 94, was recommended for deletion from the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. Staff responded that in addition to eliminating the proposed I-15/I-805 HOV to HOV connectors ($150 million) as discussed by the Transportation Committee, staff was recommending deletion of this I-15 widening project ($40 million) in order to afford the slightly higher cost of the I-5 to I-8 freeway to freeway connectors ($200 million). Staff stated that I-15 from I-5 to SR 94 works at acceptable levels of service as a six-lane freeway without the originally proposed widening.

Mayor Smith (San Marcos) seconded the motion and asked how soon the environmental document for SR 76 would be completed. Mr. Orso-Delgado (Caltrans) responded that biological studies are currently being conducted. The time frame for completion of the environmental document is three to five years.

Mayor Smith asked when the I-15 bus route from Escondido to Temecula would be completed. Staff mentioned that the time frame for completion of that project is approximately 5 to 10 years.

Mayor Smith asked if the Board can do anything about the road that is being blocked in Carlsbad. Staff suggested that the Board consider exercising the conflict resolution procedure regarding this issue. He added that staff could do fact finding on this issue. Additionally, staff has been working with all the North County cities to look at improving all the arterial system in North County.

Mayor Smith indicated he would like to make a motion to study this issue.

Mayor Pro Tem Finnila indicated that she is prepared to state Carlsbad’s position on this issue, noting that this issue has been discussed with the staffs of Oceanside, Vista, and San Marcos. She pointed out that the City of Carlsbad is currently operating under a growth management plan, and the rules are different in Carlsbad than in those cities that do not have growth management plans.

Mayor Lewis (SDCWA) asked about the conceptual proposal made by Supervisor Horn for an additional North-South connector. Staff stated that the new North-South Facility Study would commence after the adoption of the 2030 RTP and would be completed prior to the next RTP update.

Mayor Lewis (SDCWA) added that Carlsbad is a regional player and suggested that the Board consider the impacts on Carlsbad in regards to SR 78.

Councilmember Kellejian mentioned that the new North-South transportation corridor study is included in SANDAG’s current work program. He noted that any recommendations resulting from the study could be added in the RTP at a later date. This study is intended to evaluate transportation corridors and may not necessarily mean a new road, highway, or freeway. He mentioned that rather than hearing about Carlsbad’s growth management plan today, he asked that staff evaluate this issue and bring back recommendation to the Transportation Committee and then the Board at a later date.

Mayor Johnson (Oceanside) stated that he appreciated all the comments from his colleagues regarding this issue. However, he expressed concern that public roads are
being built and completed with tax dollars, but are not being open for public use. He noted that the residents on both sides of the barricades would like them to be removed. He hoped that a resolution to this issue be sought soon.

Supervisor Cox (County of San Diego) indicated that it was Supervisor Horn who originally suggested that the County Board of Supervisors recommend including the entire widening for SR 76 from Melrose to I-15 in the 2030 RTP Revenue Constrained Plan. He commented that while he understands the reasons for not including the Mission to I-15 segment, the Board needs to do what it can to complete the entire project in a timely fashion. He also noted that Supervisor Horn suggested that a concept plan for the San Diego Luis Rey River Park be developed and used as potential environmental mitigation for SR 76 improvements. He commended Supervisor Horn for tying these two projects together and highlighting them.

Deputy Mayor Earnest (Del Mar) supported Solana Beach’s recommendation that staff investigate the facts first and report back to the Board. He stated that if an acceptable solution can not be identified at that level, then the Board should go through the conflict resolution process. The goal is to resolve this issue in a fair, regional way.

Mayor Madrid (La Mesa) suggested that the Board immediately go to the conflict resolution step instead of going through the initial fact finding step. He asked what would happen if, as a result of the conflict resolution process, a decision is rendered and some cities do want to honor that decision. General Counsel responded that the Board does not render decisions on issues that are brought forth under the conflict resolution procedure. Fact finding and conflict resolution can occur separately or simultaneously and any member agency can request the implementation of the conflict resolution procedure for an item such as this. However, all parties would then need to agree to involve themselves in the process, which is similar to mediation wherein all parties need to be at the table, come together and resolve the issue jointly, with the help of SANDAG. The SANDAG Board would be a resource to the parties involved. This is a confidential process whereby mediation also has been involved. The process has been successful in the past.

Councilmember Guerin (Encinitas) stated that this issue is beyond the fact finding stage, and conflict resolution should be implemented. She added that she is interested in hearing the City of Vista’s point of view on this issue, because Vista is being impacted in addition to the City of Oceanside.

Vice Chairman Cafagna mentioned that it is important to respect the local control of all cities, and indicated that it is important to hear what Carlsbad’s reasons are for what it is doing. This is an issue that needs to be brought to a head, and the Board needs to hear Carlsbad’s position on this issue.

Mayor Smith recommended that the Board take action on this issue.

Mayor Pro Tem Finnila briefly pointed out three things: (1) the part of College Boulevard that has been referred to is scheduled to open in 18 months; (2) there is pedestrian access around the barricade; and (3) Carlsbad’s issues with the City of Vista are being handled though their City Managers.
Mayor Padilla (Chula Vista) reminded the Board that it has been the focus of criticism regarding its ability to focus on the appropriate agenda. He respectfully urged the Chair to direct the conversation at hand to the agenda item itself. He encouraged the North County cities to take maximum use of the conflict resolution resources available to them through SANDAG.

Councilmember Feller stated that it is very important and urged all cities to direct their City Managers to make contact regarding this issue.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe (Coronado) sensed a growing concern and issue around the completion of SR 76. He mentioned that there are other areas throughout the region that also need to be completed.

Chair Morrison called for the question.

**Action:** City of San Diego – San Marcos. The motion was made, and second, to approve the proposed modifications to the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MOBILITY 2030, presented in the staff report. The changes will be incorporated into the Draft Final 2030 RTP for Board review in February 2003 and the Final 2030 RTP scheduled for Board approval in March 2003. Yes - 18 (weighted vote - 100%). No - 0 (weighted vote - 0%). Absent – 2 (Encinitas, San Diego-B).

**Action:** San Marcos – Oceanside. The motion was made and seconded to initiate the conflict resolution procedure, to include fact finding to be brought back to the Board. The Cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside will be contacted to ensure that they both are willing to move forward with the process. Yes - 18 (weighted vote - 100%). No - 0 (weighted vote - 0%). Absent – 2 (La Mesa, San Diego-B).

Chair Morrison noted that Item #13 – Amendment to the TransNet Program of Projects and the Introduction of Ordinance CO-03-1 Amending Ordinance CO-87-1 (San Diego Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance And Expenditure Plan) to Provide TransNet Funding for MTDB North I-15 Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Capital Projects, will be moved up on the agenda.

**13. AMENDMENT TO THE TRANSNET PROGRAM OF PROJECTS AND THE INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCE CO-03-1 AMENDING ORDINANCE CO-87-1 (SAN DIEGO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN) TO PROVIDE TRANSNET FUNDING FOR MTDB NORTH I-15 CORRIDOR BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) CAPITAL PROJECTS (Resolution 2003-22) (APPROVE)**

Tom Larwin, General Manager of the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB), provided the Board with an overview of the North I-15 Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project, which includes the proposed Sabre Springs/Rancho Penaquitos Station acquisition.

Councilmember Guerin (Encinitas) asked if monies for this project would come out MTDB's share of TransNet funding, and if there are no TCRP funds available to reimburse the TransNet program in the future, what would the impact be to other projects assumed to be funded by the TransNet monies. Mr. Larwin commented that the TransNet funding would come from MTDB's portion of the 1/3 of the total TransNet funds available for
transit projects. Currently, there are no specific projects that would be postponed because the MTDB Board is exploring options for how best to use their future remaining TransNet funds. MTDB's plans call for the implementation of new service with the Transit First projects. Some of those projects may have to be scaled back if the TCRP funds are not received.

Supervisor Cox (County of San Diego) made the motion to approve the staff recommendation.

Mayor Madrid (La Mesa) seconded the motion.

Mayor Pro Tem Finnila (Carlsbad) asked if MTDB has had conversations with the property owners of the proposed hotel. Mr. Larwin replied that MTDB has been in negotiations with the property owner.

Vice Chair Cafagna commented that he has spoken with the property owner and indicated that the property owner is willing to cooperate with the Board. He implored the Board to vote for this issue because the region cannot afford to lose this parcel of land. This is a critical link to the project.

Chairman Morrison clarified that the motion that was made included the reading of the Ordinance to be introduced by title only.

Mayor Murphy (City of San Diego) agreed with Mayor Cafagna that the Sabre Springs transit station is a significant part of the Regional Transit Vision, and is the first real bus rapid transit project. This project is needed to tie into the I-15 Managed Lanes for the entire system to work. Mayor Murphy clarified that the $5.5 million comes from MTDB funding, but that MTDB can only spend 20% of its funding on non-rail projects. Therefore, every time funds need to be spent on a non-rail project, there needs to be a two-thirds vote from the Board.

Chairman Morrison pointed out that for today's vote on the introduction of the Ordinance, only a majority vote is required. When this issue is brought back before the Board, it would require a two-thirds vote for approval.

Mayor Murphy asked for clarification regarding the deadline for acquiring the property and the requirement for the second reading. Staff responded that the recommendation has two aspects to it. The first is a resolution relating to the loan of TransNet funds, which would allow SANDAG to transfer the TransNet funding to MTDB in time to meet the deadline for the property acquisition. This transfer would be made under the assumption that the TCRP funds would be received so that the loan could be repaid. The second part is the proposed Ordinance Amendment which would allow for the permanent use of TransNet funds for this purpose in the event the TCRP funds are not received.

Deputy Mayor Earnest (Del Mar) requested to hear from the property owner on this issue to understand their ability to be in agreement with and flexible, in case the second reading date falls outside of the escrow date. Mark Byrnes, 50% owner of the parcel, along with Phelps Program Management, stated that they are prepared to be flexible on
this issue, if need be. Hopefully, escrow on the property will close shortly after the second reading.

Councilmember Ritter (Vista) mentioned that the HOV Lanes and transit stations are the basis of the region’s north-south mass transit. She encouraged the Board to vote in favor of this issue.

Supervisor Cox (County of San Diego) asked if, under the new voting process, the two-thirds vote be based on the agency vote or the weighted vote. General Counsel replied that the vote would be based on two-thirds of both the agency and weighted vote.

General Counsel read the ordinance for introduction only. The ordinance states, “That Section 4B(2)(a) of Commission Ordinance 87-1 is hereby amended to read as follows:

a. Not less than eighty percent shall be used to implement the rail capital facilities and the bus capital facilities required to support the express bus services in the I-15 corridor, as identified in the Expenditure Plan. However, in no case, shall the use of revenues under this section preclude the use of the revenues necessary to implement Section 4B(2)(b).”

Action: County of San Diego - La Mesa. The motion was made, and second, to approve the Transportation Committee’s recommendation to approve Resolution 2003-22 amending the TransNet Program of Projects to allow the use of TransNet funds for the Metropolitan Transit Development Board’s Sabre Springs transit station project until the intended reimbursement of Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) funds takes place. The Board also voted to approve that Ordinance CO-03-1 be introduced, and scheduled for adoption at the February meeting, amending Section 4B(2)(a) of the San Diego Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan to expand the use of the 80% rail capital funds to include MTDB’s North I-15 Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) capital facilities, such as the Sabre Springs transit station project, in the event the intended repayment with TCRP funds does not occur. Yes - 19 (weighted vote - 100%). No - 0 (weighted vote - 0%). Absent – 1 (San Diego-B).

12. 2002 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE

Councilmember Kellejian, Chair of SANDAG’s Transportation Committee, reported that SANDAG is required by law to prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP). The purpose of the CMP is to monitor SANDAG’s transportation system’s performance, identify new congestion management strategies, and coordinate land use and transportation decisions. The Draft 2002 update to the CMP was released in August of last year and a public hearing was held at the September 2002 Board meeting. On January 17, 2003, the Transportation Committee reviewed the revised 2002 CMP update and recommended adoption.

Public Comment

Matt Adams, Director of Government Affairs for the Building Industry Association (BIA), thanked the SANDAG Board and staff for working with the BIA in addressing their concerns with the CMP. He added that the BIA looks forward to
continuing to work with SANDAG staff to develop a program that is fair and equitable to everyone.

Action: Carlsbad - Poway. The motion was made, and second, to approve the Transportation Committee's recommendation to adopt the 2002 CMP Update, as revised. Yes - 19 (weighted vote - 100%). No - 0 (weighted vote - 0%). Absent - 1 (San Diego-B).

14. PROGRESS REPORT ON REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

Chair Morrison announced that the San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO) and the Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council (REPAC) have been working hard over the past couple months in developing a draft of a Regional Energy Strategy for review. He pointed out that the four SANDAG appointees to the REPAC included Mayor Morris Vance (Vista), Mayor Jerome Stocks (Encinitas), Councilmember Mary Salas (Chula Vista), and Councilmember Jerry Jones (Lemon Grove). In addition, County Supervisor Dianne Jacob and San Diego City Councilmember Michael Zucchet have both been appointed to the REPAC.

John Moot, Chair of the REPAC, noted that the REPAC appeared before the Board in July 2002 to review what the region’s vision is for its energy future; what were the most critical energy problems facing the region; and what energy projects and programs are needed. The REPAC also had an opportunity to lay out a forward looking forecast of the region’s energy needs, which looks out 30 years.

Irene Stillings, Executive Director of the SDREO, presented the Board with a PowerPoint presentation which laid out the key strategy and elements that the REPAC has been looking at, which included the potential organizational structures that could help meet the region’s energy needs. She highlighted the critical energy issues that the REPAC has identified and discussed next steps and plans for outreach. Ms. Stillings noted that the SDREO is continuing to solicit discussion and input from key stakeholders, which includes business, government, environmental and health agencies, and a draft Energy Plan will be presented to the REPAC for discussion at its March 6, 2003 meeting. More outreach to stakeholders will take place and a revised draft of the Plan will be presented to the REPAC on April 3, 2003 and a completed Regional Energy Strategy and Implementation Plan will be presented to the SANDAG Board at its April 2003 meeting.

Mayor Pro Tem Finnila (Carlsbad) asked if the draft will include an estimate of the fiscal impacts on options B and C presented in the Board report? Ms. Stillings responded yes.

Councilmember Kellejian (Solana Beach) needed clarification on the process of forming a JPA, the development of an annual budget and the process for the allocation of the budget between the cities. Mr. Moot stated that first the draft of the strategy would be presented to the Board and if the Board accepted the REPAC's recommendation, the details would then be prepared.

Councilmember Kellejian inquired if the financial information can be made available prior to Board making a decision. Mr. Moot replied that hopefully, rough numbers will be included as part of the draft Regional Energy Strategy.
Councilmember Kellejian requested that those numbers be provided to the Board prior to April 2003 meeting and pointed out that it is hard to approve something without knowing the cost. He added that the Solana Beach City Council would need, at a minimum, a ballpark figure in order to consider the request.

Councilmember Guerin (Encinitas) pointed out that SDG&E, a publicly held corporation, has been charged by the CPUC to develop a 30-year plan and to evaluate the needs of the area agencies. She expressed concern that SDG&E should be at the table regarding this issue and questioned if there has there been any coordination with SDG&E on this issue. Ms. Stillings noted that regarding coordination, the SDREO is working very closely with SDG&E to assist them and provide input in their 20-year plan. Mr. Moot added that the REPAC has identified advisory members, of which SDG&E is one. He added that the SDG&E representative is an active, productive member of the group, having attended all of the REPAC meetings and is called upon regularly for input.

Mayor Madrid (La Mesa) asked if the REPAC has been able to project the demand that new homes and new infrastructure needs will add. Mr. Moot stated that the Infrastructure Study speaks to that issue.

Mayor Madrid asked if the energy provider can be supplanted for five years down the road if the Board chooses to adopt this proposal. He asked if there is any way that each jurisdiction can take a stand alone position without incurring huge costs that could jeopardize their general fund budgets. Mr. Moot stated that the most controversial discussion amongst the group is how does the current energy utility fit into this structure. The REPAC has never taken a vote and moves forward simply on consensus. But this is an issue that is very controversial.

Mayor Murphy (City of San Diego) suggested creating a San Diego Regional Energy Authority, with geographical representation similar to the San Diego Regional Airport Authority. He added that SANDAG should not take this function on, its plate is too full. Ms. Stillings stated that Mayor Murphy’s proposal will be presented to the REPAC, will be discussed and may very well be a part of what is presented to the SANDAG Board in April.

Public Comment

Mitch Mitchell, representing the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, indicated that this is a very complex regional issue. The most important issue for this region and the business community is that we create a road map, a plan, that we know where we’re going to be 5-10 years from now. That’s what needs to be done to settle concerns. Forming a JPA is a scary situation for the business community. Mayor Murphy’s proposal is one that the Chamber is willing to look at. However, the $1 surcharge needs to be investigated.

Ken Smokaska, Chapter Vice Chair and Air Quality Committee Chair of the Sierra Club San Diego, agreed that energy efficiency and renewable resources are an important element of the Regional Energy Plan and are supported by the Sierra Club. Also, he introduced to the Board a, “San Diego Go Solar,” campaign that the Sierra Club has recently adopted. He suggested that the Board give
authorization to staff to initiate a feasibility study with a budget not to exceed $50,000.

Mayor Lewis (El Cajon) expressed concern regarding the costs of the proposed energy JPA.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe (Coronado) pointed out that former Port Commissioner Frank Urtasun is available to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this issue. He expressed concern that SDG&E is not a voting member of REPAC. SDG&E, by law, is required to develop a 20-year plan for the region. SANDAG should be in sync with that in order to move forward.

Councilmember McCoy (Imperial Beach) mentioned that she is looking at the Border Power Plant Working Group. She is under the impression that there will be several LNG plants on the other side of the border. This is an issue that has to be faced so people understand the safety factors.

Councilmember Jones (Lemon Grove) indicated that the JPA idea developed as a funding mechanism in order to finance renewables and generation. Energy can be thought of in two ways: (1) generation and (2) transmission. SDG&E is primarily the source of transmission. He added that he can’t think of any other way for the Board, as a region, to take its destiny into its own hands other than forming a JPA. There needs to be a conceptual agreement in order to move forward on this issue.

Chair Morrison reiterated that this is an information item only.

15. TRANSPORTATION MARKETING, PUBLIC OUTREACH AND INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM (INFORMATION)

Last year, SANDAG directed staff to raise the public’s awareness of SANDAG by providing public information and outreach for the Regional Transportation Plan, providing public information on the existing TransNet program, as well as marketing the RideLink Transportation Demand Management services. Caltrans, MTDB and NCTD have assisted with the outreach efforts. SANDAG hired a local integrated marketing and communications firm, to assist with the creative approach for this public outreach.

Indra Gardner, Principal for Bailey Gardner and Francine Crocker, Senior Vice President of Advertising for Bailey Gardner, provided the Board with a summary of the program and the accomplishments to date.

**Public Comment**

Robert Hoffman, a San Diego resident, mentioned that every public agency should follow in SANDAG’s footsteps in regards to its outreach efforts.

Councilmember Ritter (Vista) mentioned that the Board needs to consider expanding the parking available for the commuters that utilize public transportation.
16. CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Mark Baza, Caltrans, announced that the State has completed its Draft California Transportation Plan (CTP), which is the State’s equivalent to the San Diego region’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). He provided the Board with some background on the CTP, explained the purpose of the CTP, and pointed out why the CTP is important to the state and the region. There will be seven Regional Workshops held throughout the state. The San Diego Workshop is scheduled for Friday, February 21, 2003 from 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. at the Doubletree Hotel in Mission Valley, 7450 Hazard Center Drive. Mr. Baza welcomed input on the CTP from the Board.

Vice Chair Cafagna asked if the CTP is being coordinated with the RTP? Mr. Baza responded that the State is implementing strategies in the CTP that are consistent with the RTP.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Mayor Holt Pfeiler (Escondido) reported on the results of the first Regional Comprehensive Plan Subregional Workshop which was held at Escondido City Hall. She encouraged all Board members to attend the RCP workshops.

Chairman Morrison stated that the Board members particularly don’t want to miss the workshop coming to their specific areas. He highlighted upcoming SANDAG meetings: (1) the SANDAG Annual Retreat will be held January 29-31, 2003 at the La Casa Del Zorro; (2) Executive Committee and Policy Development Board meetings on Friday, February 14, 2003; and (3) SANDAG Board of Directors meeting on Friday, February 28, 2003.

ADJOURNMENT: 12:02 p.m.
SUMMARY OF THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING
Meeting of February 14, 2003

The meeting of the SANDAG Policy Development Board was called to order at 10:37 a.m. by Chair Ron Morrison. Attendance was as follows:

SANDAG Board Voting Members
City of Carlsbad ................................................................. Ramona Finnila, Mayor Pro Tem
City of Chula Vista ............................................................... Steve Padilla, Mayor
City of Coronado ............................................................... Phil Monroe, Mayor Pro Tem
City of Del Mar ................................................................. Crystal Crawford, Councilmember
City of El Cajon ................................................................. Mark Lewis, Mayor
City of Encinitas .............................................................. Christy Guerin, 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 ......................................................... Jill Greer, Councilmember
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 ............................................................ Corky Smith, Mayor
City of Santee ................................................................. Hal Ryan, Vice Mayor
City of Solana Beach ......................................................... Joe Kellejian, Councilmember
City of Vista ................................................................. Morris Vance, Mayor
County of San Diego ........................................................ Greg Cox, Supervisor

Advisory Members
California Department of Transportation Pedro Orso-Delgado, District Director
Metropolitan Transit Development Board Leon Williams, Chairman
North San Diego County Transit Development Board Hon. Judy Ritter, Chair
U.S. Department of Defense Absent
San Diego Unified Port District Jess Van Deventer, Commissioner
San Diego County Water Authority Absent
Mexico Absent
INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY (IRIS)

Chairman Morrison pointed out that today’s Policy Development Board meeting discussion will focus on the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS), a subcomponent of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and will begin with public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Clive Richard, a San Diego resident, congratulated the Board on becoming the new consolidated planning agency and supported keeping the SANDAG name.

Donna Tisdale, President of Backcountry Against Dumps, commented on the last sentence of the Policy Development Board agenda, which states, “there are efforts underway to augment the region’s landfill capacity by opening a new site in East county in the community of Campo.” She noted that the site is located on the Campo Indian Reservation, and is a project that she has been fighting since 1989. She does not believe that the Campo landfill has completed all of the necessary requirements to become operational.

Chair Morrison commented that the staff report indicates that these are on-going issues and does not take a position for or against any of the projects mentioned.

OVERVIEW OF THE INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY (IRIS)

Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair of SANDAG’s Regional Planning Committee, stated that the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is progressing and discussion of the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS) is a key part of the process. In recognizing that the SANDAG Board is composed of 18 individual cities, there is a need for an integrated framework for the region. The IRIS and RCP are ongoing processes and as the region moves forward, enhancements and expansions to the work programs will be considered.

Staff provided the Board with a presentation of the four-step IRIS process summarized in the board report. First, staff will create an inventory of the existing infrastructure provision in the region. This information will be organized into documents similar to SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan (long-range planning document) and Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (short-term programming document) so comparisons can be made across infrastructure areas. The second step is to determine if there are any infrastructure deficiencies using level of service standards and estimates of future service demands. The third step will be to develop a set of solution options that address each infrastructure deficiency from the perspective of supporting the urban form called for in the RCP. The options will be incentive based and come from three main areas, reprogramming existing funds, public policy changes and, if necessary, raising new revenue. The final step will be to develop an integrated regional infrastructure strategy from the set of public policy and financing options, and a procedure to monitor the region’s progress and performance in meeting the quality of life goals and objectives identified in the RCP.
Staff noted that progress to date has been primarily in the first of the four steps. As the work progresses, one of the principles of the RCP is to plan for growth differently in the future than we have in the past. To do things differently, the RCP is proposing an incentive based process to channel growth into the incorporated cities and protect the rural unincorporated areas from sprawling development. In order to maintain or improve the region’s quality of life, we will have to make sure that the infrastructure expenditures necessary to accommodate that growth are available in advance of its occurrence.

Regional Integration

The Board asked about the relationship between the RCP and other agencies representing the ten infrastructure areas included in the IRIS. The Board asked how do we get those organizations to coordinate their investments regionally and support the vision proposed in the RCP? Furthermore, how involved should the board be in facilitating this interaction?

Staff responded that it is up to the board to decide if they want to move in the direction of creating an integrated framework for the region’s infrastructure plans and that staff will assist the Board however the Board sees fit. Staff suggests a two step process to facilitate collaboration with regional infrastructure providers on the IRIS and RCP: 1) make sure that all staffs of pertinent agencies are on the same page. This will entail a staff-to-staff discussion to work out major issues and ensure data consistency across agencies; and 2) Peer-to-Peer discussion by the SANDAG Board members and Board members from the infrastructure providers to discuss how to proceed. The Peer discussion will focus on how we can integrate regional capital improvement plans with the smart growth vision outlined in the RCP.

In addition to these efforts, staff will work to include the infrastructure providers in the outreach efforts planned for the RCP, including Workshops and Committee meetings where appropriate.

The Board supported this approach, emphasizing the need for regional integration, and requested to be kept abreast of IRIS progress. The Board agreed with Mayor Holt Pfeiler and restated that the RCP should not be looked at as a static plan, it should be looked at as an ongoing and continuing effort. The Board also emphasized the need to make sure that the infrastructure Boards/Agencies in the region understand and are familiar with the RCP, preferably supporting the Plan’s vision and core values. The Board stated that all jurisdictions’ general plans are at the table and SANDAG should be proactive with those agencies that have an influence on what the region is proposing as far as infrastructure development and regional planning are concerned.

Staff clarified that SANDAG does not want to take over the planning functions from the individual infrastructure agencies. The objective is to organize the information so that it is more useful, to see what the long-term strategies and incremental expenditures are. Staff’s role is to collect the data and put it in an informative format that can be used to help make decisions.

Staff suggested that we need to identify long-term goals for each issue and work toward them incrementally with the short term plans. Of the four infrastructure studied so far, only one has integrated their short-term expenditure plans into their long-term strategies. The Board agreed that short and long term plans should be integrated. Staff noted that each infrastructure area will be treated the same way and all viable information from long-term strategies will be considered as the IRIS moves forward.
Infrastructure Areas

The Board suggested including healthcare as an additional infrastructure area to be included in the plan. Staff agrees that a more inclusive look at the region’s infrastructure is useful for planning purposes, noting that what was presented to the Board were the 10 infrastructure areas that staff felt could be adequately addressed and incorporated into the first round of the RCP. Once the Board has adopted the first RCP and believes the process to be successful, additional infrastructure areas could be added to the list. To assist the Board, staff will develop and maintain a list of potential infrastructure areas that could be included in later versions of the RCP.

The Board also made a number of comments regarding the specifics of the infrastructure areas being studied. For example, the Board would like to emphasize the importance of recycling with respect to solid waste, to incorporate discussions on desalinization, trash to energy plants and other forms of renewable resources. The Board directed staff to describe the interaction of all the infrastructure areas and to mention trade-offs where appropriate. In addition, a discussion of previous efforts that have been tried and failed should also be included. Staff will incorporate these discussions into the final report.

Fiscal Reform

The Board asked if the issue of State/Local fiscal reform will also include lobbying efforts with Sacramento.

Staff responded yes, it will. SANDAG’s State/Local fiscal reform approach is a five-prong strategy that not only provides incentives for housing development but also takes a look at fiscal stabilization, exchanging relatively unstable funds, such as Vehicle License Fees with more stable fees such as property taxes and constitutionally protecting revenue streams. There has been discussion to moving towards a regional solution to fiscal reform as opposed to a state solution.

The Board suggested discussing State/Local fiscal reform with the region’s City Managers, using the SANDAG proposal as a starting point for discussion.

The Board also brought up the issue of a Regional Impact Fee. Perhaps the residents in the region should be polled to see if they’re willing to pay for infrastructure. If not, maybe a sliding scale could be developed for residents to pay on an as used basis.

The Board concluded that the RCP is needed because the region is going to grow. However, the region can affect the form of that growth through good planning and regional collaboration. There are choices to be made and the better the choices that the region makes, the more likely we will be to maintain and improve our existing quality of life. The question remains, as this effort is coordinated, how can the Board help with that coordination?

Staff will continue to work towards the direction provided by the Board, identifying opportunities for the Board to coordinate with regional infrastructure providers and stakeholders and incorporating them into the process.
Public Comment

Robert Hoffman, a resident of San Diego, commented that the region’s real transportation problem is that mass transit has no marketable features.

Clive Richard, a San Diego resident, stated that basic transportation service should be a social service, to be paid for by the public.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Chairman Morrison noted that the next SANDAG Board meeting will be held at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, February 28, 2003 and added that there will be no Policy Development Board meeting to be held in March 2003. In addition, he encouraged all members and colleagues to attend the upcoming subregional RCP workshops.

The Board asked if there is a time frame when SDG&E’s 20-year plan is to be completed.

Frank Urtasun stated that SDG&E is required to submit its 20-year Resource Plan by April 1, 2003.

Leon Williams pointed out that the MTDB Board voted to request that the SANDAG Board leave the question of changing the name of SANDAG open for discussion.

Mayor Madrid commented that those same MTD Board members mentioned at the SANDAG retreat that they wanted to keep the SANDAG name.

ADJOURNMENT – 12:08 p.m.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Secretary
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of February 14, 2003

Chairman Ron Morrison called to order the Executive Committee meeting. Committee members in attendance were Mickey Cafagna, Ramona Finnila, Hal Ryan, Dick Murphy, Greg Cox and alternates Steve Padilla, Lori Holt Pfeiler and Art Madrid.

Chairman Morrison announced that this is the first meeting of the Executive Committee with representatives from all the subregions and pointed out there are now 12 members and alternates on the Committee. He welcomed them all to the meeting.

CONSENT

1. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE: RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR FULL PAYMENT OF THE VEHICLE LICENSE FEE (VLF) TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT (APPROVE)

Approval of this resolution is consistent with SANDAG’s legislative program to oppose cuts in City/County revenues by the State of California for purposes of balancing or enhancing the state budget. To date, 15 local jurisdictions have adopted similar resolutions while three others have sent letters of support.

Action: The Executive Committee voted to approve Resolution 2003-23 urging the California legislature to reject a shift of local Vehicle License Fee (VLF) revenues and to honor the 1998 commitment to restore the VLF.

2. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS/COMMENTS

None.

REPORTS

3. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – HOUSING:

A. HOUSING ELEMENT DUE DATE EXTENSION (APPROVE)

State law requires that all cities and counties update the housing elements of their general plans every five years. Preparations for the next housing element update, which currently covers the 2004-2009 time period, started recently. SANDAG has been working with its
working groups on two key housing element-related tasks: (1) determination of the region’s share of the state’s housing needs and; (2) allocation of this need by jurisdiction and by income category (the regional share allocation). This represents the number of new housing units that jurisdictions must plan for in their housing elements. Currently, state law mandates that these tasks be completed by June 30, 2003, to assist jurisdictions in meeting the June 30, 2004, housing element due date. Meeting this deadline gives jurisdictions a year to incorporate the regional share numbers into their housing elements. If this deadline is not met, there are no penalties to SANDAG or to local jurisdictions; however jurisdictions will have less time to complete their housing elements.

The Regional Housing Task Force and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group have recommended that SANDAG pursue legislation to extend the housing element due date. This would allow the regional housing needs process to be integrated into the preparation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). A draft RCP will be completed by December 2003, with the final RCP scheduled for June 2004. Because legislation is required to extend the housing element due date, an extension is not guaranteed. Given this uncertainty, SANDAG could proceed with the regional housing needs process in one of two ways: (1) pursue legislation extending the housing element due date by six months, and proceed based on the assumption that extension of the due date will be granted, and complete the allocation process by December 31, 2003; and (2) do not pursue legislation to extend the housing element due date, and complete the allocation process by the original deadline of June 30, 2003.

Members of the Executive Committee expressed concern about housing element requirements regarding farmworker housing sites. Discussion also included recent legislation requiring jurisdictions to implement ministerial approval of second dwelling units, and the potential traffic and water impacts of this type of development. Staff pointed out that those types of issues will be addressed in the housing element of the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Action: The Executive Committee voted to direct staff to pursue legislation to extend the housing element due date from June 30, 2004 to December 31, 2004, and proceed with the regional housing needs determination and allocation based on the passage of the proposed legislation. The Executive Committee also directed staff to review the recently passed second dwelling unit legislation at the next Executive Committee meeting.

B. HOUSING ELEMENT SELF-CERTIFICATION PILOT PROGRAM: REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE AND LEGISLATURE PROPOSALS (APPROVE)

In 1995, legislation was passed and signed by the Governor to establish a pilot program that would allow jurisdictions in the San Diego region to self-certify the housing elements of their general plans if they met certain criteria. The self-certification law requires that SANDAG report to the Legislature on the use and results of the self-certification process following the completion of the revision of all housing elements in the region. The law states that, “the report shall contain data for the last planning period regarding the total number of additional affordable housing units provided by income category, the total number of additional newly constructed housing units, and any other information deemed useful by SANDAG in the evaluation of the program.” A draft report to the legislature was presented to the Committee.
Also, two changes are proposed to state law regarding the housing element self-certification program: (a) extension of the sunset date to allow jurisdictions to self-certify their 2009-14 housing elements (an option that does not exist under the current law), and (b) grant full eligibility for all state funds and programs to jurisdictions that self-certify their housing elements. This legislation is consistent with SANDAG’s 2003 Legislative Program and would allow a more thorough and complete evaluation of the self-certification program. It would also eliminate discrimination against self-certifying jurisdictions for state funding, which has acted as a disincentive to use the program.

Staff provided background to the Executive Committee on the establishment and details of the pilot program, emphasizing four key points from the report’s findings and conclusions. The key points are: (1) a large number of jurisdictions were able to meet the production goals and opted to pursue self-certification; (2) those jurisdictions met a significantly higher percentage of their needs than those that did not self-certify; (3) HCD, while originally supportive of the approach, decided that certification was not equivalent to their determinations of compliance; that action by HCD undermined the viability of the program because jurisdictions that pursued self-certification would be at a competitive disadvantage for funds that required HCD’s compliance as a condition for funding; and (4) self-certification provides a cost savings for both state and local governments, which is especially important with the looming budget crisis.

Executive Committee members requested that the “Total Housing Units Completed by Jurisdiction” table be updated to reflect data through the current year.

Action: The Executive Committee voted to approve the report to the Legislature on the use and results of the self-certification pilot program and direct SANDAG to pursue legislation to extend the sunset date for the pilot housing element self-certification program and to grant full eligibility for all state funds and programs to jurisdictions that self-certify their housing elements.

4. DRAFT FY 2004 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM (RECOMMEND DISTRIBUTION)

The Executive Committee was provided with full write-ups for each job proposed for inclusion in the FY 2004 Overall Work Program (OWP). The SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to authorize distribution of the full Draft FY 2004 OWP for federal, state, and local review at its February 28, 2003 meeting. Following Board authorization, the full Draft OWP will be prepared and distributed to federal and state funding agencies, and to local agencies for review and comment by the beginning of March. Comments will be due back to SANDAG by April 2, 2003. SANDAG staff will meet with the Intermodal Planning Group (IPG), representatives from our state and federal funding agencies, on April 8, 2003 to review their comments. The Executive Committee will review all comments and recommend appropriate revisions to be incorporated into the final OWP, which is scheduled for Board approval at the April meeting. The draft OWP will be used in the preparation of the Preliminary Program Budget, which will be presented to the Executive Committee and the Board at their March meetings. The Final FY 2004 OWP is scheduled for approval by the Board in April, with the Final Program Budget scheduled for adoption in May.

Staff noted that the Draft OWP includes 110 projects, which is up from 88 projects currently in the FY 2003 OWP. This reflects a 25% increase in proposed workload but does not necessarily mean that type of increase in budget. Twenty-three of the new projects added are part of the transit planning that will be consolidated into the agency effective July 1,
2003. Those projects will come with their own source of funding. Staff will be evaluating the affordability of the remaining projects in the coming weeks.

**Action:** The Executive Committee voted to recommend to the Board of Directors that the Draft FY 2004 Overall Work Program be accepted for distribution and comment.

5. REVIEW OF DRAT BOARD AGENDA FOR FEBRUARY 28, 2003 (APPROVE)

As part of the discussions on the February 28th Board agenda, the Executive Committee directed staff to dedicate a future Policy Development Board meeting to Border issues to discuss legislative strategies, national security, the SENTRI program and to hear the Border Alliance presentation. Committee members also requested that ARJIS make a presentation to the SANDAG Board of Directors at a future meeting to emphasize the importance of the system, which is a national model.

**Action:** The Executive Committee voted unanimously to approve the draft Board agenda for February 28, 2003 as presented.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Secretary
The regularly scheduled meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal). Other voting Committee members in attendance were Dick Murphy (City of San Diego), Mickey Cafagna (North County Inland), Art Madrid (East County), Jerry Rindone (South Bay), Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), Bob Emery (MTDB), Judy Ritter (NCTD), and Terry Johnson (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority). Also in attendance were Christy Guerin (Alternate - North County Coastal), Corky Smith (Alternate - North County Inland), Phil Monroe (Alternate – South Bay), Leon Williams (Alternate – MTDB), and ex-officio member Pedro Orso-Delgado (Caltrans).

CONSENT ITEMS (1-5)

1. PROPOSED COMMENTS ON THE AB 2766 VEHICLE REGISTRATION FUND DRAFT ALLOCATION PLAN (APPROVE)

Every two years, the Air Pollution Control Board (APCB) allocates vehicle registration fees collected under AB 2766 to fund projects and programs that reduce the air pollution caused by motor vehicles. The Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and APCB allows SANDAG the opportunity to review and comment on the draft vehicle registration fund allocation plan.

Action: The Transportation Committee supported the FY 2002-03 Vehicle Registration Funds Draft Allocation Plan prepared by APCB, subject to the concurrence of the SANDAG Board of Directors through approval of the Transportation Committee actions.

2. APPOINTMENT OF TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP – NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORTATION FACILITY STUDY (APPOINT)

The purpose of the North-South Transportation Facility Study is to evaluate the need for and feasibility of a new or enhanced north-south transportation facility either east or west of Interstate 15 and north of SR 52. The study is scheduled to begin in Spring 2003.

Action: The Transportation Committee appointed the technical working group recommended in the staff report to assist in the study with the addition of MTDB, NCTD, and the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority.
3. LOS ANGELES - SAN DIEGO - SAN LUIS OBIΣPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY (LOSSAN) BOARD ACTIONS (INFORMATION)

LOSSAN oversees intercity passenger rail service in the coastal rail corridor from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo and plans capital improvements that benefit intercity, commuter, and freight services. The Transportation Committee received the January 29, 2003 LOSSAN Board Actions as information.

4. 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE/MANAGED LANE STRATEGY (INFORMATION)

In January 2003, the Transportation Committee received a report summarizing the 2030 RTP High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/Managed Lanes strategy. The Committee requested additional information about the reasons people decide to use HOV lanes and switch from driving alone to carpooling.

Staff summarized information from the HOV Performance Program study recently completed by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA). Staff presented the results from the MTA telephone and license plate surveys, both of which produced results that are statistically significant. These results show that almost three-quarters of Los Angeles residents believe that the availability of HOV lanes is a strong incentive to get people to carpool. Ninety-five percent of existing transit riders stated that HOV lanes are important in their decision to use transit. Twenty-six percent of existing HOV users and two-thirds of existing transit riders indicated that they would stop carpooling or using transit if HOV lanes were not available.

Staff noted that the MTA study showed that the primary reason that people in Los Angeles carpool is to save time, followed by to save money, and companionship. There also is overwhelming support for HOV lanes, which are supported by 88 percent of all Los Angeles residents and 70 percent of solo drivers. The MTA study shows that HOV lanes also encourage people to shift from driving alone to carpooling. In Los Angeles County, 61 percent of HOV lane users previously drove alone (either in a general purpose freeway lane or on a parallel street or highway).

A Committee member asked whether HOV lanes were the best use of freeway capacity and whether freeways with HOV lanes carry more people than freeways without HOV lanes. Staff replied that the MTA study showed that on average, freeways with HOV lanes carry more people per vehicle than those without HOV lanes.

Another Committee member asked staff to explain what employer-offered incentives include. Staff replied that these incentives are intended to support alternatives to driving alone, and may include such incentives as free parking for carpoolers or cash subsidies to use transit, carpool, or vanpool. The Committee member stated that the private sector needs to support these types of incentives to help address the peak period traffic caused by employees commuting to and from work.
Robert Hoffman stated that he did not believe the MTA survey results. Instead of time savings, he believes that smoothness of flow is the primary reason people use HOV lanes.

Walt Brewer distributed a handout. He believes that his analysis of a Ventura County example shows that a freeway without HOV lanes can carry more people than a freeway with HOV lanes. He recommended abandoning HOV lanes and replacing them with HOV priority at freeway ramp meters.

Staff stated that the bottom line was that an HOV system encourages people to shift from driving alone to carpooling or using transit, which results in fewer vehicles on the road and more efficient use of the transportation system.

A Transportation Committee member suggested opening the existing I-15 HOV lanes to all vehicles for a one-week demonstration to determine whether traffic on the I-15 corridor would flow better. Another Committee member disagreed with Mr. Brewer’s recommendation regarding ramp metering. He stated that the freeways could be operated at free flow, but would result in extensive vehicles queues at the ramp meters onto city streets. This is a fundamental policy and operational decision that has not yet been made.

Another Committee member voiced support for the HOV system, because it is the framework in the 2030 RTP for moving people faster and more efficiently on public transit.

5. 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): DRAFT AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS (INFORMATION)

Federal law requires that SANDAG and the U.S. Department of Transportation make a determination that the 2030 RTP Revenue Constrained Plan conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality. The draft air quality conformity analysis for the 2030 RTP was issued for public review on February 12, 2003 and is posted on SANDAG’s Web site. The 30-day public comment period on the draft analysis ends on March 14, 2003. The SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to certify the 2030 RTP Final Environmental Impact Report, to make a finding of conformity of the 2030 Revenue Constrained Plan and the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Plan, and to adopt the Final 2030 RTP at its March 28, 2003 meeting.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public comments or communications.
REPORTS

7. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE: FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION REQUESTS (APPROVE)

Staff stated that the federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) reauthorization process has begun. The region’s congressional and senatorial delegation requested the San Diego region’s list of high priority projects for the new “TEA-3.” In cooperation with Caltrans, MTDB, and NCTD staff, a list of potential projects for federal discretionary funding has been developed and discussed with the delegation’s staff. Because TEA-3 is expected to cover FY 2004 to FY 2009, the focus is on projects included in the first 10 years of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Staff distributed a handout summarizing the key transportation project evaluation criteria contained in the Reauthorization Questionnaire developed by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Key project criteria categories include high regional priority, project benefits, and project readiness and deliverability.

Staff indicated that the projects that received the most support by delegation staff were the major corridor projects that cut across district boundaries. It also is important to note that the federal transportation discretionary funding requests are just one piece of the overall regional funding picture, which also includes other federal funds and future state and local transportation funding opportunities. The list of federal requests is staff’s initial proposal, which is subject to change based on Transportation Committee discussions.

Yehudi Gaffen, North Embarcadero Alliance, provided a presentation on a proposed intermodal center for the North Embarcadero redevelopment area. The North Embarcadero revitalization is a joint effort of the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC), the City of San Diego, the County of San Diego, the San Diego Unified Port District, and the U.S. Navy. Mr. Gaffen requested including the $60 million intermodal center in the region’s list of federal funding requests. He believes that there will be a separate category of TEA-3 funding for intermodal projects, and therefore, the proposed intermodal center would not compete directly with the region’s other high priority projects. He stated that if there is no separate category for intermodal funding, then the request would be withdrawn.

A Committee member asked if staff had evaluated the proposed intermodal center against the established project evaluation criteria. Staff replied that only a cursory evaluation had been conducted. The project meets some, but not all of the criteria, and does not compete well with the major transportation corridor projects proposed.

Supervisor Roberts, County of San Diego, stated that the County is a member of the North Embarcadero Alliance. While the County feels that the intermodal center is a good project, it is not its highest priority, and there is a concern that requesting funding for this project – even from a separate discretionary source – may lessen the chances of receiving funds for higher priority projects.

Mayor Murphy, City of San Diego, stated that the City also is a member of the Alliance, but is not advocating the inclusion of this project in the list of federal requests. The
Transportation Committee discussed whether redevelopment bonds could be issued to fund the project. It was noted that while technically possible, CCDC had already maximized its bonding capacity with other redevelopment projects, such as the downtown ballpark.

Hal Sadler, CCDC, provided a presentation on a proposed pedestrian bridge at 8th Avenue and Harbor Drive. CCDC and the City of San Diego are requesting that SANDAG include the $7 million project in the region’s list of federal transportation requests. Mr. Sadler stated that the project is part of the overall vision to link Balboa Park to San Diego Bay.

Patti Boekamp, City of San Diego, summarized the background and justification for the proposed request. While a new railroad grade crossing is not being proposed, because the Park to Bay link will involve the realignment of 8th Avenue and will affect the existing rail crossing, the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) has requested that the City grade separate pedestrian and rail traffic, at a minimum.

Mayor Murphy contended that the project is of regional significance, because it serves the region’s major central business district (CBD), including the expanded convention center and future downtown ballpark. He stated that the PUC had initially requested a more extensive vehicular and pedestrian overcrossing. He feels that the pedestrian bridge is a compromise that the PUC will accept, under the condition that the bridge be funded as soon as possible.

The Transportation Committee discussed other opportunities for funding the pedestrian bridge, such as the sale of naming rights or seeking demonstration funding from the carbon fiber industry. A Committee member asked if staff had evaluated the proposed pedestrian bridge against the established project evaluation criteria. Staff responded no, because specific information about the project had only been received today.

Staff suggested that the funding request could be included under the Regional Rail Grade Separation Program (Project R on Attachment 2). If the Committee did not want to commit the funding specifically to the 8th Avenue pedestrian bridge at this time, it could direct staff to develop criteria for rail grade separations and rank individual projects in the future.

Kathy Keehan, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, requested that regional bikeway projects be included in the list of federal transportation requests. She suggested additional funding for the San Diego River Bikeway, the Oceanside-Escondido Rail Trail, the Coastal Rail Trail, the Bayshore Bikeway, and a bikeway project at the San Ysidro border crossing.

Erik Bruvold, San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation (EDC), speaking on behalf of the Coalition for Sorrento Traffic Relief, stated that he supports the staff recommendation as presented. The Coalition particularly supports the I-5/Sorrento Valley and Genesee Interchanges (Project C), because it serves the biggest job center in the San Diego region. On behalf of the EDC, Mr. Bruvold also voiced his support for the 8th Avenue pedestrian bridge, because of its importance to the Centre City CBD.
Councilmember Guerin, City of Encinitas, raised concerns about the Coastal Rail Corridor Infrastructure Improvements (Project M). She was concerned that the TEA-21 reauthorization and FY 2004 appropriation requests would only fund half the costs of the Encinitas Pedestrian Crossings and Leucadia Boulevard Grade Separation Project Study Report (PSR), while the requested funding for the Encinitas Double Track would help fully fund the double tracking project. She asked why 100 percent funding for the Encinitas Pedestrian Crossings and Leucadia Boulevard Grade Separation PSR was not included.

Staff responded that the congressional staff suggested that Transit New Starts funding requests include only a portion of the total project costs. With the reauthorization, the New Starts program is expected to require a 50 percent non-federal match. The Encinitas Double Track project already has an identified non-federal match, and the $3 million request is the remaining unfunded portion of the project. Because the Encinitas Pedestrian Crossings and Leucadia Boulevard Grade Separation PSR do not have funds identified, the original federal funding request was for 50 percent of the total costs, consistent with anticipated New Starts funding rules. Staff reiterated that the list of federal requests is a draft proposal, which may be modified by the Transportation Committee.

The Committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of including additional project requests on the list. Staff reminded the Committee that, while the congressional delegation ultimately would decide which funding requests to put forward, it is important to recommend the highest priority projects for the region.

Mayor Murphy asked whether the North Coast I-5 project (Project D) included the I-5/SR 56 connectors. Staff responded yes, and that the clarification would be made both on the map and list of federal requests.

Judy Ritter, NCTD, requested adding two more projects to the list – (1) the Oceanside Maintenance and Security Improvements project ($2.4 million request in FY 2004) and (2) Oceanside-Escondido Rail Enhancements ($90 million reauthorization request). She stated that the first funding request would allow NCTD to expand its existing center in Oceanside to handle the security for the future Oceanside-Escondido Rail line. The second project would allow for future double tracking and grade separations on the Oceanside-Escondido Rail line, which will be needed to allow for future 15-minute headways.

MTDB staff recommended including on the list a $13.6 million request for the Joint Transportation Operations Center (JTOC), which is a project similar to NCTD’s Oceanside security center.

Vice Mayor Jerry Rindone, City of Chula Vista, voiced concern that there were no South Bay projects on the list. Staff replied that several of the projects, such as the I-805 Corridor (Project E) and the three border projects (Projects S, T, and U) directly benefited the South Bay area. In addition, grade separations for the Blue Line Trolley would be eligible for funding under the Regional Rail Grade Separation Program (Project R).

The Committee discussed other potential funding sources for regional bikeway projects, such as TransNet and other federal sources, such as Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality
Staff stated that regional bikeways do not compete favorably with the major corridor projects.

**Action:** Subject to the concurrence of the SANDAG Board of Directors through approval of the Transportation Committee actions, the Transportation Committee approved the list of federal transportation funding requests under the multi-year TEA-21 reauthorization process and the FY 2004 annual appropriations process, with the following changes:

- Added a $7 million FY 2004 appropriation request for the City of San Diego 8th Avenue pedestrian bridge under the Regional Rail Grade Separation Program (Project R).
- Doubled the TEA-21 reauthorization and FY 2004 appropriation requests for the Encinitas Pedestrian Crossings (from $600,000 to $1.2 million) and Leucadia Boulevard Grade Separation PSR (from $100,000 to $200,000) under the Coastal Rail Corridor Infrastructure Improvements (Project M).
- Added a $2.4 million FY 2004 appropriation request for NCTD’s Oceanside Maintenance and Security Improvements project.
- Added $13.6 million TEA-21 reauthorization and FY 2004 appropriation requests for MTDB’s JTOC project.

NCTD staff reiterated the request for including on the list the Oceanside-Escondido Rail Enhancements, which would fund future double tracking and grade separations. The Transportation Committee discussed the appropriateness of seeking funding to complete the original project as well as the future double tracking/grade separations. The Committee decided against including the Oceanside-Escondido Rail Enhancements on the list of federal requests.

The Committee discussed the need to address rail grade separations from a comprehensive, regional perspective, rather than on a case-by-case local perspective. The Committee felt it was important to develop a comprehensive regional policy to address rail grade separation requests. Staff suggested that the Committee first adopt project evaluation criteria, conduct a regional needs assessment, and then address funding requests for regional rail grade separations.

**Action:** The Transportation Committee directed staff to develop criteria for regional rail grade separations, including pedestrian grade separations, and return to the Committee with recommendations (the proposed FY 2004 Overall Work Program includes a project to develop criteria for regional grade separations).

8. TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION RELIEF PROGRAM: PRINCIPLES FOR ESTABLISHING PRIORITIES (APPROVE)

Staff stated that the region’s state delegation asked SANDAG to identify general principles for prioritizing Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) projects in case funding cuts need to be made as a result of the state’s budget crisis. No final actions have been taken by the Legislature in relation to the proposed transportation budget cuts, but in preparation for potential cuts to the TCRP, a set of principles for prioritizing projects is proposed. These principles are based on project deliverability, and include:
• Priority 1 – Projects already under construction should be completed (includes completing transit vehicle procurement processes already underway)
• Priority 2 – Projects ready-to-go within the next six months (by June 2003)
• Priority 3 – Projects ready-to-go in FY 2004 (by June 2004)
• Priority 4 – Projects not ready to go until after June 2004

**Action:** Subject to the concurrence of the SANDAG Board of Directors through approval of the Transportation Committee actions, the Transportation Committee approved the proposed principles for establishing TCRP project priorities to address potential funding reductions, as needed.

9. **STATION CAR DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (APPOINT)**

This agenda item was continued to the March 21, 2003 Transportation Committee meeting.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
BORDERS COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of February 21, 2002

On February 21, 2003 the Borders Committee met with elected officials from Riverside County as the I-15 Interregional Partnership Policy Committee, and separately as the Borders Committee, at Temecula City Hall in Temecula, California. The Discussion and Actions from both meetings are summarized below.

I-15 Interregional Partnership Policy Committee
Discussion and Actions

The February 21, 2003 meeting of the I-15 IRP Policy Committee was called to order at 12:30 p.m. Committee Members in attendance were Co-chairs Jeff Comerchero (City of Temecula) and Crystal Crawford (North County Coastal), Robert Schiffner (City of Lake Elsinore), Thomas Buckley (City of Lake Elsinore), Jill Greer (East County), Ed Gallo (North County Inland), and Patricia McCoy (South County). Alternates Phil Monroe (South County) and Judy Ritter (North County Inland) also attended the meeting.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

   Co-Chair Jeff Comerchero, Councilmember, City of Temecula, welcomed Policy Committee members and guests, and self-introductions were made.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

   Lynne Baker, Endangered Habitats League provided comments during the discussion of Agenda Item #6.

3. I-15 IRP POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

   The committee unanimously approved the summary for the October 18, 2002 meeting.

4. I-15 IRP EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT

   An earlier draft of the Existing Conditions Report was presented to the Policy Committee in October 2002, and has been revised based on comments from both the Technical Working Group and Policy Committee. The initial draft was based on a telephone survey of southwestern Riverside County residents as well as regional data for both Riverside and San Diego counties. This regional data include information from the 2000 United States Census.
The final draft has been expanded to include recently released census information and additional Riverside County transportation data. The Technical Working Group (TWG) has reviewed the final draft and recommended its approval on February 13, with minor corrections.

**Action:** The Policy Committee unanimously approved the I-15 Interregional Partnership Existing Conditions Report with the modifications recommended by the TWG and asked that the corridor maps in the report be extended south to include the Mexican border.

### 5. SHORT-RANGE TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIES

At its initial meeting, the I-15 Policy Committee asked staff to recommend short-range strategies to address the jobs-housing imbalance in the I-15 corridor that could be initiated quickly. The Policy Committee reviewed three strategies in October 2002. Subsequently the TWG identified five additional short-range strategies. All of these short-range strategies addressed transportation issues.

Two of the added strategies address transit. Strategy T4 would add new interregional transit service to supplement the existing, private-sector service that operates in the corridor. Both the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) and Friendship Transit (the existing private-sector operator) plan to add routes in May 2003.

Strategy T7 would coordinate interregional services with local transit services. In response to a question by co-chair Crawford, staff said that the primary obstacle to implementing this strategy is the size limitations of the existing transit centers and transfer locations.

Strategy T1 would better coordinate the bus-pool, van-pool and car-pool programs of the two regions. Both SANDAG and the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) subsidize vanpools. There are currently 900 interregional van-pool passengers. The two agencies use different sources of funding for these programs. SANDAG pays an on-going monthly subsidy; RCTC subsidizes van-pools for only one year.

RCTC operates a bus pool program, but doesn't currently provide service to San Diego County. SANDAG provides most of the carpool matching in the corridor because contact is primarily made at the work end of the trip. Both agencies believe that they can learn from each other's programs.

Committee members felt that there was a need for additional rideshare activity, linking Camp Pendleton with the growing military population in Riverside County. In addition, they felt that a joint funding strategy linking the two regions could be developed.

Strategy T2 would expand park-and-ride lots and improve the signage at these lots. Committee members supported the emphasis on shared (or leased) parking facilities. Caltrans is currently establishing priorities for small project funding such as this.

Strategy T3 would coordinate outreach and marketing for transit and ridesharing. Eric Haley, RCTC Executive Director noted that the two rideshare agencies currently use the same outreach consultant, simplifying coordination.
Strategies T10, T11 and T12 are employer-based programs such as employer subsidized transit passes, alternate work schedules, and teleworking. SANDAG will focus on these programs at a workshop this summer. Most of the Interregional employers in the corridor are located in San Diego. The Policy Committee discussion supported the TWG recommendation that these three strategies be combined and refined at this workshop.

At its meeting on February 13, 2003, the TWG recommended the approval of these strategies. It was noted that the programs identified in these strategies are already funded. The recommended strategies primarily call for interregional coordination of these programs, with expansion where funding permits.

**Action:** The Policy Committee unanimously approved the Short-Range Transportation Strategies.

6. **PROPOSED LONG RANGE STRATEGY EVALUATION CRITERIA**

In contrast to the Short-Range Strategies, the emphasis of the long-range program will be on new efforts to address the jobs-housing imbalance. The criteria proposed for evaluating and prioritizing the potential long-range strategies was presented. Policy Committee members discussed the need to closely coordinate the capital improvement programs of the two regions, noting the ongoing differences in the proposed improvements for I-15.

Lynne Baker, who represents the Endangered Habitats League on the TWG, stated her support of the proposed evaluation criteria. Ms. Baker said that there will be a need to significantly increase the quality of transit vehicles and service between the regions if transit is to attract a significant portion of the interregional commuters.

**Action:** By consensus, the Policy Committee approved the evaluation method and criteria presented, as recommended by the TWG.

7. **OVERVIEW OF THE SAN DIEGO REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PROJECT**

Rick Bishop, WRCOG Executive Director, presented the Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP). The RCIP is a three-part program, which will comprehensively address the impact of growth on these areas of concern: the County’s General Plan, transportation, and habitat conservation.

Eric Haley, RCTC Executive Director, presented the transportation issues, Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP), in greater detail. CETAP addresses transportation demand in four corridors. One of these corridors parallels I-15; a second corridor crosses I-15 from west to east near Lake Elsinore. Earlier this month, RCTC selected the widening of I-15 and I-215 as the preferred projects in the initial corridor.

Due to time limitations, SANDAG will present San Diego’s Regional Comprehensive Plan at the next Policy Committee meeting. The Regional Comprehensive Plan is a program similar to the RCIP.
8. I-15 IRP PROJECT SCHEDULE

The schedule for the I-15 IRP work program was reviewed. The Technical Working Group (TWG) will hold two workshops: an Economic Development Workshop in Temecula on March 13, 2003, and a Housing Workshop in Escondido on April 10, 2003. Staff and the TWG will recommend an overall program for achieving a jobs-housing balance at the next Policy Committee meeting.

9. NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

The next meeting of the I-15 IRP Policy Committee will be held on June 20, 2003 in Escondido.

Borders Committee Discussion and Actions

The regularly scheduled meeting of the San Diego Association of Governments Borders Committee was called to order by Chair Crystal Crawford (North County Coastal). Other members in attendance were Patricia McCoy (South County), Ed Gallo (North County Inland) and alternates Judy Ritter (North County Inland) and Phil Monroe (South County). Ex-Officio members in attendance were Gene Pound (Caltrans), and Tom Buckley (Riverside County).

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Self introductions were made at the beginning of the IRP meeting which preceded this meeting.

2. MEETING SUMMARY OF DECEMBER 3, 2002

The Borders Committee took no action on the meeting summary.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public comments or communications.

CONSENT

4. COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (INFORMATION)

The Borders Committee took no action on the Consent Agenda.
REPORTS

5. CHAIR AND MEMBERS REPORTS (INFORMATION)

There were no reports made.

6. BORDERS CHAPTER OF THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (Crystal Crawford) (DISCUSSION/APPROVE)

Crystal Crawford briefly presented the preliminary draft outline for the borders chapter of the RCP. Key elements of the structure and content of the draft included:

- All borders included in one chapter, with distinctions made between binational and interregional;
- Inclusion of relevant borders issues in other elements of the RCP; and
- Organization based upon issue areas as opposed to geographical areas.

The Committee agreed upon the organizational structure of the outline and made the following suggestions regarding the content:

- Include mention of the concept of equitable planning, i.e. that impacts upon other regions be accounted for in the planning process (regarding this point, Chair Crawford made note of the fact that this concept is encapsulated in one of the core values approved by this Committee: “Our region will pursue integrated planning in order to achieve equity and fairness.”
- Highlight importance of jobs/housing imbalance;
- Include baselines from which to measure growth in the future;
- Include a matrix or map depicting all issue areas, even though all issues will not be developed/discussed in the chapter; and
- Consider impacts that major infrastructure development outside of the county will have on congestion in San Diego County.

Chair Crawford asked the Committee to begin thinking about the subsequent sections of the outline including the Policies, Principles and Goals section as well as the Actions and Implementation section to be discussed at the next meeting.

The Committee requested that they receive a presentation regarding the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS) component of the RCP at its next meeting.

7. NEXT MEETING TOPICS, DATE, AND LOCATION (INFORMATION)

The next meeting of the Borders Committee will be held on Friday, March 21, 2003 at 12:30 in SANDAG’s 7th Floor Conference Room.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
INITIAL TRANSITION PLAN FOR CONSOLIDATION (SB 1703)

Recommendation

Based on direction from the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition, it is my recommendation that the Board of Directors approve the attached Transition Plan – Initial Transfer covering the consolidation of transit planning and programming functions of MTDB and NCTD into SANDAG.

Introduction

At the January 24, 2003 meeting the Board of Directors accepted for distribution the Draft Transition Plan – Initial Transfer. The report was approved by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition, which includes Board members from SANDAG, NCTD, and MTDB. The NCTD Board voted to support the initial transition plan at its February 20, 2003 meeting. The MTD Board reviewed the plan and did not have any further comments.

Prior to July 1, 2003, under the initial transfer, the consolidated agency will assume the planning and programming functions of the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) and the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD).

After July 1, the legislation calls for the consolidation of project development and construction functions and responsibilities of the transit agencies into the consolidated agency no later than January 30, 2004. In addition, the law allows transfer of other functions, with the exception of operations, based on agreement by the new consolidated agency and the transit boards.

Attached is the “Transition Plan – Initial Transfer,” covering the transfer of the planning and programming functions. This plan is due February 28, 2003, and the plan for transferring the project development and construction functions must be completed no later than September 30, 2003.

Discussion

To ensure a smooth transfer of responsibilities, a transition team of staff members from SANDAG, MTDB, and NCTD began meeting in September 2002 to develop transition plans for the initial and subsequent transfers. An Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition, with three Board members from each of the agencies — MTDB, NCTD, and SANDAG — also has been established to provide policy direction for the transition.

The Working Group recognized that each of the transit agencies are unique in their roles, responsibilities, and structures and, therefore, separate and unique implementation plans to implement the functions outlined in the transition plans will be developed for each agency. These implementation plans are being prepared.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment

Key Staff Contacts: Bob Parrott, (619) 595-5330, bpa@sandag.org; or Debra Greenfield, (619) 595-5366, dgr@sandag.org
TRANSITION PLAN – INITIAL TRANSFER

February 28, 2003

Prepared by SANDAG, MTDB, and NCTD
Staff Transition Team under the direction
of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition
TRANSITION PLAN – INITIAL TRANSFER

Introduction

On New Year’s Day 2003 the San Diego consolidated transportation agency is statutorily created taking over all the functions of the San Diego Association of Governments (SB 1703 (Peace)). All the area’s 18 cities and county government are at the table as voting members of the consolidated agency.

The governance structure consists of 20 locally elected representatives – two from the City of San Diego, and one each from the 17 other Cities and the County of San Diego. Voting is patterned after the Senate and House of Representatives at the federal level, with approval of an action requiring both a majority of the jurisdictions and a majority of the weighted votes based upon the number of people who reside in a jurisdiction.

Prior to July 1, 2003 under the initial transfer the consolidated agency will assume the planning and programming functions of the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) and the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD).

After July 1, the legislation calls for the consolidation of project development and construction functions and responsibilities of the transit agencies into the consolidated agency no later than January 30, 2004. In addition, the law allows transfer of other functions, with the exception of operations, based on agreement by the new consolidated agency and the transit boards.

Below are definitions as included in the Legislation for the transfer of the transit agencies functions:

- “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.

- “Project Development” shall mean 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 plan.

- “Construction” shall mean the final design, permitting and building of all transit projects including, but not limited to commuter and freight rail, light rail, general rail infrastructure, regional bus facilities, paratransit, and other regional transit projects. Construction shall exclude 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 as defined in 132353.2. The aforementioned construction contracts may be assigned to the consolidated agency with mutual agreement of the consolidated agency and the respective transit board. Construction projects shall exclude local and minor improvement projects as defined in the transition plan.
The bill also calls for and evaluation of the consolidated agency by the Legislative Analyst Office with recommendations to the Governor and Legislature by the end of 2004. Also, starting in 2005 and in every odd numbered year, the consolidated agency will submit a report on its progress.

To ensure a smooth transfer of responsibilities a transition team of staff members from SANDAG, MTDB, and NCTD began meeting in September 2002 to develop transition plans for the initial and subsequent transfers. An Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition, with three Board members from each of the agencies - MTDB, NCTD, and SANDAG - also has been established to provide policy direction for the transition.

This transition plan for the initial transfer, planning and programming, is due February 28, 2003 and the plan for transferring the project development and construction functions must be completed no later than September 30, 2003.

Initial Transfer

The initial transfer calls for the consolidation of planning and programming functions of MTDB and NCTD into the consolidated agency by July 1, 2003. Table 1 “Agency Transit Action Matrix – Initial Transfer” outlines the transferring functions covered under the initial transfer in terms of agencies’ responsibilities before and after the transitions.

Planning

Attachment 1, Transit Service Planning, specifies the planning responsibilities of the consolidated agency and the responsibilities of the transit agencies. Figure 1.1 is a flow chart documenting the process for transit planning and the delivery of services.

The identified responsibilities and process recognizes the close tie between short range transit planning by the consolidated agency and the preparation of service implementation plans by the transit agencies. Also recognized is the need for the consolidated agency to initially maintain the existing service concepts upon which the service is based and the existing levels of service (revenue hours/miles) for each transit board. The revenue hours/miles budgeted in FY 2003 would be considered as minimum levels of service for each Transit Board and would assume net service levels to be added upon completion of the Oceanside to Escondido and Mission Valley East rail projects. If future funding shortfalls occur, necessitating cutbacks in service, then there would be a regionwide process of examination of service levels, protecting a “lifeline” system of services.

As outlined in Attachment 1 planning responsibilities vary for regional service and local service. Flexibility in implementing the service, in terms of minor changes to the planned services, is provided to the transit operators.

Programming

The programming functions being transferred from the transit agencies to the consolidated agency include the acquisition, prioritization and allocation of funding of transit projects and services. Table 1, under “Programming: Prioritization and Allocation of Funding” documents the responsibilities for the various federal, state, and local funding sources under the existing conditions and after the transfers. Attachment 2, Transit Programming and Funding, specifies the specific
programming responsibilities of the consolidated agency and the transit agencies with the implementation of the initial transfer.

The consolidated agency will act as the claimant, applicant, and grantee for local, state and federal formula and discretionary funds for the functions that are transferred. All local, state, federal, and other funding available to carry out the responsibilities of the consolidated agency shall become the funding of the consolidated agency (SB 1703). MTDB and NCTD shall continue to receive funds needed for operating purposes in accordance with state and federal law and as allocated by the consolidated agency.

Allocation of funds by the consolidated agency would recognize existing contract obligations and other commitments of MTDB and NCTD, and would be allocated in a manner which will help to enable the transit boards to meet their obligations, responsibilities, and commitments. A key to the process being established is the development of agreements by the consolidated agency with funding agencies and with respective project lead agencies to ensure a timely revenue flow.

Figure 2.2 provides a flow chart summarizing the programming and funding responsibilities for annual operating funds. Flexibility is provided to allow the transit boards to act as the claimant and grantee for operating items.

Figure 2.3 provides a flow chart summarizing the programming and funding responsibilities for major capital projects. Important to this process will be the establishment by the consolidated agency in conjunction with the transit agencies of criteria for selecting capital projects and standards for maintenance.

Other related functions

Regional Fare Policy: 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.

Lobbying Efforts: An opportunity may exist for a more coordinated and effective advocacy efforts by giving the consolidated agency primary responsibility for directing joint efforts by the three agencies and through the consolidation of contracts for legislative advocacy services, both in Sacramento and Washington, DC.

Board and Policy Advisory Committees Responsibilities

Attachment 3 outlines the responsibilities for the Board of Directors and each of the four Policy Committees (Executive, Transportation, Regional Planning, Borders) of the consolidated agency. Selected responsibilities are delegated by the Board to the Policy Committees to allow the consolidated agency to effectively address key public policy and funding responsibilities. A number of new transit related responsibilities have been delegated to the Transportation Committee.
All items delegated to the Policy Committees are subject to Board action upon request of any member.

Next Steps

With form following function - staff, non staff resources, funding, and the organizational structure needed to take on the responsibilities of the initial transfer are being identified by the management teams of each agency. Recognizing that each of the transit agencies are unique in their roles, responsibilities, and structures there is a need for separate and unique implementation plans for each agency to implement the functions outlined in the transition plans. Jobs, current pay levels, and benefits of the staff members affected by the transfer of these responsibilities to the consolidated agency are protected under SB 1703.

Specific planning and programming projects and functions will be identified in the consolidated agency’s FY 2004 Overall Work Program and Budget. Work has also begun of the transition plan for the subsequent transfer - project development and construction.

The transition team and ad hoc working group also believe that it will be necessary to remain flexible as the plans are implemented.

Attachment 4 provides a glossary of terms and acronyms used in this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Process Actions</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>After Initial Transfer</th>
<th>After Subsequent Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local route planning, financial &amp; scheduling</td>
<td>Transit agencies</td>
<td>See Attachment 1 - Transit Service Planning</td>
<td>See Attachment 1 - Transit Service Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-range planning</td>
<td>Transit Agencies</td>
<td>See Attachment 1 - Transit Service Planning</td>
<td>See Attachment 1 - Transit Service Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-range planning</td>
<td>MTDB &amp; SANDAG</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project included in RTP</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Analysis (Planning)</td>
<td>Transit Agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Grant Functions (Related to Planning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project &amp; Grant Tracking</td>
<td>Transit Agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoicing to Funding Agency</td>
<td>Transit Agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to Funding Agency</td>
<td>Transit Agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Close-out</td>
<td>Transit Agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming: Prioritization and Allocation of Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Attachment 2 - Transit Programming and Funding</td>
<td>See Attachment 2 - Transit Programming and Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>Transit agency submits projects as part of RTIP to SANDAG</td>
<td>Responsible agency submits project as part of RTIP to Consolidated agency (pursuant to ordinance)</td>
<td>Responsible agency submits project as part of RTIP to Consolidated agency (pursuant to ordinance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>TDA claim approved MTDB/SANDAG</td>
<td>TDA claim approved Consolidated agency</td>
<td>TDA claim approved Consolidated agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>Same as TDA</td>
<td>Same as TDA</td>
<td>Same as TDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-Regional</td>
<td>Transit agency submits candidate projects to SANDAG</td>
<td>Consolidated agency develops project list with input from transit agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency develops project list with input from transit agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-Inter-regional</td>
<td>Transit agency submits app to Caltrans</td>
<td>Consolidated agency consults with transit agency and submits requests to Caltrans</td>
<td>Consolidated agency consults with transit agency and submits requests to Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Process Actions</td>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>After Initial Transfer</td>
<td>After Subsequent Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5307</td>
<td>Agency submits RTIP to SANDAG</td>
<td>Consolidated agency develops with input from transit agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency develops with input from transit agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td>Application to Caltrans by non profit</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5311</td>
<td>Agency App. to Caltrans</td>
<td>Consolidated agency applies to Caltrans with input from transit agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency applies to Caltrans with input from transit agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA/FHWA CMAQ</td>
<td>Project submitted to SANDAG</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA/FHWA STP</td>
<td>Project submitted to SANDAG</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5309 Rail Mod</td>
<td>Agency submits RTIP to SANDAG</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5309 Bus</td>
<td>Transit Agency inc. RTIP</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5309 New Start</td>
<td>Transit Agency Obtains funds</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCD (AB2766)</td>
<td>App submitted to APCD</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JARC, SP&amp;R, State Rural, TCRP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Policy</td>
<td>Transit agency</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input. See Attachment 1, #8 - Transit Service Planning</td>
<td>Consolidated agency with transit agency input. See Attachment 1, #8 - Transit Service Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Develop. Cycle Begins</td>
<td>SANDAG and NCTD - Jan. MTDB - Nov.</td>
<td>Joint Development of work program and budget until transition complete</td>
<td>Joint Development of work program and budget until transition complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Program Cycle</td>
<td>MTDB - Sept. for 2004 NCTD - Dec. for 2005</td>
<td>TBD by Consolidated agency</td>
<td>TBD by Consolidated agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying Efforts</td>
<td>All 3 agencies</td>
<td>Consolidated agency directs joint efforts</td>
<td>Consolidated agency directs joint efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING

Consolidated Agency Responsibilities - carried out in consultation with the transit agencies

1. Preparation of long-range transit plans as part of the Regional Transportation Plan.
2. Preparation of a five year Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) that defines both changes to regional and local service and new services, including new services for areas being developed, each year over the five year period covered in the plan. The consolidated agency would initially maintain the existing service concepts upon which the service is based in order to preserve and improve mobility. FY 2003 budgeted revenue hours/miles would be considered as minimum levels of service for each Transit Board and would assume net service levels to be added upon completion of the Oceanside to Escondido and Mission Valley East rail projects. If future funding shortfalls occur, necessitating cutbacks in service, then there would be a regionwide process of examination of service levels, protecting a “lifeline” system of services.
3. Annual route evaluations which will be incorporated into the annual updates of the short range transit plan and planned service changes. (Evaluations should vary by type of service and type of service area.)
4. Define regional transit service* in terms of the type of service, the route configuration, frequency of service, service hours, required major stops, and required timed-transfers with other services. (These regional services may cross transit operator boundaries.)
5. Identify parameters for local route transit services**, including geographic area, frequency of service, service hours, required connections to regional transit service defined in #4 above, and service unit (revenue hours, miles, or operating budget). Through an agreement with the consolidated agency the transit operators would define the actual route configuration within the defined parameters, see below Transit Operator Responsibilities.
6. Provide technical assistance to transit operators for local route planning.
7. Develop a public input process & hold required public hearings for service changes. The consolidated agency should ensure that the public input process for public hearings on service changes would be conducted in a manner to facilitate public input from the affected area.
8. Develops the Regional Fare Policy which incorporates 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, adopt the Comprehensive Fare Ordinance setting forth all fares for all operators, including their special fares.
9. Adoption of transit operator Service Implementation Plan to fund defined services.

* Regional transit service is defined as Corridor and Regional Service in the 2030 RTP, along with inter-community service, with lower speed, frequent stops
** Local route transit service is defined intra-community service, with lower speed, frequent stops and community based shuttles, with lower speed, frequent stops

“Community” refers to residential, commercial, services, and/or employment areas that are closely linked and not defined strictly by municipal boundaries.
Transit Agencies Responsibilities – carried out consultation with the consolidated agency

A. Development of a Service Implementation Plan for regional and local transit services including defining route stops, and development of schedules/ runcutting, operating budget, and capital improvement needs. Through an agreement with the consolidated agency local route planning also would include defining the route configuration within the defined community area. Minor changes to a transit operator’s defined service (less than 25% of revenue miles/hours of a route within the operator’s existing approved budget) will be at the discretion of the transit operator.

B. Development of a Service Implementation Plan for special event transit service and service contingencies.

C. Submit Service Implementation Plans to the consolidated agency for adoption.

D. Service implementation including operations, contract services, service management, temporary changes and detours of service, service monitoring and reporting, and labor contract administration.

E. Provide input on long and short range transit plans, and route evaluations.
Set parameters, including route configuration, for changes to existing **Regional Services** and proposed new **Regional Services** allowing for minor changes by the operator. Set parameters for local services.

Proposed changes to existing Local Services and proposed new **Local Services**

**SRTP Developed;** includes new services and proposed changes to existing service

- Budget/Funding Process
- Public Hearings on fares and service
- Adopt

**Service Implementation Plans Developed**

**Operating Budgets** prepared to reflect funded services

**Annual performance monitoring process conducted** (Evaluation varies by type of service and type of service area.)

**Service Monitoring and Reporting**

*Blue Boxes = Consolidated Agency function*

*Red Dashed Boxes = Transit Agencies function*
CONSOLIDATED AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES – Carried out with input from the transit agencies

1. Act as the claimant, applicant, and grantee for local, state and federal formula and discretionary funds once the transfer and consolidation takes place pursuant to a transition plan. All local, state, federal, and other funding available to carry out the responsibilities of the consolidated agency shall be deemed to be funding of the consolidated agency (SB 1703). MTDB and NCTD shall continue to receive operating funds in accordance with state and federal law and as allocated by the consolidated agency. Allocation of funds by the consolidated agency would recognize existing contract obligations and other commitments and responsibilities of MTDB and NCTD.

2. Adopt a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) on a biennial basis, with amendments as required. RTIP to include all required federal, state, and local funding sources.

3. Develop and recommend a list of projects for funding under the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – Regional Share for submittal to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Coordinate with and provide input to Caltrans on projects to be included in the STIP – Interregional share.

4. Develop the annual Program of Projects for the FTA Section 5307 program, including preventive maintenance and any other funds used for operating purposes, as well as projects to be funded with Section 5309 rail modernization formula funds for inclusion in RTIP. Upon RTIP approval, submit FTA grants for the region and develop agreements with respective project lead agencies as needed to ensure timely revenue flow. As an option, transit operators may submit a separate grant for operating purposes. In accordance with SB 1703, except for funds which are transferred to the consolidated agency, MTDB and NCTD shall continue to receive FTA Section 5307 funds pursuant to federal statute. These funds should be allocated in a manner which will help to enable the transit boards to meet their obligations and responsibilities recognizing the methodology and historic funding levels that have previously guided these funding decisions. The consolidated agency shall conduct periodic reviews of the allocation and methodology for all formula based funding.

5. Incorporate TransNet funded projects in the RTIP consistent with the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan and retain/pass-through TransNet funds to the appropriate lead agencies.

6. For STP, CMAQ, TEA, and other federal, state and local funding programs, develop recommended project lists for inclusion in RTIP consistent with the requirements of the respective funding program and established project evaluation criteria, prepare applications and/or grants as needed, and develop agreements with lead agencies as needed to ensure timely revenue flow.

7. For TDA, STA and other annual operating funds, develop fund estimates based on formulae established in state law, approve claims prepared by the operators consistent with the Service Implementation Plans, and develop payment schedules to ensure timely payment to the operators. As described in the transit service planning memo (Attachment 1), the Service Implementation Plans are intended to provide the details on the services to be operated, the annual operating budgets, and related short-term capital improvement needs. Based on SB 1703, MTDB and NCTD will continue to receive TDA (Articles 4 and 4.5) and STA funds in accordance with state law. The 10% of the TDA funds taken off the top of the MTDB area
apportionment shall be shared between MTDB and the consolidated agency in accordance with the division of responsibilities as determined by the consolidated agency in consultation with MTDB.

8. Work with state and federal funding agencies to revise master agreements, grant contracts, etc., to make the cash flow process as efficient as possible. The basic approach should be to centralize the grant application process through the consolidated agency with funds to provide to the operators for projects or project categories for which they are to serve as the lead or responsible agency, and to ensure timely revenue flow.

9. Establish or revise financial tracking and auditing procedures as needed. Emphasis should be placed on examining the budget and budget process in an effort to obtain efficiencies.

10. Refine and enhance the current transit performance monitoring process to ensure that transit service is being provided as efficiently and effectively as possible. Establish criteria for selecting capital projects and establish standards for maintenance in consultation with the transit operators.

Transit Agencies Responsibilities

1. Develop annual operating budgets and related documentation for the annual claims process for TDA, STA and other operating funds consistent with the Service Implementation Plans and annual fund estimates.

2. Provide input for the development of programs and projects including capital and operations to be funded through the various capital funding programs (STIP, STP, CMAQ, FTA Section 5307 and 5309) including project descriptions, costs, and schedules for those projects for which the operator will serve as the lead agency for implementation.

3. Prepare Federal grants applications for operating purposes if the option of consolidating grants under the consolidated agency is not followed.

4. For funds received through various local, state and federal funding programs, maintain adequate financial reporting and accounting systems to meet project tracking and monitoring requirements.

5. Participate in the development of the enhanced performance monitoring system, criteria for the selection of capital projects, and the establishment of standards for maintenance, and provide transit performance data as needed.

6. Provide input on potential projects to be considered for state and federal discretionary funding processes and coordinate with the consolidated agency on efforts to obtain such funding.
SRTP Identifies Short-Term Service Needs and Fund Estimates/Apportionment Schedules Provided.

Service Implementation Plan Identifies Operating Budget.

TDA/STA and other Claims Prepared based on Operating Budget.

TDA/STA & Other Operating Claims Approved & Funds Prioritized and Programmed in RTIP if required (5307/5309 Rail mod./CMAQ/STP/TransNet Fund).

Consolidated Agency is Claimant/Grantee. Makes Payment to Operators Consistent with Grant/Claim. Reports quarterly to FTA & Closes out Grant. Annual Fiscal Audits/Claim Adjustments.

Transit Board is Claimant/Grantee for operating items. Makes Expenditures under their Grant / (Claim) and draws down funds from FTA/ (Consolidated Agency). Reports quarterly to FTA & Closes out Grant. Annual Fiscal Audits/Claim Adjustments.

Optional Track.

Ongoing Performance Monitoring/Triennial Performance Audits.
Figure 2.3
Transit Programming and Funding Flow Chart
For Major Capital Projects

SRTP/RTP
Identifies Project Needs/Priorities

Regional Prioritization Process by Major Fund Source/Type

Selected Projects Programmed in RTIP

Grant/Application Submitted to Funding Agency

Funds Received by Lead Implementing Agency

Funds Expended/Financial Reporting/Project Close Out

Project Tracking/Use-it-or-Lose-It Compliance (If Appropriate)

Capital Project Input Provided by Operators through SRTP/CIP and Service Implementation Plan Process

Annual Audits/Financial Reports

Blue Boxes = Consolidated Agency Function
Red Dashed Boxes = Transit Agency Function
OPERATIONS POLICY FOR NEW AGENCY

Board and Policy Advisory Committees Responsibilities

Shown below are responsibilities for the Board of Directors and each of the four Policy Advisory Committees (Executive, Transportation, Regional Planning, Borders) of the new Agency. Selected responsibilities are delegated by the Board to the Policy Committees 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.

Executive Committee Membership and Responsibilities

The Executive Committee shall consist of six voting members with board members representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South County, and the representative, or the representative’s alternate in their absence, from the City of San Diego and the County. The Chairperson of the consolidated agency shall be one of the six voting members. The Vice Chairperson of the consolidated agency shall be one of the six voting members if the Vice Chairperson represents an area of the region that is different from the area of the region represented by the Chairperson.

- Set agenda for Board
- Review and recommend annual work program and program budget
- Approve amendments to the Budget and Overall Work Program and authorize contracts up to amount approved by the Board
• Review and act on state and federal legislation
• Comment on project EIR/EIS
• Act upon and evaluate dispute resolution
• Advise on personnel actions
• Act on behalf of Board when timing requires
• Make policy recommendations to the Board
• Perform other duties as assigned by the Board

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 policy¹
• 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

Regional Planning Committee Membership and Responsibilities

The Regional Planning Committee shall consist of six 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, and a supervisor from the County of San Diego.

• Provide oversight for preparation and implementation of Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and its components
• Recommend regional infrastructure financing strategies to the Board

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.
• Represent the Board for outreach and public information on the Regional Comprehensive Plan and its components
• Advise Board on regional planning policy issues

Borders Committee Membership and Responsibilities

The Borders Committee shall consist of seven 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, and a mayor, council member, or supervisor from the County of Imperial.

• Provide oversight for planning activities that impact the borders
• Provide oversight for the preparation of bi-national and interregional planning programs
• Recommend border infrastructure financing strategies to the Board
• Establish closer SANDAG working relations with surrounding counties and Mexico
• Advise Board on bi-national and interregional policy-level issues
# Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>APCD</td>
<td>(San Diego) Air Pollution Control District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>EIR/EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>JARC</td>
<td>Job Assistance Reverse Commute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>MHCP</td>
<td>Multiple Habitat Conservation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>NCTD/NSDCTDB</td>
<td>North County Transit District/ North San Diego County Transit Development Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>RCP</td>
<td>Regional Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTIP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Improvement Program (SANDAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan (SANDAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP&amp;R</td>
<td>State Planning and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRTP</td>
<td>Short Range Transit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>State Transit Assistance (act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program (CTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STIP-IIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Interregional Program (CTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STIP-RIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Regional Improvement Program (SANDAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>Transportation Enhancement Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA-21</td>
<td>Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion Relief Program (Governor's initiative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>San Diego Region 1/2% Local Transportation Sales Tax Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
PROJECT 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.

City of Coronado—Transportation Modeling

The City of Coronado is currently working on a Major Investment Study (MIS) for the SR-75 / SR-282 corridor. This work is being performed to address congestion on Coronado’s major streets leading to NAS North Island, a major commuter destination. SANDAG will conduct traffic modeling work to assist the City in analyzing alternative roadway strategies, such as different tunnel configurations and grade separations of 3rd Street, 4th Street, and Orange Avenue. The estimated cost of this project is $4,300. With the LTA deduction of $1,000, the cost to the City of Coronado will be $3,300.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Mike Calandra,
(619) 595-5629; e-mail mca@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #1.02 and Reimbursement by the Requesting Agency
FY 2004 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) 
APPORTIONMENT SCHEDULE 
AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

**Recommendation**

It is my recommendation that the Board of Directors approve Resolution 2003-25 adopting the FY 2004 Apportionment Schedule and issue the TDA Claim Guidelines for use in administering the program.

**Introduction**

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides funding support for the region’s public transit operators and for nonmotorized transportation projects. The revenue comes from ¼ percent of the total 7¾ percent sales tax assessed in the region. It is a major source of revenue for public transit, second only to passenger fares.

SANDAG is responsible for the apportionment of TDA funds each year in conformance with legislative priorities, as described below. The County Auditor has estimated that $106,236,000 of TDA funds will be available for next year. The apportionments for FY 2004 determine the amount of funds available to each agency for next year’s TDA claims. SANDAG is required to notify prospective claimants of the apportionments by March 1, necessitating Board action this month.

SANDAG also prepares the Transportation Development Act Claim Guidelines to assist prospective claimants of TDA funds in meeting the various filing, reporting, and compliance requirements of the Transportation Development Act. The guidelines include all of the SANDAG policies and procedures concerning TDA administration. With the passage of SB 1703, SANDAG has been working with MTDB and NCTD on the transition plan to consolidate the agencies’ planning and programming functions. Because the FY 2004 claim process will be completed prior to the implementation of the transition process, it is recommended that the TDA Claim Guidelines remain the same as for FY 2003 and be updated for the FY 2005 claim process after all transition issues have been resolved.

**Discussion**

FY 2004 Apportionment Schedule

Pursuant to Section 6620 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), the County Auditor has furnished SANDAG with the following estimate of TDA monies to be available for apportionment during FY 2004 as compared to the previous estimate for FY 2003:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2004</th>
<th>FY 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year’s Unapportioned Balance</td>
<td>$5,102,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Receipts</td>
<td>100,134,000</td>
<td>99,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Interest Earnings</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>$106,236,000</td>
<td>$109,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In its January 2002 letter, the County Auditor made available $4.7 million in unapportioned balance. Then in September 2002, the County Auditor added $4.3 million bringing the total prior year unapportioned balance made available for FY 2003 to $9 million.

Although the actual sales tax receipts to date indicate an annual growth rate of three to four percent, the County Auditor is taking a much more conservative approach, estimating only marginal growth for next year. The County Auditor did indicate a willingness to revisit the estimate later this year if actual monthly receipts reflect a higher growth rate.
The legislative priorities established by state law include certain categories for which TDA funds are taken “off the top.” For FY 2004, these include the apportionment and allocation to SANDAG, MTDB, and the County Auditor for various planning, programming, and administrative related expenses, funding of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and for support of community transit services. Based on SB 1703 the planning fund allocation to SANDAG was increased from 2 percent to 3 percent. The remaining apportionment along with prior year carryover funds are divided between MTDB, NCTD, and the non-transit board area (areas of County of San Diego not in either transit district) on the basis of population. Prior year carryover funds are those apportionments that have not yet been claimed by the operators.

In developing the apportionment schedule, it is necessary to subdivide the County population into three areas: (1) the Metropolitan Transit Development Board area; (2) the North San Diego County Transit Development Board area; and (3) the Non-Transit Board area. The population distribution is based on the January 1, 2002 Department of Finance (DOF) population figures for San Diego County. See Attachment 1 for a breakdown of the apportionments by the population estimates.

Transportation Development Act Claim Guidelines
The TDA Claim Guidelines document the Board’s policies related to the TDA. They also assist the region’s transit operators and local agencies in submitting claims and meeting all the requirements of the TDA. Typically, the guidelines are updated when required by changes in policy or state law. This past year, there was one significant change in TDA related legislation, SB 1703. There are number of overlapping provisions in the current TDA law pertaining to SANDAG and MTDB responsibilities. Until the transition is fully completed, staff is recommending that the TDA Claim Guidelines updated as of February 2002 remain in effect.

With the Board's approval of this item, staff will distribute the fund estimate, along with all the necessary claim materials, in time to meet the March 1, 2003 deadline. Claims for these funds will be due back to SANDAG by April 1, 2003 with Board action on the claims scheduled for the June 27, 2003 meeting.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment
Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim,
(619) 595-5350; ski@sandag.org

No Budget Impact
WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act of 1971, as amended, has provided certain sales tax revenues for deposit in the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) to support the development and operation of public transportation systems and other transportation purposes as outlined in Section 99233 of the Public Utilities Code; and

WHEREAS, the San Diego Association of Governments has been designated by the Secretary of the California Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the San Diego region; and

WHEREAS, in conformance with Chapter 3, Title 21, Section 6620 of the California Code of Regulations, the San Diego County Auditor has estimated that $106,236,000 will be available to the San Diego region for apportionment during FY 2004; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has apportioned $106,236,000 in conformance with the priorities set forth in PUC 99233; and

WHEREAS, in conformance with Public Utilities Code Section 99241, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim Guidelines were prepared for Fiscal Year 2003 to assist prospective TDA claimants in the preparation and administration of their TDA claims. Pursuant to the passage of SB 1703, the implementation of the transition consolidating Metropolitan Transit Development Board and North County Transit District with SANDAG is still ongoing. Therefore, Claim Guidelines from Fiscal Year 2003 will be used for the FY 2004 claims process; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the SANDAG Board of Directors as follows:

1. That the Board does hereby approve the attached TDA Fund Apportionment Schedule (Attachment 1) for FY 2004, including the apportionment and allocation of $495,000 to SANDAG for administrative expenses; $38,000 to the San Diego County Auditor for administrative expenses; $2,114,060 for funding of bicycle and pedestrian facilities; $3,030,222 to SANDAG for transportation planning; $6,969,040 to both SANDAG and Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) for planning and administration of construction and acquisition programs in the MTDB service area; $4,679,484 for support of community transit services; and the remainder ($88,910,194) for apportionment to the MTDB, Non-Transit Board Area, and the North San Diego County Transit Development Board on the basis of population.


3. That the Board does hereby authorize the Executive Director to transmit the FY 2004 Apportionment Schedule and TDA Claim Guidelines to prospective TDA claimants and other interested agencies.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 28th day of February, 2003.
## FY 2004 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) 
### APPORTIONMENT SCHEDULE FOR THE SAN DIEGO REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOF Population Estimates</th>
<th>% of Total Regional Population</th>
<th>FY 2004 Apportionment</th>
<th>Prior Year Carryover</th>
<th>Total Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit Development Board</td>
<td>2,024,002</td>
<td>69.36%</td>
<td>$59,585,294</td>
<td>$421,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North San Diego County Transit Development Board</td>
<td>821,526</td>
<td>28.15%</td>
<td>$26,872,431</td>
<td>$14,081,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Transit Board Area</td>
<td>72,726</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>$2,452,469</td>
<td>$1,507,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,918,254</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$88,910,194</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,010,480</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99233.1 County Auditor Administrative Expenses 38,000
99233.1 SANDAG Administrative Expenses 495,000
99233.3 2% Pedestrian/Bicycle Funds 2,114,060
99233.5(a) SANDAG 3% Planning Funds 3,030,222
99233.5(b) SANDAG/MTDB 10% Funds 6,969,040
99233.7 5% Community Transit Services 4,679,484

**$106,236,000**

---

1. Population estimates (prepared by SANDAG) are consistent with the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates as of January 2002.
2. Based on SB 1703 SANDAG Planning Funds were increased from 2% to 3% and the MTDB 10% Funds would be allocated to SANDAG and MTDB based on the transferring of functions.
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 $14.4 million in January 2003, bringing the fiscal year total to $115.3 million. Revenue for the fiscal year is 5% higher than it was last fiscal year at this time. A decrease in the construction cost index further enhances this revenue increase. The California Highway Construction Price Index is currently 8% lower than last year at this time. Revenue available for allocation since the inception of the TransNet Program totals $2.095 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.

Progress on the I-5/I-805 “Merge” (project #2) continues. Earthwork along both sides of the freeway in preparation of the widening is underway. Construction of various bridge columns, abutments and retaining walls continues. A web camera system, which allows viewing of traffic conditions in the vicinity of the construction area, is available at www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/dist11tmc/sdmap/camer as/merge.html. Links to other relevant information including lane closure and current freeway speeds are also available at this Website. The widening is scheduled to open to traffic in June 2005 for the northbound lanes and in January 2007 for the southbound lanes.

On February 15, a ground-breaking ceremony was held for the SR 905/Siempre Viva Interchange (project #42). This Caltrans project is the first stage of the SR 905 corridor and will be open to traffic by the end of 2004. The overall SR 905 project is scheduled for completion in 2007.

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.

A ribbon-cutting ceremony is scheduled on February 21, for the opening of the Sorrento Valley Station Parking Lot Expansion (project #55). This MTDB project built 120 new parking spots, which will now allow users to park at this station. In addition, this project will allow shuttle buses easier access to the station.

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.

The Chula Vista City Council is scheduled to award the construction contract for Palomar Street Widening project on February 18th (project #73). This project will widen Palomar Street to a six-lane facility from Interstate 5 to Industrial Boulevard. Opening to traffic is scheduled for March 2004.

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 awarded a construction contract to install Changeable Message Signs (CMS) (Project #115). This project will install three CMS’s on I-8 and one on SR 94. Installation is scheduled for January 2004.

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 41% percent in the last year, from 175 vanpools to 247 vanpools. Vanpools from outside San Diego County represent 44% of all vanpools, and have nearly doubled over the past year from 55 to 109 vanpools. Each vanpool eliminates an estimated 18 home-work trips.

Vanpool Employer Programs: During the past month, SANDAG contacted 25 employers. Of those contacts, two resulted in formal presentations to the employer. Two companies began internally marketing or promoting commuter services to their employees. One employer survey was conducted; three employers have indicated interest in having surveys done in the future. Five have expressed interest in commuter programs, but will require more follow up before a commitment to survey can be obtained.

Vanpool Marketing/Outreach: During the past month, SANDAG developed web content and collateral to support the consolidated Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program. New RideLink web pages and collateral were developed to announce the availability of 36 eLockers (on-demand bicycle lockers) located at three Coaster stations. Work continued on the planning for three upcoming employer outreach events.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs reduced an estimated 15,000 pounds of smog forming pollution last month, bringing the fiscal year total to 93,000 pounds reduced, an increase of 28% over last year at this time. Since July 1, 2002, the Freeway Service Patrol has assisted over 33,000 motorists, an increase of 14% 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program &amp; Recipient</th>
<th>TransNet Allocations This Month</th>
<th>TransNet Allocations FY To Date</th>
<th>TransNet Allocations Program To Date</th>
<th>Fund Disbursements This Month</th>
<th>Fund Disbursements FY To Date</th>
<th>Fund Disbursements Program To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BICYCLE ELEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Agencies</td>
<td>$83,333</td>
<td>$583,333</td>
<td>$16,678,596</td>
<td>$615,408</td>
<td>$11,761,144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALKABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Agencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,025,887</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGHWAY ELEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programwide</td>
<td>4,787,450</td>
<td>38,222,281</td>
<td>702,915,247</td>
<td>$8,662,590</td>
<td>734,854,306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT ELEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly/Disabled (Various Agencies)</td>
<td>47,875</td>
<td>382,223</td>
<td>6,599,278</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>347,300</td>
<td>6,694,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>3,408,539</td>
<td>27,213,260</td>
<td>495,891,872</td>
<td>901,000</td>
<td>11,514,000</td>
<td>484,737,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDCTDB</td>
<td>1,331,037</td>
<td>10,626,798</td>
<td>190,582,026</td>
<td>327,416</td>
<td>5,841,915</td>
<td>168,931,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL STREET &amp; ROAD ELEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>152,795</td>
<td>1,218,248</td>
<td>21,962,297</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,829,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>296,095</td>
<td>2,364,707</td>
<td>35,360,540</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,630,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>41,126</td>
<td>324,856</td>
<td>6,231,629</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,350,616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>140,047</td>
<td>1,082,121</td>
<td>21,308,791</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>68,190</td>
<td>2,162,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>147,741</td>
<td>1,177,817</td>
<td>21,308,791</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>994,000</td>
<td>23,282,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>103,927</td>
<td>827,288</td>
<td>16,843,738</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,956,026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>212,203</td>
<td>1,693,540</td>
<td>29,029,539</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,226,091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>42,895</td>
<td>339,012</td>
<td>6,472,535</td>
<td>39,921</td>
<td>331,186</td>
<td>6,346,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>95,640</td>
<td>760,989</td>
<td>14,930,437</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,339,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>45,225</td>
<td>357,648</td>
<td>6,989,832</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,629,084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>88,215</td>
<td>701,586</td>
<td>12,776,333</td>
<td>65,143</td>
<td>951,107</td>
<td>12,519,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>265,734</td>
<td>2,121,804</td>
<td>34,846,114</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,746,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>90,443</td>
<td>719,409</td>
<td>13,032,444</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,201,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>1,937,163</td>
<td>15,493,897</td>
<td>274,703,455</td>
<td>2,499,568</td>
<td>285,640,457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>97,955</td>
<td>779,513</td>
<td>12,166,572</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,231,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>87,275</td>
<td>694,066</td>
<td>13,059,606</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>11,919,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>28,676</td>
<td>225,247</td>
<td>4,621,491</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>247,400</td>
<td>4,613,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>140,241</td>
<td>1,117,818</td>
<td>20,554,867</td>
<td>1,160,000</td>
<td>22,407,873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>900,055</td>
<td>7,196,625</td>
<td>129,017,905</td>
<td>395,000</td>
<td>132,528,562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSNET PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14,445,684</td>
<td>$115,250,175</td>
<td>2,089,914,009</td>
<td>$5,522,807</td>
<td>58,231,468</td>
<td>2,095,219,141</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>Phase Completion</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Realignment Virginia Ave POE Relocation in San Ysidro</td>
<td>Environmental Dec-03</td>
<td>$47,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5/ I-805 Merge Widening Genesee Ave to Del Mar Heights Rd</td>
<td>Construction Jan-07</td>
<td>$180,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Widening (Northbound) Del Mar Heights Rd to Via de la Valle</td>
<td>Environmental May-03</td>
<td>$6,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Widening (Northbound) Mission Bay Dr to SR-52</td>
<td>Construction Feb-03</td>
<td>$6,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Widening 24th Street to Harbor Drive</td>
<td>Environmental Apr-03</td>
<td>$8,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 HOV/General Purpose Lanes Del Mar Heights Rd to Vandegrift Blvd</td>
<td>Environmental Oct-07</td>
<td>$890,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Noise Barriers City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Environmental not available</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5/ SR-56 Connectors West to North and South to East</td>
<td>Environmental Dec-05</td>
<td>$140,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5/ SR-78 Connector Widen North to East Connector</td>
<td>Construction Sep-03</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8 Widening (Eastbound) 2nd Street to Greenfield Drive</td>
<td>Environmental Mar-04</td>
<td>$9,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-11 4-Lane Freeway New Border Crossing</td>
<td>Environmental Feb-06</td>
<td>$190,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Widening (Southbound) Friars Road to I-8</td>
<td>Construction Jan-04</td>
<td>$9,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes South Segment SR-163 to SR-56</td>
<td>Environmental Feb-03</td>
<td>$205,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Widening Mira Mesa Blvd to Miramar Way</td>
<td>Construction Dec-04</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Widening Mercy Rd to SR-56</td>
<td>Design &amp; Right of Way</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes Middle (stage 4) South of 15/56 to 15/56</td>
<td>Environmental Feb-03</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15/ SR-56 Interchange Modifications and I-15 Widening</td>
<td>Construction Oct-04</td>
<td>$26,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes Middle (stage 1) 15/56 to Camino del Norte</td>
<td>Environmental Feb-03</td>
<td>$66,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes Middle (stage 2) Camino del Norte to Duenda Road</td>
<td>Environmental Feb-03</td>
<td>$61,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes Middle (stage 3) Duenda Road to Lake Hodges</td>
<td>Environmental Feb-03</td>
<td>$86,000,000</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>Limits</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes Middle (stage 5)</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes North Segment</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Valley Road to Centre City Pkwy</td>
<td>Centre City Pkwy to SR-78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-52 4-Lane Freeway SR-125 to Cuyamaca St</td>
<td>Design &amp; Right of Way</td>
<td>Jan-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-52 4-Lane Freeway Cuyamaca St to SR-67</td>
<td>Design &amp; Right of Way</td>
<td>Jun-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-54 and SR-125 HOV Lanes I-805 to SR-94</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Feb-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-56 4-Lane Freeway Black Mtn Rd to Camino Ruiz</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mar-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>Nov-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>Jun-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>May-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-05</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>Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40</strong> SR-125 4-Lane Toll Highway SR-905 to San Miguel Rd</td>
<td>Design-Build</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41</strong> SR-905 4-Lane Freeway I-805 to U.S./Mexico Border</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Jan-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42</strong> SR-905 Construct Interchange Siempre Viva Rd</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Dec-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Estimate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Programmed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,393,544,000</td>
<td>$2,219,413,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TransNet funded projects in **bold.**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title Description / Limits</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
<td>Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 San Ysidro Station</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$19,500,000</td>
<td>$19,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Modifications</td>
<td>Dec-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 East Village Stations</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$29,200,000</td>
<td>$29,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Modifications</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Mission Valley East LRT</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td><strong>$455,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$444,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 to Baltimore Drive</td>
<td>May-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Mid-Coast Balboa LRT Old Town to Balboa Ave</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$116,700,000</td>
<td>$110,090,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Nobel Drive Station</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td><strong>$9,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,525,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Coaster Station</td>
<td>Apr-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Sorrento Valley Station</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 I-15 Bus Rapid Transit Centers</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>$51,000,000</td>
<td>$51,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs, Rancho Bernardo Del Lago</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Encinitas Coaster Station</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Oceanside Station</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>$9,100,000</td>
<td>$9,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Oceanside - Escondido LRT</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td><strong>$351,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$219,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Hwy to Valley Pkwy</td>
<td>Mar-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Coastal Rail Double Track Corridor Level EIR</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>$2,498,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Oceanside-Escondido Bikeway</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$10,208,600</td>
<td>$10,208,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$25,456,000</td>
<td>$12,833,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 San Diego Bayshore Bikeway</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$7,398,000</td>
<td>$6,698,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Escondido-San Diego Bikeway</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Segment</td>
<td>Feb-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,093,462,600</td>
<td>$935,552,600</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; Jun-03</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Widen Rancho Santa Fe Rd</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Construction Sep-04</td>
<td>$39,000,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Olympic Parkway/ I-805 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Environmental Mar-03</td>
<td>$21,400,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Widen Palomar Street</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Construction Mar-04</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Palomar Street/ I-805 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Environmental TBD</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Coronado Tunnel</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Environmental Jun-04</td>
<td>$295,000,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Widen Jamacha Road</td>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Environmental Jun-03</td>
<td>$4,700,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Manchester Ave/ I-5 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Environmental May-05</td>
<td>$27,900,000</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Widen Bear/ East Valley Pkwy</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Environmental Sep-03</td>
<td>$13,700,000</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Nordahl Road/ SR-78 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Environmental Aug-03</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Widen Plaza Blvd</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Environmental Nov-03</td>
<td>$9,100,000</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Extend Rancho Del Oro Drive</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Construction Apr-04</td>
<td>$6,900,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Rancho Del Oro Dr/ SR-78 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Environmental Nov-05</td>
<td>$34,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Widen Espola Road</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Environmental Apr-05</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Extend Carroll Canyon Rd</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental Aug-03</td>
<td>$11,600,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Friars Rd/ SR-163 Interchange</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental May-05</td>
<td>$15,300,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Genesee Ave/ I-5 Interchange</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental Jun-04</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 Clairemont Mesa Blvd/SR-163 Interchange</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental Feb-03</td>
<td>$8,800,000</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Genesee Ave Widening</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Design &amp; Apr-03</td>
<td>$2,733,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 El Camino Real</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental Jul-04</td>
<td>$18,457,000</td>
<td>2007</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 Apr-03</td>
<td>$20,200,000</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Rancho Santa Fe Rd</td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Construction Mar-04</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></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>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Lomas Santa Fe Dr/ I-5 Interchange</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Environmental May-03</td>
<td>$20,600,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 Widen West Vista Way</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Environmental Aug-04</td>
<td>$7,700,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 South Santa Fe Ave</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental Dec-03</td>
<td>$34,900,000</td>
<td>$34,900,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Bradley Ave/ SR-67 Interchange</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental Aug-05</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 Los Coches/ I-8 Interchange</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Design Aug-03</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></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><strong>$670,690,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$267,005,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TransNet funded projects in **bold.**

*Underlined items changed from last report.*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Route: Limits</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113 CCTV Incident Identification System</td>
<td>I-15: SR-94 to I-8, I-805: SR-94 to I-8</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Oct-04, $9,000,000, $9,000,000, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 Changeable Message Signs</td>
<td>I-5: 3 Locations</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Mar-04, $1,200,000, $1,200,000, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Changeable Message Signs</td>
<td>I-8: 3 Locations, SR-94: 1 Location</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Jan-04, $1,700,000, $1,700,000, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 Ramp Meters (Northbound)</td>
<td>I-5: Coronado Ave to E Street</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Apr-04, $7,700,000, $7,700,000, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 Ramp Meters (Northbound)</td>
<td>I-805: Otay Valley Rd to E Street</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-03, $9,200,000, $9,200,000, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 Traffic Monitoring Systems</td>
<td>I-5, SR-52, SR-94 and I-805</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Mar-03, $6,500,000, $6,500,000, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$72,800,000</td>
<td>$72,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transportation Demand and Incident Management

**February 2003 Progress Report**

#### DEMAND MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</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>Reduced Travel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Trips Reduced</td>
<td>112,176</td>
<td>98,170</td>
<td>702,150</td>
<td>581,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduced</td>
<td>5,399,605</td>
<td>4,760,591</td>
<td>33,446,574</td>
<td>26,034,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduced Emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounds of Smog-forming Pollution Reduced</td>
<td>14,999</td>
<td>13,223</td>
<td>92,905</td>
<td>72,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduced Fuel Consumption</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallons of Fuel</td>
<td>294,338</td>
<td>259,504</td>
<td>1,823,200</td>
<td>1,419,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduced Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Auto Fees</td>
<td>$2,635,007</td>
<td>$2,323,169</td>
<td>$16,321,928</td>
<td>$12,704,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Program Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>This Month</th>
<th>Last Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Vanpools</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool Passengers</td>
<td>2,324</td>
<td>2,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies in RideLink Subsidy Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Locker Members</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed Ride Home Participants</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>3,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phone Calls Received</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool Matchlists Distributed</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCIDENT MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</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>Freeway Service Patrol</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assists</td>
<td>4,341</td>
<td>4,394</td>
<td>33,036</td>
<td>28,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Changeable Message Signs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Broadcasts</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Duration (total minutes)</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>14,236</td>
<td>46,281</td>
<td>13,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Incident Advisories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig Alerts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig Alert Duration (total minutes)</td>
<td>3,857</td>
<td>2,456</td>
<td>23,423</td>
<td>24,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Freeway Service Patrol Assists
(Data for January 2003)
February 2003
REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM FOR FY 2004

Introduction

At its February 6, 2003 meeting, the Shoreline Preservation Committee recommended that SANDAG continue the Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program in FY 2004. Funds for the basic monitoring program have been provided by the region’s coastal cities since 1996.

The Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program provides physical measurements of the region’s beaches essential to the design and evaluation of efforts to replenish beaches and manage the region’s shoreline. Starting in the spring of 2001, the program was expanded to cover the additional beach monitoring requirements for the Regional Beach Sand Project.

The cost of continuing the basic monitoring program is anticipated to be $75,000. The cost of the program expansion for the Regional Beach Sand Project is $45,000 and is available from the Project’s budget. The total cost of the FY 2004 monitoring program is $120,000. All costs and funding sources are the same as in FY 2003.

Discussion

The Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program was developed by the Shoreline Preservation Committee to measure the impacts of beach erosion over time, document the benefits of sand replenishment projects, and help improve the design and effectiveness of beachfills.

The program has consisted of twice yearly physical surveys of 32 beaches from the Mexican border to Oceanside Harbor since 1996. In 1998, surveys of the region’s lagoon inlets were added to help monitor the impacts of erosion and replenishment on the lagoons.

Graphic and written reports on beach widths, beach and lagoon profiles, and sand volume changes are made available to coastal cities and other public and private sector users, including state and federal coastal management agencies and engineers and scientists doing work on the San Diego region coastline. For example, the products of the monitoring program were used to design the beachfills for the Regional Beach Sand Project.

Recommendation

It is the Shoreline Preservation Committee’s recommendation that the Board of Directors approve Resolution 2003-24 authorizing the Executive Director to:

1. Accept up to $75,000 in local funds to continue the basic Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program in FY 2004;
2. Use up to $45,000 from SANDAG’s state and federal Regional Beach Sand Project funds for expanding the FY 2004 Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program to cover the additional beach monitoring requirements for the Regional Beach Sand Project; and
3. Contract with consultants for up to $120,000 to carry out the basic and expanded Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program in FY 2004.
and to develop computer models of sand movement along the coastline for use in the project’s Environmental Impact Report. In addition, the monitoring program will be the basis for meeting the project’s permit requirements for assessing the impacts of the project’s sand as it moves along the coastline.

The basic program cost for FY 2004 is $75,000. The Shoreline Preservation Committee has recommended that it be funded by the region’s coastal cities, based on each jurisdiction’s proportion of shoreline miles of sandy beach, excluding federal lands. Attachment 1 shows the funding distribution. Letters will be sent to each coastal city asking that the funds be set aside in their FY 2004 budgets following SANDAG approval. Invoices will be sent in July 2003.

The permits for the Regional Beach Sand Project require additional beach monitoring activities, including surveys at 13 new locations twice yearly. SANDAG has developed an expanded monitoring program to respond to the permit requirements. The cost of the expanded program is $45,000 yearly, and will be carried out for four years, through FY 2005. The Shoreline Preservation Committee recommends that the expanded program costs be funded with SANDAG’s state and federal Regional Beach Sand Project funds.

SANDAG manages the program and contracts with a consultant to perform the surveys. The authorizations in Resolution 2003-24 are needed to allow the continuation of the program in FY 2004.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Steve Sachs, (619) 595-5346; ssa@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #5.08
AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ACCEPT UP TO $75,000 IN LOCAL FUNDS TO CONTINUE THE BASIC REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM IN FY 2004; USE UP TO $45,000 FROM SANDAG’S STATE AND FEDERAL REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT FUNDS FOR EXPANDING THE FY 2004 REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM TO COVER THE ADDITIONAL BEACH MONITORING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT; AND CONTRACT WITH CONSULTANTS FOR UP TO $120,000 TO CARRY OUT THE BASIC AND EXPANDED REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM IN FY 2004

WHEREAS, SANDAG’s Overall Work Program Work Element #5.08 has the purpose of coordinating management of the San Diego region’s shoreline; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Committee has recommended that in FY 2004 a basic Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program at a cost of up to $75,000 is necessary to effectively carry out the purpose of Work Element #5.08; and

WHEREAS, the Shoreline Preservation Committee has recommended that the Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program be expanded in FY 2004 to cover additional beach monitoring requirements for the Regional Beach Sand Project, at a cost of up to $45,000; and

WHEREAS, the Shoreline Preservation Committee has developed an equitable allocation of the annual cost of the basic monitoring program among coastal cities, and has recommended that SANDAG use its state and federal Regional Beach Sand Project funds to cover the cost of the Expanded Program; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors authorizes the Executive Director to:

1. Accept up to $75,000 in local funds to continue the basic Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program in FY 2004;

2. Use up to $45,000 from SANDAG’s state and federal Regional Beach Sand Project funds for expanding the FY 2004 Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program to cover the additional beach monitoring requirements for the Regional Beach Sand Project; and

3. Contract with consultants for up to $120,000 to carry out the basic and expanded Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program in FY 2004.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 28th day of February, 2003.
### REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING

**Basic Program FY 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Shoreline (Miles)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>$11,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>$5,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>$5,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>$9,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>$4,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>$6,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>$29,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$2,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$75,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expansion For Regional Beach Sand Project Monitoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and Federal Funds</th>
<th>$45,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This allocation was revised by the Committee in FY 2002 to exclude federal lands and provide more equitable funding allocations.
QUARTERLY INVESTMENT REPORT—
PERIOD ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2002

Background

The California Government Code requires that the Board be provided a quarterly report of investments held by SANDAG. This report includes all money under the direction or care of SANDAG as of December 31, 2002, including funds of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission and SourcePoint.

Discussion

SANDAG’s Investment Policy and California Government Code Section 53646 (b) outlines the requirements for the treasurer or chief financial officer of a local agency in reporting to the legislative body of the local agency. The attached report prepared by the Financial Services Manager shows summary (Attachment 1) as well as detailed information (Attachment 2) regarding SANDAG’s investment portfolio as of the end of the last fiscal quarter.

As of December 31, 2002, a total of $225.5 million was held by SANDAG in a number of investment accounts in comparison to $202.9 million held in the previous quarter. The $22.6 million increase during the quarter is primarily due to the timing of the receipt of sales tax revenues and the payment of TransNet debt service payments.

Approximately $16.6 million was held in five Bank of America money market checking accounts at the end of the quarter. Funds in these money market checking accounts are transferred to other accounts discussed below, or to local agencies as part of their TransNet payments on an ongoing basis. The majority of the money managed by SANDAG, including funds of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, is currently invested in seven major funds or accounts. They are:

1. State of California Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) – State law allows local agencies to invest up to $40 million in LAIF. SANDAG currently has approximately $39.0 million invested in LAIF. This fund is highly liquid and funds may be accessed easily for immediate needs;

2. California Asset Management Program (CAMP) – Cash Reserve Portfolio – This is a fund administered by SANDAG’s financial advisor, Public Financial Management, Inc. (PFM), for the specific purpose of managing the investment of bond funds that are subject to arbitrage investment restrictions. SANDAG uses this program for debt service related to its various sales tax revenue bond issues. All bond debt service funds in CAMP are actually under the control of our bond trustee, US Bank (formerly First Trust California). Only the trustee may deposit or withdraw bond debt service money. Approximately $50.5 million are currently on deposit with CAMP;

3. Fidelity Funds – These are a series of high quality money market instruments, including AAA rated US treasury funds, managed by Fidelity Investments Public Sector Services Company. These also are highly liquid and are used for immediate cash needs. Approximately $6.4 million are invested in these mutual funds;

4. Nations Funds – These are a series of government treasury obligation mutual funds managed by Bank of America.
These also are highly liquid and are used for immediate cash needs. Approximately $28.9 million are invested in these mutual funds;

5. US Bank – SANDAG entered into a forward delivery agreement with Wachovia Bank for investment of its bond principal and interest funds. These funds also are under the control of US Bank, SANDAG’s bond trustee. This money, totaling approximately $52.2 million, is held by the trustee for bond debt service payments and payment of interest on the short-term commercial paper program;

6. US Trust – US Trust was hired to manage the bond fund proceeds within the guidelines of SANDAG’s Investment Policy. These funds are under the control of our bond trustee, US Bank. Only the trustee may deposit or withdraw bond proceeds money. US Trust also invests a portion of SANDAG’s sales tax proceeds. Approximately $23.9 million of sales tax proceeds are invested by US Trust; and

7. Scudder/Duetsche Institutional Funds – These are a series of high quality money market instruments, including AAA rated US treasury funds, managed by Scudder Kemper Institutional Services Company. These also are highly liquid and are used for immediate cash needs. Approximately $8.1 million are invested in these mutual funds.

As of December 31, 2002, the yield to maturity of the portfolio was 2.22% with a weighted average maturity of 68 days in comparison to 2.14% and 73 days in the prior quarter.

In accordance with SANDAG’s Investment Policy, Attachment 3 provides a report of non-money market investments. Management has continued to implement the Board’s strategy to diversify SANDAG’s investment portfolio. This will continue to be an important investment objective for the future.

Certifications

As required by state law, the Director of Finance and Administration reports that this portfolio, together with the authorized short-term commercial paper program, will provide the necessary liquidity to meet the expenditure requirements of SANDAG and the TransNet program for the next six months. This portfolio is in compliance with the updated SANDAG Investment Policy and with state law.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments (3)

Key Staff Contact: Marlene Kelleher, (619) 595-5389; mke@sandag.org
The attachments to the Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.
FY 2004 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM (OWP)

**Recommendation**

The Executive Committee reviewed the first draft of the OWP at its February 14 meeting containing objectives, tasks, products, and schedules for each of the work elements planned for FY 2004. In order to solicit timely review and comment from the member jurisdictions, and from our federal and state funding agencies, it is Executive Committee’s recommendation that the Board of Directors of the San Diego Association of Governments authorize distribution of the FY 2004 Draft Overall Work Program for review and comment. And, that the Member Agencies be encouraged to review and comment on this document prior to April 2, 2003.

**Introduction**

The SANDAG Board of Directors is being asked to authorize distribution of the full Draft FY 2004 Overall Work Program (OWP) for federal, state, and local review and comment.

Following Board authorization, the full Draft OWP will be prepared and distributed to federal and state funding agencies and to local agencies in early March. Comments will be due back to SANDAG by April 2, 2003. Following this comment period, the Executive Committee will review all comments and recommend appropriate revisions to the final OWP, which is scheduled for Board approval at the April meeting.

The draft OWP will be used in the preparation of the Preliminary Program Budget which will be presented to the Executive Committee and the Board at their March meetings. The Final FY 2004 OWP is scheduled for approval by the Board in April, with the Final Program Budget scheduled for adoption in May.

**Discussion**

At their February 14 meeting, the Executive Committee reviewed the first draft of the full write-ups containing details of each task necessary to complete the work described. In addition, specific products are identified and the estimated completion date is noted. Other sections of the final draft document that are required by SANDAG’s federal and state funding agencies also will be included in the draft version to be distributed for review and comment.

A number of work elements for transit planning projects have been included in the list of projects reflecting the initial transfer of transit functions. Staff is continuing to work with staff from MTDB and NCTD to identify projects that will be transferred as part of the implementation of SB 1703.

Staff is currently working on developing the budgets for each project based upon estimates of the staff hours and other resources necessary to complete the work described. Funding sources for each job also will be identified.

As suggested by the Executive Committee, in conjunction with the quarterly progress reports staff currently provides our funding agencies on each of the work elements, in FY 2004 staff will prepare progress reports to the Executive Committee and the Board on the
agency’s effectiveness in meeting the objectives in the OWP.

Attachment 1 contains a list of the projects proposed for FY 2004 and Attachment 2 are the summary objectives for each work element to be included in the draft OWP. Some of the projects contain bold type, which is to highlight emphasis areas or new programs, products, or tasks for FY 2004.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Leslie Campbell,
(619) 595-5340; lca@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #1.01
The attachments to the Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG's Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.
ANNUAL RETREAT SUMMARY

Introduction

The annual retreat was held January 29-31, 2003 in the community of Borrego Springs. Nearly 50 Board members and Alternates participated in the retreat with all member agencies represented. The primary retreat topics included: the TransNet local transportation sales tax program and the process to develop a new expenditure plan and ordinance as well as the best methods to seek countywide voter approval in November 2004; the roles, responsibilities, and working arrangements for SANDAG serving as the new consolidated agency; and the processes and timeline needed to develop a draft Regional Comprehensive Plan by the end of calendar year 2003.

For new Board members and Alternate members, the first retreat session covered the basics of what SANDAG is, agency functions, new voting procedures, how the work program and budget are developed, the Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program, and suggestions for communicating SANDAG’s work to city council and county supervisor colleagues. The basics also included an update on current negotiations dealing with water supply issues and a review of SANDAG regional decision-making milestones (refer to Attachment 1).

In addition, the last session of the retreat was an evaluation of the Board’s accomplishments during calendar year 2002, and priority setting for 2003.

TransNet

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 include timing, approach, sales tax rate, and length of extension. There appears to be a consensus that SANDAG would like to put a measure on the countywide ballot in November 2004. The tax rate extension would remain the same at one-half percent, and the extension probably will be 30 years.

The majority of the discussion by retreat participants centered on the process required to garner a two-thirds voter approval to get the existing TransNet sales tax extended before it expires in April 2008. One primary strategy is to gain California legislative approval to lower the threshold to extend such transportation sales tax measures to 55 percent or even a majority vote.

Retreat participants agreed that a detailed ordinance and expenditure plan has to be developed so the voters can gain a better understanding of what they are buying.

Building on these assumptions, retreat participants discussed the idea of mandating a 10-year or 15-year incremental review for a 30-year measure. This would allow for a “mid-course adjustment” should regional priorities change over time. If there is an adjustment, should amendments to the ordinance and expenditure plan require a two-thirds vote of SANDAG or some other form of a super majority vote?
Participants discussed the potential for “maintenance of effort” on the part of local cities and county government as well as the transit operators to help ensure jurisdictions are building roads and transit operators are improving services. Participants also want to make sure any extension isn’t viewed as a bailout for private developers. 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.

Environmental mitigation costs for the major capital projects in the current TransNet expenditure plan have totaled approximately five 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. The program could 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.

One potential concept is 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.

With regard to the process during the next 20 months, rather than attempting to extend 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 subregional basis with specific projects and programs for each area.

The region would be viewed from a perspective of six subregional areas. Voter research would be conducted on this subregional 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 then would be leaders in their local subregion to explain and actively promote the extension once it is on the ballot.

Participants then reviewed the proposed timeline and associated proposed actions to get a TransNet sales tax extension measure and expenditure plan before the voters in November 2004 (refer to Attachment 2).

This session ended with a presentation by Riverside officials explaining the key decisions they made to extend their region’s half-percent sales tax. The Riverside measure passed with a 69 percent voter approval rating in November 2002. The keys are: agreed upon expenditure plan; extensive use
of polling; a strong regional coalition; a well-financed campaign; a good understanding of who the voters are and what they want; and measure language telling voters what they will get for their sales tax dollars.

Actions

- SANDAG has made the lowering of the two-thirds voter threshold its number one legislative priority.
- Staff needs to identify what would have happened and what may happen if there is no TransNet program.
- Staff needs to research and publish a comparison of development impact fees by jurisdiction within the San Diego region, and to the extent possible, identify comparable information for other counties’ jurisdictions in Southern California.

Agency Consolidation and Implementation

This session began with the respective CEOs of the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB), the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD), and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) offering their perspectives on the consolidation and the transition progress to date.

Tom Larwin of MTDB noted that the consolidation should foster a better integration of transit and highways, and transit and land use public policy decisions. He said the consolidation is building on the strengths of all three agencies; however, there will be a trial and error period. At the staff level, Mr. Larwin emphasized that all personnel decisions are “personal.” Karen King of NCTD stated that the unknowns of the consolidation have been stressful but the transition teams of policymakers and staffs have given the process clarity and momentum. She added that the focus is now on delivering quality products and services. Ms. King also noted that it is important that residents and customers realize positive benefits from the consolidation. Gary Gallegos of SANDAG noted that the consolidation process has started from a position of strength among the three agencies based on a history of effective collaboration. He noted that the consolidated agency will streamline decision-making, increase responsiveness, provide more opportunities for public participation and involvement, and permit a “one-stop shop” for accountability of major transportation decisions.

As part of the agency consolidation session, members from the Ad Hoc Working Group on Transition lead the discussion on the working group’s partnering sessions, results from a Peer Review Panel, and the overall process for the consolidation. The Peer Review Panel, which had concluded its review earlier in the month, was made up of the executive director of the San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the chief executive officer of the Orange County Transportation Authority, two local city managers, and a principal from Cambridge Systematics Corporation, a private consulting company specializing in organizational management, services, and information systems to the public and private transportation agencies.

Observations from the Peer Review Panel indicate that transit planning and development in the San Diego region have been highly regarded successes, which provides an enviable basis for change. The panelists noted that consolidation provides an opportunity to build on that success. Panelists emphasized that the consolidated agency must adopt a new business outlook and perspective, and that there is a need to pay explicit attention to multiple individual functions and activities (i.e., planning, programming, project development, and construction). The new agency also needs to develop service standards.
Retreat participants from SANDAG, MTDB and NCTD discussed the naming of the consolidated agency. There was extensive discussion of the pros and cons of keeping SANDAG as the name versus coming up with a new name. A number of potential name changes that had been suggested in the past were reviewed.

Participants felt strongly about the importance of SANDAG’s name recognition and the recognition of the quality of work produced by SANDAG in Sacramento, Washington D.C., and by regional agencies throughout California and the nation.

The overwhelming consensus is to keep SANDAG as the name for the consolidated agency, but to examine different tag lines to better reflect the consolidated agency’s new responsibilities.

Actions

- Staff needs to prepare a frequently asked questions (FAQs) list with answers to help explain the consolidation and what it means for residents, business people, and visitors to our region.
- Schedule semi-annual meetings of the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the four SANDAG Policy Committees (Executive Committee, Transportation Committee, Regional Planning Committee, and Borders Committee) to facilitate policy issue communications and coordination.
- Staff needs to bring forward alternative tag lines for SANDAG versus “San Diego’s Regional Planning Agency” and test the new tag lines during polling for the TransNet extension.

The Regional Comprehensive Plan

This retreat session provided an overview of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and a description of 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’s and Borders Committee’s work to date.

The purpose of the RCP is to strengthen the relationships among local and regional plans and policies, and land use and transportation, enabling local governments as well as the region to proactively plan for change. Participants emphasized the need for jurisdictions to make the RCP their plan through a bottom-up process and include participation by the region’s special districts.

Retreat participants agreed that an incentive-based approach should be used to encourage and channel growth into existing and future urban areas and smart growth communities. One key will be in determining how best to use regional funding dollars to make smart growth a reality. Cities and County communities need to be more effective in connecting local land use plans and policies to regional transportation plans and investments.

A good portion of the session was spent discussing a key element of the RCP – the development of the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (refer to Attachment 3). The strategy will be used to assess and monitor whether the region’s existing infrastructure and planned capital improvement expenditures are adequate to meet the region’s needs, or can be reprogrammed to support channeling growth into urban communities and smart growth areas. The strategy also looks at the need for changes to public policy or new revenue sources to support implementation of smart growth development.

Regional infrastructure to be evaluated includes:
1. Transportation
2. Sewage Discharge System and Treatment Facilities (Wastewater)
3. Energy Supply and Delivery Systems
4. Solid Waste Collection and Disposal
5. Storm Water Collection and Treatment Systems
6. Water Supply and Delivery Systems
7. Regional Open Space and Habitat Preservation
8. Regional Parks and Recreation Facilities (including beach sand replenishment)
9. K-12 Education, and Community Colleges and Universities
10. Ports of Entry with Mexico

Retreat participants discussed both the need to limit the infrastructure areas to be examined as part of the initial RCP as well as if there are other areas that may need to be included.

The intent of the overall Regional Comprehensive Plan is for jurisdictions to use it as a “rudder” to get us to where we want to be, as opposed to where current trends appear to be dragging us.

Actions

- Use the San Diego County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to help outreach to special districts about the development of the RCP and the infrastructure needs inventory.
- Member agencies can develop “white papers” outlining jurisdictional priorities and expenditure plans.
- Prioritize the list of infrastructure needs.
- Hold periodic joint meetings with city managers/county CAO and the SANDAG Board of Directors.

SANDAG Priorities

As part of the final retreat session, participants evaluate the work they have accomplished during the previous calendar year and suggest priorities for calendar year 2003.

Top priorities include:
- carrying out the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, including the plan’s Regional Transit Vision, and its performance monitoring and measurement components;
- completing the Regional Comprehensive Plan, including the development of an infrastructure needs inventory and financing strategies components;
- preparing the expenditure plan for the extension of the TransNet half-percent transportation sale tax program;
- implementing the new SB 1703 California law and the consolidation of transit functions;
- strengthening the agency’s border work with surrounding counties and Mexico; and
- working with tribal governments to help meet Native American needs.

Summary

As in past years, participants, and in particular, the SANDAG Executive Committee continually refine the way the retreat is structured. Participants agree to continue to encourage their other mayors and council members, supervisors, and agency colleagues to attend and participate in the annual retreat because of the inherent value this type of interaction fosters among local leaders.

Next year’s retreat is tentatively scheduled for January 28-30, 2004.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Garry Bonelli,
(619) 595-5360; e-mail: gbo@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Overall Work Element #1.01 and Board Expenses.
Milestones in SANDAG Regional Decision-Making

1966 • Local governments create the Comprehensive Planning Organization (CPO) within the San Diego County administration under a state authorized joint powers agreement.

1970 • Governor designates CPO as the Metropolitan Planning Organization to assure areawide coordination and to serve as the technical and informational resource for local governments.

1971 • State further designates CPO as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency; Airport Land Use Commission; and Areawide Clearinghouse for federal/state grant reviews.

1972 • Local governments establish CPO as an independent Joint Powers Agency.

1975 • CPO develops & adopts the first ever, comprehensive Regional Transportation Plan.

1977 • Lemon Grove becomes a city and joins CPO.
• CPO establishes the Criminal Justice Research Division.

1978 • 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 & state Clean Air Acts.

1979 • State designates CPO to prepare the Regional Housing Needs Statement.

1980 • CPO renamed the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG).

1981 • Poway and Santee become cities and join SANDAG.

1982 • SANDAG creates SourcePoint as a nonprofit corporate subsidiary.

1986 • Encinitas and Solana Beach become cities and join SANDAG.
• State designates SANDAG as the Regional Transportation Commission.

1987 • 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, & bicycles.

1988 • Voters countywide pass an advisory measure calling for creation of a Regional Planning and Growth Management Board.

1989 • Agencies designate SANDAG as the Regional Planning and Growth Management Review Board.

1990 • State designates SANDAG as the Integrated Waste Management Task Force.
• SANDAG helps start the San Dieguito River Valley Park Joint Powers Authority.

1991 • Member agencies designate SANDAG as the Congestion Management Agency.

1992 • 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.
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
# 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>
The attachments to the Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.
## MEMBERSHIP ON POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (As of February 14, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE</th>
<th>BORDERS COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North County Inland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Mickey Cafagna, Cmte Vice Chair</td>
<td>Mickey Cafagna, Mayor</td>
<td>Lori Holt Pfeiler, Cmte Chair</td>
<td>Ed Gallo, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Escondido</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Lori Holt Pfeiler, Mayor</td>
<td>Corky Smith, Mayor</td>
<td>Judy Ritter, Councilmember</td>
<td>Judy Ritter, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North County Coastal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Ramona Finnila, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>Joe Kellejian, Cmte Chair</td>
<td>Jack Feller, Councilmember</td>
<td>Crystal Crawford, Cmte Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of Del Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Christy Guerin, Councilmember</td>
<td>Christy Guerin, Councilmember</td>
<td>Maggie Houlihan, Councilmember</td>
<td>David Powell, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Ron Morrison, Cmte Chair</td>
<td>Jerry Rindone</td>
<td>Patty Davis, Cmte Vice Chair</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy, Cmte Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Vice Mayor, City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of Imperial Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Steve Padilla, Mayor</td>
<td>Phil Monroe, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>Ron Morrison, Councilmember</td>
<td>Phil Monroe, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of National City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Hal Ryan, Vice Mayor</td>
<td>Art Madrid, Mayor</td>
<td>Jill Greer, Councilmember</td>
<td>Jill Greer, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Art Madrid, Mayor</td>
<td>Jack Dale, Councilmember</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of San Diego</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Dick Murphy, Mayor</td>
<td>Dick Murphy, Cmte Vice Chair</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer, Councilmember</td>
<td>Ralph Inzunza, Deputy Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer, Councilmember</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer, Councilmember</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of San Diego</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Greg Cox, Chair of Supervisors</td>
<td>Ron Roberts, Supervisor</td>
<td>Ron Roberts, Supervisor</td>
<td>Dianne Jacob, Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>Ron Roberts, Supervisor</td>
<td>Dianne Jacob, Supervisor</td>
<td>Bill Horn, Supervisor</td>
<td>Pam Slater, Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEMBERSHIP ON POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (As of February 14, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE</th>
<th>BORDERS COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Transit Development Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>VOTING MEMBER</td>
<td>ADVISORY MEMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bob Emery, Councilmember, City of Poway</td>
<td>Leon Williams, Chairman</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Leon Williams, Chairman</td>
<td>Bob Emery, Councilmember, City of Poway</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North County Transit Development Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>VOTING MEMBER</td>
<td>ADVISORY MEMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Judy Ritter, Chair</td>
<td>David Druker, Mayor, City of Del Mar</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Tom Golich, Deputy Mayor, Solana Beach</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Diego County Airport Authority (Transportation Committee Only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>VOTING MEMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Terry Johnson, Mayor, City of Oceanside</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mary Sessom, Mayor, City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperial County (Borders Committee Only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VOTING MEMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Victor Carillo, Supervisor</td>
<td>County of Imperial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Larry Grogan, Councilmember</td>
<td>City of El Centro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMITTEE ADVISORY MEMBERS

| Caltrans | | | | |
| Members | None | Pedro Orso-Delgado, District 11 Director | Pedro Orso-Delgado, District 11 Director | Pedro Orso-Delgado, District 11 Director |
| Alternates | None | Gene Pound, Deputy District Director | Gene Pound, Deputy District Director | Gene Pound, Deputy District Director |

| Department of Defense | | | | |
| Members | None | None | Susannah Aguilera | None |
| Alternates | None | None | None | None |
## MEMBERSHIP ON POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (As of February 14, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE</th>
<th>BORDERS COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority Members</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mike Madigan</td>
<td>Mike Madigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District Members</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Jess Van Deventer, Commissioner</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bill Chopyk, Mgr. of Planning Services</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California/Mexico Members</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Rodulfo Figueroa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California/Mexico Alternates</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Javier Diaz, Deputy Consul General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County (Borders Committee Only)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Thomas Buckley, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County (Borders Committee Only)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>City of Lake Elsinore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County (Borders Committee Only)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County (Borders Committee Only)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**CHAIR:** Hon. Ron Morrison  
**VICE CHAIR:** Hon. Mickey Cafagna  
**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:** Gary L. Gallegos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF CARLSBAD</th>
<th>CITY OF SAN MARCOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ramona Finnila, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>Hon. Corky Smith, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Bud Lewis, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Lee Thibadeau, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Matt Hall, Councilmember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF CHULA VISTA</th>
<th>CITY OF SANTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steve Padilla, Mayor</td>
<td>Hon. Hal Ryan, Vice Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Patty Davis, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Randy Vaepel, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Jerry Rindone, Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Jack Dale, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF CORONADO</th>
<th>CITY OF SOLANA BEACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Phil Monroe, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>Hon Joe Kellejian, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Frank Tiemeyer, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. David Powell, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF DEL MAR</th>
<th>CITY OF VISTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Crystal Crawford, Councilmember</td>
<td>Hon. Morris Vance, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Richard Earnest, Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Judy Ritter, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. David Druker, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Bob Campbell, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF EL CAJON</th>
<th>COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mark Lewis, Mayor</td>
<td>Hon. Greg Cox, Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Gary Kendrick, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Ron Roberts, Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF ENCINITAS</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Christy Guerin, Councilmember</td>
<td>(Advisory Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Maggie Houlihan, Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>Jeff Morales, Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF ESCONDIDO</th>
<th>METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Lori Holt Pfeiler, Mayor</td>
<td>(Advisory Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Ed Gallo, Councilmember</td>
<td>Leon Williams, Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Hon. Jerry Rindone, Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH</th>
<th>NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Patricia McCoy, Councilmember</td>
<td>(Advisory Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Diane Rose, Mayor</td>
<td>Hon. Judy Ritter, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Mayda Winter, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF LA MESA</th>
<th>IMPERIAL COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Art Madrid, Mayor</td>
<td>(Advisory Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Barry Janitz, Councilmember</td>
<td>Hon. Victor Carrillo, Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Dave Allan, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Larry Grogan, Councilmember, City of El Centro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF LEMON GROVE</th>
<th>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mary Sessoms, Mayor</td>
<td>(Advisory Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Jill Greer, Councilmember</td>
<td>CAPT Christopher Shanze, USN, CEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Jerry Jones, Councilmember</td>
<td>Commander, Southwest Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naval Facilities Engineering Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) CAPT Ken Butryn, USN, CEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF NATIONAL CITY</th>
<th>SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ron Morrison, Councilmember</td>
<td>(Advisory Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Frank Parra, Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>Jess Van Deventer, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF OCEANSIDE</th>
<th>SAN DIEGO COUNTY TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jack Feller, Councilmember</td>
<td>(Advisory Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Terry Johnson, Mayor</td>
<td>Michael B. Bixler, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Rocky Chavez, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Peter Q. Davis, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF POWAY</th>
<th>SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mickey Cafagna, Mayor</td>
<td>(Advisory Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Don Higginson, Councilmember</td>
<td>Bernie Rhinerson, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Robert Emery, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Bud Lewis, Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF SAN DIEGO</th>
<th>BAJA CALIFORNIA/MEXICO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Dick Murphy, Mayor</td>
<td>(Advisory Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jim Madaffer, Councilmember</td>
<td>Hon. Rodulfo Figueroa Aramoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Scott Peters, Councilmember</td>
<td>Consul General of Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of February 10, 2003
### CALENDAR OF MEETINGS OF THE SANDAG BOARD AND POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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 a.m. – 10 a.m.)</th>
<th>Transportation Committee (Normally third Friday, 9 a.m. - Noon)</th>
<th>Borders Committee (Normally third Friday, 12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2003</td>
<td>January 24, 2003</td>
<td>*January 17, 2003 (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>
<td>*January 17, 2003 (Joint meeting with Regional Planning Committee 11 am – 1 pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*November 7, 2003 (First Friday)</td>
<td>*November 21, 2003 (Third Friday)</td>
<td>*November 7, 2003 (12-2 pm, 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*December 5, 2003 (First Friday)</td>
<td>*December 19, 2003 (Third Friday)</td>
<td>*December 5, 2003 (12-2 pm, 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>
</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
Chair’s Report

A BOLD VISION FOR A BETTER FUTURE

February 28, 2003

What does the future hold for our region? Tomorrow is full of promise; however, a number of significant challenges and opportunities are facing the San Diego region.

SANDAG has been charged with new responsibilities to better coordinate regional decision-making, transportation, land use, and infrastructure. This unprecedented effort will require a renewed commitment from elected officials working together with our residents, community, environmental, and business leaders, and other stakeholders.

Through SANDAG, we can galvanize the regional decision-making process. We must make different choices and develop a vision, strategies, and the resources to create a better future for the San Diego region.

STREAMLINING GOVERNMENT DECISION-MAKING

Regional governance enters a new era in 2003 with SANDAG evolving into a consolidated agency responsible for transit planning, funding allocation, project development, and eventually, construction in the San Diego region.

Culminating three years of work among local mayors and council members, Governor Davis signed Senate Bill 1703 (Peace, D-El Cajon). This new consolidated agency now has all of the responsibilities and roles of SANDAG, and many of the transit functions of both the San Diego Metropolitan and North County Transit Development Boards.

In addition, the new consolidated agency will continue to provide the public forum and decision point for significant regional issues such as growth, environmental management, habitat conservation, housing, open space, air quality, energy, fiscal management, economic development, and public safety.

Many individuals and representatives of organizations contribute to the regional decision-making process by participating in SANDAG’s committees and working groups as well as by attending workshops and public hearings.
The Regional Transportation Plan is a cornerstone of SANDAG’s work in 2002. Mobility 2030 introduces a new-era strategy for transportation that increases capacity on rail, buses, trolleys, and highways, and sets out the vision for a seamless regional transportation system. More than two years of committed involvement from stakeholders has paid off with a plan that has the potential to revolutionize travel in the region. A key element of the RTP is the Regional Transit Vision, a way to get public transit integrated into communities throughout the San Diego region. The vision is bold because we seek to make public transportation competitive with driving solo in your car during rush hours for many trips.

Making the most of TransNet dollars is another initiative for SANDAG. In 1987, San Diego region voters approved the TransNet program -- a half-cent sales tax to fund a variety of important transportation projects throughout the region. TransNet is a 20-year, $3.3 billion transportation improvement program. The current TransNet program expires in 2008. Tax revenues are distributed equally in thirds among highway, transit, and local road projects. In addition, $1 million is earmarked annually for bicycle paths and facilities.

And, $1 million in TransNet funds is financing seven innovative Walkable Communities Demonstration Programs. Design and construction of the projects are underway. In Encinitas, sidewalk redesigns and landscape changes make walking safer for pedestrians along Coast Highway. And in San Marcos, a new lighted crosswalk helps guide children across a busy street to their elementary school. Other projects are planned in Oceanside, El Cajon, and the communities of North Park, Golden Hill, and Clairemont in the City of San Diego. Walkable communities also got a boost with the release of SANDAG’s Regional Pedestrian Design Guidelines that local agencies can use in developing planning and design standards to promote walkable communities.

In the past year, TransNet funds have contributed to a number of essential projects including SR 52 east through Santee to SR 67; completion of SR 125 North to extend it from Spring Valley through Lemon Grove to La Mesa and connect at SR 52 in Santee; the connector for SR 125 South in the Chula Vista area which is now being combined with a tollway to link SR 54 and the future SR 905 at the U.S./Mexico border. In the North County, SR 78 widening continues from El Camino Real to College Boulevard in Carlsbad, and SR 76 in Oceanside will be widened from Melrose Drive to Mission Road.

The future of transportation is evident in a number of projects underway in the region. I-15 will be transformed into a “freeway within a freeway” from Kearny Mesa north to Escondido. The Mission Valley East Trolley Line takes shape over I-8 in Mission Valley and on the campus of San Diego State University, as progress continues to extend the trolley east from Qualcomm Stadium to La Mesa via the university. This trolley extension will be in service by 2005.
Progress continues on the I-5/I-805 merge as high occupancy vehicle lanes and additional general purpose lanes are constructed. In the North County, the Oceanside-Escondido Rail Line gets the green light as all funding has been secured to complete the east-west line. The new commuter rail line will serve 15 stations along the route, including a loop onto the Cal State San Marcos campus.

And, construction is underway on the middle segment of State Route 56 from Camino Ruiz to Carmel Country Road, which is scheduled to be open for traffic in July 2004 and will link Interstates 5 and 15. Along the U.S./Mexico border, environmental work is wrapping up and construction set to begin on SR 905, the four-lane freeway scheduled for completion in 2007.

Reducing rush hour traffic was the focus of a major promotional effort launched for Rideshare Week October 7 – 11. The promotion included television and newspaper coverage, an advertising blitz, radio station events, and employer fairs to promote alternatives to driving solo during rush hour commutes. The outreach and advertising resulted in a 200 percent increase in rideshare information requests. The Week’s activities culminated in the Diamond Awards luncheon where San Diego Mayor Dick Murphy recognized area employers and individuals for their efforts to reduce rush hour traffic congestion.

A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

SANDAG is undertaking the development of a Regional Comprehensive Plan that will focus on the interconnected issues of urban form, transportation, housing, healthy ecosystems, our international and county borders, the economy, and infrastructure financing. At the core of the RCP is a shared vision of what we want to preserve and enhance about the region’s quality of life. Ultimately, planning has to take into account real-world trade-offs, conflicting needs, and other challenges.

The RCP represents a sweeping, integrated plan for managing our shared regional future and its resources. The goals of the planning effort are to develop a broad-based consensus reflecting the values, needs, and preferred solutions of as many residents as possible. The draft Plan is scheduled to be completed in late 2003 with the final plan adopted by mid-2004.

The SANDAG Regional Planning Committee, composed of local mayors, council members, and supervisors, will provide oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Plan. Planning and community development directors also will be closely involved in the plan’s preparation. An extensive public outreach program is underway to ensure involvement by stakeholders from every corner of the region.
SEIZING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

More of the region’s residents need the opportunity to share in the region’s economic prosperity if we are to maintain our competitiveness with other metropolitan areas around the country and the world. That is one of the major findings in SANDAG’s economic report, San Diego’s Indicators of Sustainable Competitiveness. The competitive edge, according to the findings, will go to regions in which social equity, environmental quality, and economic vitality are balanced.

The analysis, completed with the help of the San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation, reveals the region is at an economic disadvantage because of our inequities. As part of the analysis, SANDAG has developed a “sustainable competitiveness index” to measure the region’s progress in the areas of the environment, the economy, and equity. The index compares San Diego to 20 other metropolitan regions.

PRESERVING OUR BEACHES AND ENSURING PLENTIFUL NATURAL RESOURCES

SANDAG continued its work on the Regional Beach Sand Project that placed 2.1 million cubic yards of sand at 12 eroded beaches from Imperial Beach to Oceanside during a six-month period from April to September 2001. More than five miles of new beaches were created using sand dredged from offshore sites. The first year’s monitoring confirmed expectations that sand from the project would remain on the region’s coastline, and have little or no adverse environmental impacts. In addition to continued monitoring of the region’s beaches, the SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Committee and the coastal cities are exploring potential funding sources that can provide the resources to carry out a major beach restoration project every other year. These financing strategies are being examined as part of the Regional Comprehensive Plan integrated efforts to look at ten regional infrastructure areas.

To continue its efforts to ensure an adequate water supply in the region, SANDAG received an informational report from the County Water Authority that contained an evaluation of potential routes for a binational aqueduct to convey Colorado River water to the California-Baja California border region. The Regional Colorado River Conveyance Feasibility Study was undertaken to determine whether a binational aqueduct would provide a reliable, cost-effective, and practical option for the delivery of Colorado River water to the region. The work was accomplished in coordination with the International Boundary and Water Commission and the Department of Water Resources in the United States, and the Comisión Nacional del Agua and the Comisión Estatal de Agua in Mexico.
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SANDAG and the San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO) are working together on a Regional Energy Strategy which will be included in the San Diego Regional Comprehensive Plan. The SDREO has created a Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council which includes SANDAG representation to assist in the strategy’s development.

THE REGION BY THE NUMBERS

SANDAG researchers, demographers, statisticians, and economists generate and analyze a wealth of demographic, economic, transportation, land use, environmental, and criminal justice information. This past year, SANDAG has been preparing the 2030 Cities/County Forecast. SANDAG has prepared these long-range forecasts of population, housing, and employment since the early 1970s. The forecasts are used as a resource by elected officials, planners, academics, and the public. Among other applications, the Preliminary 2030 Cities/County Forecast is the basis for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Both the RTP and the RCP will be updated using the most current forecast data available. SANDAG’s forecasts are developed with the close cooperation of the local planning directors and their staffs and through a collaborative effort with experts in demography, housing, the economy, and other disciplines.

In addition, SANDAG member agencies have access to this data and expertise through the Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program. Through the LTA program, SANDAG provides assistance to local agencies in their planning efforts and decision-making. In 2002, SANDAG completed 117 projects for local agencies including Geographic Information System (GIS) analyses, subarea transportation and housing studies, surveys, and environmental and general plan analysis.

PUBLIC SAFETY IS ALWAYS A PRIORITY

SANDAG’s Criminal Justice Research Division continues to be a resource for local communities to assist in the planning process for crime-fighting (prevention), public safety, and crime-reduction strategies. The Division functions as the Regional Criminal Justice Research Clearinghouse to compile and analyze crime and arrest trends and to provide historical and current crime and justice information for member agencies, law enforcement, and community organizations. The Division also offers independent and objective evaluation of specific programs geared to address crime, social, and quality of life issues in the region.

SANDAG publishes numerous comprehensive reports on many aspects of the justice system including domestic violence, juvenile arrests, drug abuse trends, resident opinion surveys, and regional crime statistics and trends.
Research projects conducted this year include the Arrestee Drug Assessment Monitoring Report; the Annual Arrest Report; and the Mid-Year Crime Report. Evaluation projects include San Diego County Probation’s and Sheriff’s Connections program for mentally ill offenders; Anti-Defamation League and Juvenile Court Pathways program to teach tolerance; Target Capacity Expansion – HIV Reduction Project; Replication of Effective Treatment for Methamphetamine Dependence; City of San Diego Needle Exchange Project; and several San Diego County Probation Departments juvenile justice prevention and intervention programs.

ENHANCING PLANNING ACROSS BORDERS

The SANDAG Borders Committee continues its commitment to enhanced borders planning with several initiatives underway among San Diego, Riverside, Imperial, and Orange Counties, and with Baja California and its municipalities. Future plans include completion of a borders visioning process to define infrastructure priorities and financing strategies. The Committee also will focus on the development of long-term strategies with the I-15 Interregional Partnership with Riverside County.

Last October, SANDAG held an informational exchange summit with the elected representatives of eight tribal governments. Participants learned how the tribal councils are organized and function as well as the tribes’ concerns regarding land use, economic, and transportation planning and the affects on Native American reservations. As a result of the summit, staff was directed to obtain additional information about the region’s tribes, consider designating a staff person as liaison to the tribes, and examine opportunities for closer coordination between the tribal governments and SANDAG. In addition, tribal government representatives encouraged SANDAG to take a position on the Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund (which SANDAG has done). Tribal council representatives and SANDAG Directors also agreed that additional summits would be mutually beneficial.

SANDAG also has initiated a three-year study on Binational Infrastructure Needs to determine the transportation infrastructure needs to adequately serve cross-border travel and trade. SANDAG will include border infrastructure, needs and financing as part of long-term planning efforts in both the in the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan.

SANDAG worked with transportation planning agencies in California and Baja California, to develop a San Diego Region-Baja California Cross-Border Travel Forecasting traffic model to assist in transportation infrastructure planning in the binational border region. The model will help local, state, and federal agencies on both sides of the border to plan highway, major roads, and other transportation infrastructure.
WORKING FOR A BETTER REGION

With a bold, regional agenda that challenges complacency and advances creativity, SANDAG has been empowered through its member agencies to turn planning concepts into realities. Those realities will translate into more travel choices for commuters, open space and habitat preservation, continued economic growth and diversity, sand on beaches, more types of housing that is affordable, safer communities, and the very best research and information to assist in making public policy.

HON. RON MORRISON
Chair, SANDAG Board of Directors
LEGISLATIVE UPDATE:
AB 361 (KEHOE) – SAN DIEGO
CONSOLIDATED TRANSPORTATION
AGENCY

Recommendation
It is my recommendation that the Board of Directors oppose AB 361 unless amended to be acceptable to SANDAG.

Introduction

Last year during the negotiations on SB 1703 (Peace) and AB 2095 (Kehoe) the Board proposed language that was originally incorporated into the bills that would have mandated, based on funding availability, the development and adoption of a Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). This was one of the cornerstones of the proposed legislation and had strong local agency support. Attachment 1 shows the language that the Board had proposed for inclusion in the legislation. During the last month of debate on the legislation it became apparent that interest groups sought to either control the provisions related to the RCP or have it eliminated from the bill in its entirety. In order to make sure that a bill sent to the Governor would be signed, Senator Peace and SANDAG agreed, though disappointed, to eliminate the provisions related to the RCP. Instead SANDAG has determined to voluntarily develop and adopt an RCP with funding assistance through Caltrans.

Assemblymember Kehoe has now introduced AB 361 (attachment 2) which would add the requirement for an RCP and other provisions to the responsibilities of SANDAG as the consolidated agency. Some of these mandates are those proposed by special interest groups last year that were determined unacceptable to SANDAG. It is disappointing that this bill has been introduced without any review or discussion with either the Board or staff. However, we look forward to working with Assemblymember Kehoe during the session to resolve any differences we may have.

Discussion

Unfunded state mandate

The bill proposes the RCP as an unfunded state mandate. It requires an RCP that will be updated concurrently with the Regional Transportation Plan (every three years). Other actions also are required of SANDAG. Funding would be dependent on seeking a claim from the State Board of Control.

Presumes the LAO will recommend a new governance structure and calls for a public vote.

The bill proposes that after the LAO report has been submitted to the Governor and the Legislature and before any legislative proposal stemming from its recommendations on how the consolidated agency governance structure should be structured; the recommendation shall first be approved by a public vote. This is obviously premature and ineffective. As proposed in the bill the public vote would be taken on a state oversight agency (LAO) recommendation, thereby by passing the Governor and Legislature for which the LAO report was intended.

Requires that the RTP be consistent with the RCP.

This requirement could subject the RTP to third party challenge on innumerable
grounds. In fact, the RTP should be incorporated as the transportation element of the RCP as is proposed by the Board. The RCP should be internally consistent.

The bill requires that the public collaborative planning process (which is undefined) recommendations shall be integrated into the draft plan to be recommended for adoption by June 2004. The consolidated agency shall respond to these recommendations made by the public collaborative process within 30 days.

A stakeholders group has already been assembled to advise the Regional Planning Committee on the development of the RCP. It is the job of staff and the Committee, on the advice of the stakeholders, to develop a draft plan for consideration by the Board and all local jurisdictions.

The components of the RCP are different and in a different order for study than those proposed by SANDAG.

The Regional Planning Committee and the SANDAG Board, with considerable public input, are defining the components of the initial RCP, with the draft scheduled for release in December 2003 and the adoption in June 2004.

In conclusion, an offer should be made to Assemblymember Kehoe to work with SANDAG to ensure that any legislation directed to the development and adoption of an RCP be endorsed by local agencies. The state should not usurp local control of this unique and important planning effort among the local governments in the San Diego region.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Debra Greenfield, (619) 595-5366; dgr@sandag.org
The attachments to the Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.
Introduction

At the January 24, 2003 meeting, the Board supported the request of the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) to use $5.6 million in TransNet funds for the purchase of right-of-way for the proposed Sabre Springs/Rancho Penasquitos station as part of the I-15 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. The TransNet funds were approved as a loan to replace the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) funds which were programmed for this project but are frozen pending resolution of the state budget issues. It is intended that reimbursement through the TCRP will be sought if future allocations are made under the program.

However, in the event that TCRP funds do not become available in the future, an amendment to the TransNet Ordinance also was discussed at the last meeting to allow for the permanent use of TransNet funds for this project. The Board unanimously approved the introduction of the TransNet Ordinance amendment at the January 24, 2003 meeting.

Discussion

The I-15 Managed Lane project includes four BRT stations along the 20 mile corridor between SR 163 and SR 78. This project facilitates the development of regional express transit services, as identified in the Regional Transit Vision (RTV) and the 2030 Mobility Plan. MTDB has identified the four stations to be purchased. The Sabre Springs’ Rancho Penasquitos station’s final environmental document was approved by the MTDB Board on October 31, 2002 and the MTDB staff was able to reach an agreed-upon purchase price with the property owners and open escrow on January 1, 2003. Funding for the right-of-way acquisition was to come from the TCRP funds allocated to the transit component of the I-15 Managed Lane project. However, at this time, the funding from the TCRP has been proposed for elimination to help address the state budget crisis at least through FY 2004.

The use of TransNet funds for this project is consistent with the original TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan which identified commuter express bus services such as the BRT to “…provide high quality transit services in those corridors where trolley or commuter rail extensions are not planned…and include a significant expansion of express services in the I-15 corridor between Escondido and downtown San Diego.” However, the Ordinance also specified that, of the TransNet funds used for...
public transit purposes, “Not less than eighty percent shall be used to implement the rail capital facilities identified in the Expenditure Plan.” The remaining twenty percent was to be expended for the reduced price monthly pass programs and other transit service improvements, such as the proposed I-15 express bus service improvements.

Because MTDB does not have sufficient funds remaining in its share of the “twenty percent” funds to cover the cost of the Sabre Springs/ Rancho Penasquitos station right-of-way acquisition, an amendment to the Ordinance is required to allow the project to be funded permanently from MTDB’s share of the “eighty percent” rail capital funds should the intended reimbursement of the TCRP funds not be possible. The Ordinance amendment broadens the “80% rail capital” description to include bus capital facilities required to support the express bus services in the I-15 corridor. This amended language allows for the use of TransNet funds for the Sabre Springs/ Rancho Penasquitos station, as well as other bus capital needs in the corridor in the future that could be subject to the same TCRP funding issues or other funding problems. Specific projects in the future would come before the Board as amendments to the TransNet Program of Projects in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Any use of funds for such bus capital projects would come from the unprogrammed balance in MTDB’s share of TransNet funds through the end of the program currently assumed for improvements in the Mid-Coast corridor.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment

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

No Budget Impact
ORDINANCE NO. CO-03-1

AN ORDINANCE OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AMENDING ORDINANCE CO-87-1
REVISING THE EXPENDITURE OF TRANSIT FUNDS

The SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ordains as follows:

Section 1. That Section 4B(2)(a) of Commission Ordinance 87-1 is hereby amended to read as follows:

“a. Not less than eighty percent shall be used to implement the rail capital facilities and the bus capital facilities required to support the express bus services in the I-15 corridor, as identified in the Expenditure Plan. However, in no case, shall the use of revenues under this section preclude the use of revenues necessary to implement Section 4B(2)(b).”

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the San Diego Regional Transportation Commission, State of California, on February 28, 2003 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

_______________________________________________________
Chairperson
San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission

Attest:

____________________________
(Signature)

____________________________
(Title)
MOBILITY 2030: DRAFT FINAL REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Recommendation
The Board of Directors is asked to review and comment on the Draft Final 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which incorporates the modifications to the Draft RTP approved by the Board at its January 24, 2003 meeting.

Introduction
The 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MOBILITY 2030, is the blueprint designed to address the mobility challenges created by our region’s growth. This long-range plan contains an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the transportation system in the San Diego region through the year 2030.

At its January 24, 2003 meeting, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved modifications to the 2030 RTP. The changes have been incorporated into the Draft Final 2030 RTP enclosed for Board review.

The Board is scheduled to certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), make a finding that the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP is in conformance with the State Implementation Plan for air quality, and adopt the Final 2030 RTP at its March 28, 2003 meeting.

Public Review and Comment
On October 25, 2002, the Draft 2030 RTP was released for public distribution and comment. On November 14, 2002, the Draft EIR was released for a 45-day public review period. A public hearing and three sub-regional workshops were held in December 2002 to facilitate public comment on the Draft 2030 RTP and the Draft EIR. The deadline for public comments on both documents was December 30, 2002. To date, more than 550 comments were received. These comments and the responses were presented to the Transportation Committee at their January 17, 2003 meeting.

Based on comments received during the public review period and updated cost estimates, minor changes were made to the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario on which MOBILITY 2030 is based and the Revenue Constrained Plan. The changes to the Project (MOBILITY 2030) did not result in any new significant impacts that were not previously identified in the Draft EIR, and therefore, the Draft EIR was not re-circulated for an additional public review period. The Plan changes will be reflected in the Final EIR that will be presented to the Board of Directors at its March 28, 2003 meeting.

Funding Scenarios
The 2030 RTP includes three basic funding scenarios: (1) the $30 billion Revenue Constrained plan required by federal regulations; (2) the preferred $42 billion Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario; and (3) a $67 billion Unconstrained Revenue scenario, which identifies the funding needed to fully implement all of the programs, projects, and services envisioned for 2030.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Endorse
Key Staff Contact: Kim Kawada, (619) 595-5394; kka@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #8.01

Note: Hard copies of the Draft Final 2030 RTP have been mailed to Board Members and Alternates, City Managers, and key staff. A copy of the Draft Final may be obtained from the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org, or by contacting the SANDAG Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.
HOUSING TRUST FUNDS

Introduction

At SANDAG’s Policy meeting on housing, the Board recommended that staff return with information about housing trust funds and potential regional funding sources. Housing trust funds are distinct funds established by cities, counties, and states that permanently dedicate a source of public revenue to support the production and preservation of affordable housing. Housing trust funds are created to provide decent, affordable housing to those most in need. They are used for a variety of housing activities for low and very low income households, including new construction, preservation of existing housing, emergency repairs, homeless shelters, and housing-related services.¹

Housing trust funds are not a new idea nor experimental. The first housing trust fund was created in the 1970s, but their widespread growth didn’t occur until the 1990s, when federal funds for affordable housing had dramatically diminished, from $71.2 billion in 1978 to $16.3 billion in 1997. Today there are over 275 housing trust funds in cities, counties, and states throughout the U.S. More than $500 million is spent for affordable housing through housing trust funds every year and this amount is increasing. On average, for every $1 committed to a housing project by a housing trust fund, another $5-10 is leveraged in other public and private resources. Hundreds of thousands of housing units have been supported through housing trust funds.

¹ Note: The majority of trust fund information in this report was taken from Housing Trust Fund Progress Report 2002: Local Responses to America’s Housing Needs, a report by the nonprofit Center for Community Change’s Housing Trust Fund Project.

The Time is Right for Housing Trust Funds

Affordable housing is essential to our region’s prosperity. Because of the State’s budget crisis, it is more important than ever to secure a guaranteed, reliable source of funding to develop this housing. Recognizing this need, Proposition 46, which was passed on November 5, 2002, provides $25 million in matching grants to local housing trust funds, providing a strong incentive for jurisdictions to start their own housing trust fund. Of this $25 million, $10 million will be awarded to jurisdictions with trust funds that were started after January 1, 2003.

Additionally, there is a national housing trust fund effort that, if successful, would support the production of new housing units for low income households. The National Housing Trust Fund would be funded by profits generated by federal housing programs, and could include a matching component as well. Thus, local housing trust funds could help bring more state and federal funding to our region.

Benefits of Housing Trust Funds

Trust funds are characterized by flexibility and innovation. They have been established in small towns of 1,000 people and large states, and they have been structured in different ways to fit local circumstances and take advantage of unique opportunities. Because they are created locally, housing trust funds are seen as the most flexible funding source available to jurisdictions; they are not restricted by federal and state regulations except to the degree that they are used in conjunction with these revenue sources.

The most concrete benefit of housing trust funds is the permanent dedication of public
resources to a public need that requires ongoing funds. Benefits of this stability include:

Effective planning: An ongoing source of revenue enables long range planning by developers as well as government policy makers in addressing the most critical housing needs that exist within a jurisdiction.

Coordinating and leveraging resources: A secure source of funding enables scarce resources to be coordinated and leveraged with numerous public and private sources of funding. Additionally, as affordable housing is typically developed using multiple sources of often oversubscribed funds, local trust funds are often used to close funding gaps.

Productive use of resources: An ongoing source of public revenue provides security in funding affordable housing programs and projects. This, in turn, reduces or eliminates the need for annual or biennial budget battles to determine priorities for allocating scarce resources, enabling these resources to be spent in the most productive ways.

Innovation and flexibility: A sustained source of funding for affordable housing enables developers and policy makers to be innovative in their approach to addressing tough housing needs, enabling the kind of flexibility that good housing development often requires.

Funding Sources

Identifying public revenue sources to commit on an ongoing basis to a local housing trust fund is the most challenging aspect of their creation. A variety of revenue sources are available to cities, counties, or states because each controls different taxes and fees. Revenue opportunities vary from state to state and from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Attachment 1 lists the sources of revenue that have been used by cities and counties nationwide.

The most common revenue source for county housing trust funds is the document recording fee. Other sources include sales taxes, developer fees, and real estate excise taxes. The most common revenue source for city housing trust funds is a commercial linkage fee: impact fees placed on non-residential developers to offset the impact of their development on the housing market. Other cities have committed other developer fees, inclusionary zoning in-lieu fees, property taxes, and hotel/motel taxes.

Housing Trust Fund Working Group

On October 31, 2002, SANDAG’s Regional Housing Task Force held a workshop on housing trust funds. Representatives from Los Angeles, Sacramento, the City of San Diego, and San Luis Obispo discussed their housing trust funds and housing trust fund efforts. As follow up to the workshop a Housing Trust Fund Working Group, made up of interested members of the Regional Housing Task Force, was formed to discuss trust fund strategies for the region.

The Working Group discussed several options for increasing the use of housing trust funds in the San Diego region:

- Increase the number of local housing trust funds: Encouraging local jurisdictions to start their own housing trust funds, and providing them with technical assistance in developing and administering these funds, could greatly increase the amount of funding for affordable housing development in the San Diego region.
- Form multi-jurisdictional trust funds: Multi-jurisdictional trust funds can encompass a city and county or unite more than one city. This can provide more opportunities for potential revenue and for leveraging available resources. It can also reduce administrative costs for smaller cities.
- Form a regional housing trust fund: The benefits of a regional housing trust fund are greater revenue potential and reduced competition between cities.

Surveying Local Jurisdictions

After reviewing these options, the Housing Trust Fund Working Group recommended that SANDAG work with local jurisdictions to determine the potential for implementing trust funds. This step would allow the programs to be customized to fit individual jurisdiction needs. SANDAG staff will be available to make trust fund presentations to...
City Councils and the Board of Supervisors. The key questions that need to be addressed are:

- Is the jurisdiction interested in developing a trust fund?
- What is the jurisdiction’s capacity to administer a housing trust fund?
- Would the jurisdiction be willing to participate in multi-jurisdictional or regional efforts?
- What is the potential for implementing a commercial linkage fee, and how much could be raised through such a fee?
- Does the jurisdiction have other potential funding sources that could be developed and contributed to affordable housing?

Attachment 2 is a Housing Trust Fund fact sheet developed by the Working Group to assist SANDAG with its outreach efforts.

Integrating a Trust Fund Strategy into the Regional Comprehensive Plan

After gathering information from the Cities and County, the Housing Trust Fund Working Group will propose a specific strategy for encouraging and expanding local, multi-jurisdictional and/or regional trust funds to the Regional Housing Task Force and the Regional Planning Committee. If the proposal is approved, this strategy could be included in the housing element of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). By integrating the trust fund strategy into the RCP, SANDAG would have the opportunity to tie incentives to the development of these innovative funding strategies. Additionally, the RCP could include methods to provide credit toward meeting affordable housing goals to those jurisdictions that contribute funds to assist in meeting the region’s affordable housing needs.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments (2)

Key Staff Contact: Rebecca Davis, (619) 595-5344; rda@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #5.02
Housing Trust Fund Revenue Sources

City Trust Fund Revenue Sources

- Transit occupancy tax
- Business license tax
- Property tax
- Sales tax
- Real estate transfer tax
- Use tax
- Housing excise tax
- Redevelopment tax increment
- Sale of city-owned land
- City-owned parking revenues
- Settlement funds

City Trust Fund Revenue Sources

- CDBG loan repayments
- Bond revenues
- Interest from accounts held
- Housing Fees
- General fund or city corporate funds
- Linkage fees
- Inclusionary zoning fees
- Developer proffers
- Density bonuses
- Condo conversion Fees

County Trust Fund Revenue Sources

- Document recording fees
- Sale of county owned land
- Real estate transfer tax
- Developer fees
- Condo conversion fees

County Trust Fund Revenue Sources

- Sales tax
- Food and beverage tax
- Non-residential impact fees
- Loan repayments
- General funds
Housing trust funds provide a secure and sensible way to fund needed housing. Safe, affordable housing is essential to the health of every community and every community deserves the kind of funding a housing trust fund can promise.

What is a housing trust fund?

Housing trust funds are distinct funds established by cities, counties and states that permanently dedicate a source of public revenue to support the production and preservation of affordable housing.

Housing trust funds are created to provide decent, affordable housing to those most in need.

What are housing trust funds used for?

Housing trust funds support a variety of housing activities for low and very low income households, including new construction, preservation of existing housing, emergency repairs, homeless shelters, and housing-related services.

The Region’s Housing Crisis

San Diego is the 8th least affordable housing market in the nation.

A minimum wage earner would have to work 125 hours a week to afford the fair market rent on a 2 bedroom apartment.

The median home price for a resale single family home is $353,000

How many housing trust funds are there?

There are currently over 275 housing trust funds in cities, counties, and states throughout the U.S.

How effective are housing trust funds?

More than $500 million is spent for affordable housing through housing trust funds every year and this amount is increasing. On average, for every $1 committed to a housing project by a housing trust fund, another $5-10 is leveraged in other public and private resources. Hundreds of thousands of housing units have been supported through housing trust funds.

Because they are created locally, housing trust funds are seen as the most flexible funding source available to jurisdictions.

Funding Sources for Housing Trust Funds

| Revenue sources vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Common revenue sources include: |
| Real Estate Transfer Taxes |
| Commercial Linkage Fees |
| Inclusionary In-Lieu Fees |
| Property Taxes |
| Hotel/Motel Taxes |
| Document Recording Fees |
| Business License Tax |
Trust Fund Success Stories

Los Angeles, California
In 2002, L.A. Mayor James Hahn announced the creation of a $100 million housing trust fund for the City of L.A., the largest trust fund in the U.S. Revenue sources include: increasing redevelopment set-aside funds for housing; revenue from bus stop advertising; general fund revenue; tobacco settlement funds, city business tax; and hotel occupancy tax. The trust fund will be used to provide rental housing to households earning 80% or less of the area median income and homeownership housing to those earning no more than the area median income.

Seattle, Washington
Seattle's housing trust fund will provide $86 million over the next seven years to support needed housing throughout the city. The fund, which consists of a property tax levy that costs homeowners about $49 per year, pays for construction of low income apartments, emergency aid for renters in danger of eviction, and subsidies for first time homebuyers. The majority of the fund serves the poorest Seattle residents, who earn 30 percent or less of area median income.

San Diego, California
The City of San Diego’s housing trust fund receives funding from commercial linkage fees - fees charged to non-residential developers. Since its inception in 1990, the trust fund has invested over $53 million in San Diego communities, and leveraged an additional $500 million. To date, the fund has helped develop, rehabilitate, and purchase over 6,000 units, and has supported about 450 transitional shelter beds annually.

Boulder, Colorado
Boulder’s combines its housing trust fund with a number of other funding sources (including HOME funds, CDBG funds, and inclusionary in-lieu fees) to fund a variety of housing projects and programs. Currently the program has approximately $3.1 million available. Applicants only have to submit one application to receive any of the funds, which reduces administrative time and costs.

SANDAG and Housing Trust Funds
The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is working with its Regional Housing Task Force to encourage the development of housing trust funds throughout the San Diego region.

If you would like to learn more about housing trust funds, and SANDAG’s trust fund activities, please contact Rebecca Davis at 619-595-5344, or rda@sandag.org