

From: [PIO](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board](#)
Cc: [McCormack, Irene](#)
Subject: FW: Airport Transit Center
Date: Thursday, October 24, 2019 3:54:12 PM

From: Jeff Stenberg <jeffsdiego@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2019 3:38 PM
To: PIO <PIO@sandag.org>
Subject: Airport Transit Center

Proposed airport transit center would be a huge waste of money. It would add a transfer point and increase time required to get to the airport. Money should be spent on freeway corridor trolley lines and branch bus lines. I use the trolley and bus every day. Getting to the airport is no problem. Travelers with light luggage can easily use trolley and bus to get to the airport. Travelers with a lot of luggage do not use public transit and will not use an airport transit center.

Lloyd Cook
From: [Lloyd Cook](#)
To: [Lero, Tessa](#)
Subject: Re: Opposition to Mr. Ikhata's Grand Vision
Date: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 7:42:38 PM

,

Please provide my comments to the entire Board.

,

From: Lloyd Cook <lcook1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 1:35 PM
To: Lero, Tessa <Tessa.Lero@sandag.org>
Subject: Opposition to Mr. Ikhata's Grand Vision

Steve Vaus via Tessa Lero,

I am opposed to Mr. Ikhata's plan to not add lanes to SR67. I live in the City of San Diego and see the need and value of adding lanes to SR67 as the SANDAG Board of Directors intend. His plan is not aligned with the needs of San Diego County as a whole. Adding lanes aids in times of evacuation and during times when those in the city visit the beauty of east San Diego County. If in his statement that if his plan was not accepted he had no problem going home, well I say have a pleasant trip home.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Cook

From: [Gonzales, Jessica](#)
To: [Cox, Elizabeth](#); [McCormack, Irene](#); [Meier, Antoinette](#); [Clementson, Coleen](#); [Wood, Allison](#)
Cc: [Clerk of the Board](#)
Subject: RE: Transit:: Door Number 3 (Letter to the Editor)
Date: Monday, October 28, 2019 8:19:45 AM

From: Mary Ann Horton
Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2019 4:19:01 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: letters@sduniontribune.com
Cc: SDFORWARD
Subject: Transit:: Door Number 3

Should we spend billions on more freeways or high speed trains? In pondering this dilemma, SANDAG offers a third choice.

Imagine a fleet of self-driving shared electric Ubers, priced at much less than the cost per mile of a private vehicle. Click your phone and it delivers you door to door, but you share with other riders. 4 passenger cars or 9 passenger vans. Even if the average occupancy is only 2, the roads are only half as full. No parking required at home or work. No need for car payments, insurance, repairs, gas, drivers licenses, traffic tickets. The young, elderly, drunk, and suburban travel as easily as anyone. No "Mom's taxi" required. No construction cost – they use existing roads.

SANDAG invited Professor Daniel Sperling from UC Davis to present this recently. It's a great idea! I hope they are evaluating it.

Mary Ann Horton

Poway

From: [PIO](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board](#)
Subject: FW: City of Encinitas
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2019 10:38:03 AM

From: S. Graydon Carter <pbilliege@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, November 4, 2019 11:07 AM
Subject: City of Encinitas

Encinitas finalizes housing element update

by [Aaron Burgin](#) March 28, 2019 0414

ENCINITAS — The Encinitas City Council cast its final vote on its long-anticipated affordable housing plan on Wednesday night, a few days after a Superior Court judge rejected a last-ditch effort by residents to intervene on two lawsuits related to the plan.

The council unanimously adopted the second reading of its plan at its March 27 meeting.

It includes several controversial recommendations from state housing department officials, including:

- Raising the maximum building heights from 33 feet for a flat roof and 37 feet for a pitched roof to 35 feet and 39 feet, respectively.
- Changing where building heights are measured from.
- The inclusion of parking lots, driveways and drive aisles in calculating the project's density — which could result in additional "bonus" housing.
- Eliminating sections from the city code aimed at requiring developers who propose super-dense projects to conform to the surrounding neighborhood and provide public benefits beyond the statutory requirements.
- The elimination of any subjective language from the update. "HCD directed that all standards must be objective in nature, containing no subjectivity," according to the staff report.

State Housing Element law requires cities to provide enough housing to meet the needs of all its residents, from very-low income earners to above-moderate ones. Encinitas is the only city in San Diego County that lacks a state-certified plan, known as a housing element, and is under a court order to enact one by April 11. The city has been subject to multiple lawsuits, by both the building industry and affordable housing advocates, because of its lack of a housing element. Voters rejected the city's most recent attempts at passing a housing plan in 2016 and 2018, which prompted a judge to give the city 120 days to adopt a plan.

The housing element now goes to state housing officials who must approve it before the April 11 deadline.

At Wednesday's meeting, seven people spoke, all chiding the council for taking the step and urging them to reconsider.

Former Mayor Sheila Cameron said that current Mayor Catherine Blakespear was leaving a legacy of being tone deaf to residents' concerns about increased density, building heights and other changes to city codes that she and opponents feel would damage the character of the community. Donna Westbrook, who frequently opines on city issues, said that the proposed housing element was a "developer's wish list."

One of their biggest concerns was that the city was seeking the courts to invalidate Proposition A, which requires a public vote on future housing elements and other major zone or land use changes citywide, for future housing elements.

Councilman Tony Kranz said the city tried its best to balance neighborhood concerns with the fact that it was under court order to adopt a plan.

Kranz, speaking about additions that the Housing and Community Development Department recommended be added to the housing element in February, said the city didn't have great options.

"That's the frustration of being in a position in which we have a lot of terrible choices," Kranz said. "When we put the parcels before HCD, not only did they approve the parcels, they put a long list of things that they wanted.

"Donna (Westbrook) referred to it as a 'developer's dream list' and I can't disagree because these were all things developers wanted," Kranz said. "But because of the court order we didn't have a whole lot of choice."

Judge Robert Dahlquist recently also ruled against a request by a citizens group called Preserve Proposition A to intervene in the two active lawsuits.

Dahlquist ruled March 15 that the group's request was very late in the court proceedings and would unnecessarily delay the resolution of the lawsuits. "Now, after the merits of the lawsuit have been fully adjudicated, (the group) wants to jump into the fray and re-litigate the case all over again," Dahlquist wrote in his decision denying the intervener request. "There is no good reason for the court to allow this to happen, and there are very compelling reasons not to allow it to happen."

[Aaron Burgin](#)

Seems the courts care little for allowing its citizens to govern themselves as the above supports this view.

Theodore Roosevelt,

"I believe that the initiative and referendum should be used, not as substitutes for representative government, but as methods of making such government really representative. Action by the initiative and referendum ought not to be the normal way of legislation; but the power to take it should be provided in the constitution, so that if the representatives fail truly to represent the people on some matter of sufficient importance to rouse popular interest, then the people shall have in their hand the facilities to make good the failure."

Theodore Roosevelt, "A Charter for Democracy," speech to the Ohio State Constitutional Convention, February 21, 1912.