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BOARD OF DIRECTORS AGENDA
Friday, December 19, 2003

ITEM #  RECOMMENDATION

+1.  APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 21, 2003 MEETING MINUTES  APPROVE

2.  ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

3.  PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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 completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Board members may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CONSENT ITEMS (4 through 9)

+4.  ACTIONS BY POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES  APPROVE

+5.  FINAL 2030 CITIES/COUNTY FORECAST (Paul Kavanaugh)  APPROVE

Last month the Board discussed the Final 2030 Cities/County Forecast, which is the baseline view of the future for the Regional Comprehensive Plan. This forecast reflects the likely distribution of growth to jurisdictions and other areas within the region based on the currently adopted land use plans and policies of the 18 cities and the most recent information from the County of San Diego’s general plan update (GP2020). The Board is being asked to approve the Final 2030 Cities/County Forecast for use in planning and other purposes.

+6.  FINAL ARJIS/SANDAG CONSOLIDATION PLAN (Mayor Art Madrid, ARJIS Board Chair; Pam Scanlon, ARJIS Executive Director)  APPROVE

This action would approve the final ARJIS/SANDAG Consolidation Plan, including the necessary policy and legal actions to consolidate Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) within SANDAG, contingent upon supporting actions by the JPA jurisdictions, and the formation of a policy advisory committee on Public Safety to cover both ARJIS and criminal justice functions.

+7.  2004 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM (Ellen Roundtree)  APPROVE

The Executive Committee has reviewed the proposed federal and state legislative program for the upcoming year and recommends its approval.
+ 8. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE (Julie Wiley) ACCEPT FOR DISTRIBUTION

The attached Proposed Amendment to Conflict of Interest Code reflects necessary updates to the list of designated positions subject to filing annual economic disclosure statements and the financial disclosure categories applicable to such designated positions. The County of San Diego is SANDAG’s code reviewing body pursuant to Government Code section 87306.5. The Board is asked to accept the Notice and Proposed Amendment for distribution. Following the comment period and approval by the Board at a subsequent meeting, the amended Conflict of Interest Code will be sent to the County of San Diego for review.

+ 9. REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM FOR FY 2005 (Rob Rundle) APPROVE

Approval of this item would continue the regional shoreline monitoring program that has been conducted since 1996. The monitoring program provides data to measure the impacts of beach erosion over time and documents the benefits of sand replenishment.

CHAIR’S REPORT

10. PRESENTATION OF AWARD OF RECOGNITION TO SENATOR DENISE MORENO DUCHENY FOR PASSAGE OF SB 491

Senator Denise Ducheny authored and secured the passage of Senate Bill 491. This important legislation extends the housing element deadline for cities and counties by one year. This will allow SANDAG and the local jurisdictions to coordinate planning efforts in conjunction with the development of the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

REPORTS

+ 11. TIME CERTAIN 10 A.M.: DRAFT REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) (Mayor Lori Holt-Pfeiler, Chair, Regional Planning Committee) ACCEPT FOR DISTRIBUTION

The Regional Planning Committee unanimously recommended that the SANDAG Board accept the Regional Comprehensive Plan for distribution. The staff recommends a sixty day review period. The Board’s consideration of the certification of EIR and approval of the Plan tentatively is scheduled for the Board meeting in June 2004.

+ 12. MID-COAST LRT ALIGNMENT SELECTION AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY (Major Joe Kellejian, Chair, Transportation Committee) APPROVE

Updated alignment analyses in the UCSD/University City area for the Mid-Coast light rail transit (LRT) project have been conducted to address changing land uses and travel patterns in the area and to respond to renewed interest in directly serving UCSD and University Town Center shopping center. This report provides the Transportation Committee’s recommendation to adopt a new alignment for the area and lays out next steps for moving the project through the federal funding process and toward implementation.
+13. **PUBLIC HEARING: FREEWAY DEFICIENCY PLAN: CENTRAL INTERSTATE 5 CORRIDOR (Michael Hix)**

SANDAG, Caltrans, National City, and the City of San Diego have prepared a Freeway Deficiency Plan for the Central Interstate 5 Corridor that identifies improvements and an implementation plan to alleviate freeway congestion. The Plan was adopted by the two city councils and is now before the Board for final acceptance. The environmental impact report for the new Padres ballpark requires that the Plan be accepted by the SANDAG Board before the Certificate of Occupancy for the ballpark facility is issued by the City of San Diego.

+14. **REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION (Mayor Pro Tem Ramona Finnila, Chair, Energy Task Force)**

The Executive Committee will present the recommendations, developed by its Energy Task Force, for implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy (RES), approved in July 2003. The Board is asked to establish the Energy Working Group to report to the Regional Planning Committee. This working group will advise SANDAG on the implementation of the RES, advocate for the RES implementation at state and federal levels, and seek funds to conduct these activities.

15. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next business meeting of the Board of Directors will take place on Friday, January 23, 2004.

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
November 21, 2003

Chairman Ron Morrison called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: A motion and second were made to approve the minutes as presented from the October 24, 2003, Board of Directors meeting. Yes – 14 (weighted vote, 94%), No – 0 (weighted vote, 2%), Abstain – 1 (City of Encinitas), Absent – 5 (Cities of Coronado, Oceanside, San Diego, Santee, and the County of San Diego).

2. ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

None.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

Mayor Dick Murphy (City of San Diego) introduced to the Board San Diego’s recently appointed Police Chief, Bill Lansdowne. Chief Lansdowne was the Chief of Police for San Jose, California, prior to accepting his post in San Diego. Chief Lansdowne thanked Mayor Murphy for the introduction, and stated that he looks forward to associating with SANDAG in the future.

Mayor Joe Kellejian (City of Solana Beach) stated that Solana Beach, in an unprecedented decision, has banned smoking on its 1.4 miles of public beach.

Deputy Mayor Maggie Houlihan (City of Encinitas) reported that there will be a dedication ceremony for the new Veteran’s War Memorial at Cottonwood Park, Encinitas, on December 7, 2003, at 1:00 p.m. The ceremony will include a 21-gun salute and live music. Members of the Board and public were encouraged to attend.

Councilmember Patricia McCoy (City of Imperial Beach) related her recent experiences while riding the Trolley last week from South County to attend SANDAG’s U.S. Visit meeting. She stated that she found the conditions on the Trolley to be very bad with regard to safety, cleanliness, timeliness, seat space, and comfort. Councilmember McCoy explained how during her trip she waited over an hour for the Trolley to arrive, therefore arriving quite late for her meeting. She experienced much discomfort due to the narrow, ill-padded seating. She also experienced having a large individual who was involved in a physical conflict with another individual fall onto her lap while she was seated. She then nearly sat in filth left
behind on a seat by a previous passenger. She stated that taking the Trolley is unusual for her, so consider what the worker who rides it daily must experience. Improving the quality of Trolley ridership needs to remain a top priority.

Chair Morrison commented on two items he wished to share with the Board and the public:

- First, an invitation to a train tour of the Carrizo Gorge and Goat Canyon Trestle to celebrate the reopening of the San Diego and Arizona Eastern rail link. The train tour will be held December 6, 2003, beginning at 12:30 p.m.

- Second, a letter thanking Jeff Tayman, SANDAG's Technical Services Director, from Incident Commander John R. Hawkins of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. The letter thanked Mr. Tayman and SANDAG staff for providing outstanding GIS and mapping support to Command Team 5 during the Cedar Fire.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a resident of San Diego County, representing disabled transit users, stated that more funding is needed for wheelchair/disabled transit access.

4. **CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9 CONCERNING STATE ROUTE (SR) 76 CONSTRUCTION CLAIMS**

Conference with Legal Counsel – Pending Litigation, C.A. Rasmussen, Inc., v. California Department of Transportation (Case No. A-0035-00)

Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation, Potential initiation of litigation against C.A. Rasmussen, Inc. (one case)

Chair Morrison called the meeting into closed session at 9:40 a.m. The meeting was reconvened into open session at 10:30 a.m.

General Counsel reported out of closed session that the Board has given settlement authority within a specified range to the Executive Director for the upcoming mediation with Rasmussen. The Board has authorized staff to pursue legal action against Rasmussen under the False Claims Act.

CONSENT ITEMS (5 through 13)

5. **ACTIONS BY POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

6. **ANNUAL MEETING CALENDAR**

The Board of Directors was presented with the meeting calendars for the Board and the Policy Advisory Committees for the upcoming year.

7. **FY 2004 OWP/BUDGET AMENDMENTS**

The Executive Committee has recommended that the Board of Directors approve the following budget amendments:
1. Accept $130,000 from the U.S. Department of Education, (2) increase the Highway Development Plan by $650,000 to conduct the value pricing study for the Interstate 5 (I-5) North Coast/high occupancy vehicle (HOV) Managed Lane Project, (3) increase Regional Transportation Performance Monitoring by $200,000 to expand the capabilities of the Regional Performance Monitoring system, and (4) increase Transportation Planning for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities by $141,750.

8. FY 2005 BUDGET CALENDAR

Staff reported that the Executive Committee has recommended to the Board of Directors that the SANDAG Bylaws be changed to require budget adoption by June 30, instead of the current July 1 date.

9. FY 2004 DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PROGRAM

Federal regulations require all recipients of funds from the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) to develop DBE programs with specific project goals. The draft program is pending approval by Caltrans and, with Board approval, will be distributed for public comment.

10. PROPOSED NEW BOARD POLICIES

Over the last two months, staff has provided six proposed policies to the Transportation Committee for review and comment. The Transportation Committee recommended approval of all six policies. If approved by the Board, they will become new SANDAG Board Policies.

11. SAN DIEGO AND ARIZONA EASTERN (SD&AE) RAILWAY REOPENING ACTIVITIES (RESOLUTION #2004-07)

The Carrizo Gorge Railway is completing repairs to reopen the rail link between San Diego and Imperial Valley. To assist in the reopening and to prepare a business plan for the Railway, the Transportation Committee recommends to the SANDAG Board that it authorize the Executive Director to accept up to $1.6 million of Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) demonstration funds, amend the FY 2004 Overall Work Program and Budget, and contract for consultant services related to reopening the SD&AE Railway.

12. PROGRESS REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS (INFORMATION)

Staff presented a report on 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.

13. QUARTERLY INVESTMENT REPORT — PERIOD ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2003

As required by State law, the Board was presented with a quarterly report of investments held by SANDAG.
Action: A motion and second was made to approve Consent Items 5 through 13. Yes - 17. No - 0. Abstain - 0. Absent - 2 (County of San Diego and City of Santee).

CHAIR’S REPORT

14. FINAL 2030 CITIES/COUNTY GROWTH FORECAST

Staff reported that the Final 2030 Cities/County Growth Forecast is the baseline view of the future for the first Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). It shows an increase for the San Diego region of one million persons, 439,000 jobs, and 314,000 housing units. The forecast reflects the likely distribution of this growth to jurisdictions and other areas within the region based on the currently adopted land use plans and policies of the 18 cities, and the most recent information from the County of San Diego’s general plan update (GP2020) for unincorporated areas. This final forecast updates the Preliminary 2030 Regional Growth Forecast approved by the Board in October 2002. This update incorporates an extensive review by local agencies, recent releases of 2000 census information, and a revised national economic forecast. The Final 2030 Regional Growth Forecast will be brought back for Board approval at next month’s meeting.

Gail Goldberg (City of San Diego) commented about the process of planning for 2030. Ms. Goldberg expressed her gratitude for the excellent work done to date on the project.

Mayor Phil Monroe (City of Coronado) presented a chart on the job/housing ratio of individual areas.

15. PRESENTATION OF AWARD OF RECOGNITION TO SENATOR DENISE MORENO DUCHENY FOR PASSAGE OF SB 491

This activity was postponed until the next meeting.

16. ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (AMPO) NATIONAL PLANNING AWARD (INFORMATION)

Mayor Mary Sessom (City of Imperial Beach) reported that during the AMPO annual conference last month, she was honored to accept on behalf of SANDAG the AMPO Award for Technical Merit in Metropolitan Planning for the publication, Planning and Designing for Pedestrians. Mayor Sessom circulated the award for the Board’s review.

17. Chair Morrison introduced and welcomed to the Board of Directors the new SANDAG Board Member, Barry Jantz. Mr. Jantz will represent the City of La Mesa as its regular member.
REPORTS

18. 2004 ANNUAL RETREAT

Staff reported that the Executive Committee has scheduled the 2004 Annual Retreat for Wednesday afternoon, all day Thursday, and Friday morning, January 28, 29, and 30, 2004, in the desert community of Borrego Springs. The primary objective of the retreat is to afford participants the opportunity to discuss strategies for some of the agency’s regional policies and programs. From these retreat discussions, participants can develop ideas for the future direction of the agency.

The Executive Committee is recommending three major topics to serve as the foundation of the retreat: agency consolidation, funding for TransNet, and the draft Regional Comprehensive Plan, with extra focus on public transit. Invitations for the Retreat will be sent out in Mid-December.

Action: A motion and second was made to approve the 2004 Annual Retreat. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – 1 (County of San Diego).

19. COBRO ANNUAL REPORT AND CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Elsa Saxod, Chair of the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO), presented to the Board the annual report of COBRO and the recommendations from the 2003 Summer Conference. She stated that the next conference will most likely be held in July 2004.

Action: A motion and second was made to approve the COBRO Annual Report and Conference Recommendations. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – 1 (County of San Diego).

20. DRAFT FINAL ARJIS/SANDAG CONSOLIDATION PLAN

Mayor Art Madrid, Chair of the ARJIS Board, reported that since April 2003 the consolidation of the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) into SANDAG has been pursued by the ARJIS/SANDAG Consolidation Committee. The specific working group is composed of members from the ARJIS Board and the Chief’s/Sheriff’s Management Committee. The Draft Final Consolidation Plan has been reviewed by the Consolidation Committee, the ARJIS Board, and the SANDAG Executive Committee. Significant modifications to the ARJIS joint powers agency (JPA) include the creation of a SANDAG Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee (PSPAC) that will replace the current ARJIS Board and Executive Committee. ARJIS consolidation also requires changes to a SANDAG Policy Advisory Committee policy to allow voting rights to nonelected officials serving on the PSPAC. The final plan will be brought back for Board approval at next month’s meeting. The Board is being asked to direct staff to docket for approval the new ARJIS JPA on the agenda of each city council and the County Board of Supervisors. In addition, the Board is being asked to work with the law enforcement agencies, which will appoint representatives to the proposed Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee subject to Board approval, and on approval of the revised ARJIS JPA by member jurisdictions.
He stated that on Page 21, Section 3.1, the last sentence, a modification was made on the issue of subcommittees, to read: “The management subcommittee may now appoint advisory members.”

Mayor Madrid congratulated Board members and SANDAG staff on their excellent work to date, and thanked them for their participation.

21. RESULTS OF COMMUNITY BASED OUTREACH, REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (City of Escondido) reported on the five local low-income, minority, and disabled community-based organizations who received grants from SANDAG to conduct outreach and secure input for the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The input received from these communities has been incorporated into the draft RCP, which will be presented to the Board at its December 19, 2003, meeting.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler introduced representatives from three of the outreach grant recipient organizations, who presented the following comments:

Ms. Irene Linayo Putman of the Union of Pan Asian Communities stated that the outreach grants greatly helped to increase the number and diversity of Asian groups participating in the public process. She expressed her gratitude that the Pan Asian community was able to contribute its voice to this cause.

Mr. Bob Eagleman of Able-Disabled Advocacy stated that he and his organization took pride in being involved with the focus group process on behalf of the disabled and tribal communities. The process was very helpful in providing input to SANDAG on the difficulty persons with disabilities and those in remote communities have in accessing transit to get into the city, specifically for job interviews.

Mr. Rob Howard, Chairman of the North San Diego County Chapter of the NAACP stated that the outreach program was aligned with the issues of underserved communities. His chapter was able to solicit input from African-American and Hispanic residents during community events and at other regularly scheduled community events. The organization made hundreds of phone calls to encourage participation at the SANDAG public workshop in Oceanside. He urged the SANDAG Board to continue to strengthen the connection between larger, better-funded organizations and smaller community organizations.

22. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next business meeting of the Board of Directors will take place on Friday, December 19, 2003, immediately followed by the Board’s holiday luncheon and annual photos. There will be no Policy Board meeting on December 5, 2003.

Chair Morrison also mentioned that the first two weeks of January is the time for selection of Board and Policy Advisory Committee members. There will be a letter going out this week to the Board to explain the selection process.
23. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Secretary

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Ramona Finnila (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Steve Padilla (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Richard Earnest (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Mark Lewis (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Maggie Houlahan (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt Pfeiler (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Barry Jantz (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison, Chair (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Terry Johnson (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Mickey Cafagna, Vice Chair (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Dick Murphy (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Corky Smith (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Joe Kellejian (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Morris Vance (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Ron Roberts (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ADVISORY MEMBERS LISTED BELOW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Bill Figue (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>Leon Williams (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Victor Carrillo (Member)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>CAPT Christopher Schanze (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Unified Port District</td>
<td>Jess Van Deventer (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD County Water Authority</td>
<td>Bud Lewis (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California/Mexico</td>
<td>Rodulfo Figueroa Aramoni</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following actions were taken by the Policy Advisory Committees since the last Board meeting. Actions printed in bold typeface must be ratified by the Board of Directors to be effective.

**Regional Planning Committee**
(December 5, 2003)

This meeting was cancelled.

**Executive Committee**
(December 5, 2003)

The Executive Committee took the following actions:

- **Approved additional consolidation of the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Web site function with SANDAG Web site services.**

- **Approved a SourcePoint resolution accepting affiliation with the Coordinated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA) and transferring Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4.5 funds to finance the services of CTSA.**

The Executive Committee also recommended that the following actions be taken by the Board of Directors:

- Approve the 2004 Legislative Program and forward the list of projects to the Transportation Committee.

- Approve the five recommendations of the Energy Task Force:

  1. SANDAG assume the responsibility for coordination of the implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy as described in the Energy Task Force findings.

  2. Continue the November 7, 2003, Executive Committee authorizations: (a) for the Energy Task Force to engage the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Energy Commission, state legislature, and other appropriate state and federal entities to secure cooperation and funding support for the additional SANDAG energy responsibilities; and (b) for the expenditure of budgeted funds to support the Task Force efforts and to report back to the Executive Committee in January 2004 on the results of these efforts.

  3. Direct staff to request member organizations on the Energy Task Force to help provide interim funds for the period from January to June 2004 in accordance with the resource needs.

  4. Create an Energy Working Group to advise the Regional Planning Committee, convene the Group in January 2004, and hire support staff and/or consultants as soon as interim funding is secured. The Energy Working Group should develop an outreach strategy to explain SANDAG’s new role in regional energy planning and seek
permanent financial resources to support its efforts.

5. Evaluate SANDAG's FY 2004 Overall Work Program priorities and reprogram to make resources available to support the Energy Working Group activities for the same six-month period.

**Policy Board Meeting (December 5, 2003)**

This meeting was cancelled.

**Transportation Committee (December 12, 2003)**

The Transportation Committee took the following actions:

- Approved Resolution 2004-09 approving Amendment No. 16 to the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

- Determined that a proposed pilot program for trolley ticketing programs for PetCo Park set by the MTS Board of Directors was consistent with the "Initial Transition Plan" related to SANDAG’s responsibilities.

- **Approved the transfer of land from Caltrans to the Grossmont-Cuyamaca College District, without monetary compensation, to leverage funding for the Grossmont College Life/Safety Entrance Road Project. This project will improve access to State Route 125, reduce traffic congestion in the area, and facilitate transit service to the college.**

- Agreed to consider the Subcommittee for Accessible Transportation's (SCAT's) request for additional funding for community transportation services during the FY 2005 SANDAG budget process, and referred the SCAT recommendations to include specific senior and persons with disabilities transportation services and funding in a TransNet extension program of projects to the Ad Hoc Working Group on TransNet.

- Endorsed an initial screening process for the North/South Transportation Facility Study that compares the environmental and development impacts as well as the costs and benefits of potential transportation improvement options under four categories.

- Accepted the Draft Regional Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) for distribution for review and comment.

**Borders Committee (December 12, 2003)**

The Borders Committee took the following actions:

- Recommended that additional comments regarding the June 2003 Maquiladora Survey be sent to Caltrans and added that Caltrans should be encouraged to pursue innovative funding mechanisms for border-related projects. In addition, the Borders Committee recommended that this report be presented to the Transportation Committee.

- Agreed to continue discussion on the concept of Equitable Development and to defer the update on Imperial Valley issues for the February 20, 2004 meeting.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

SANDAG Board of Directors  December 19, 2003 – Agenda Item #4 (APPROVE)
The forecast process includes two iterative phases. First, a forecast for the entire region is produced, based largely on economic trends and the associated demographic characteristics. The second phase allocates the regional forecast to jurisdictions and smaller geographic areas based on the region’s general and community plans.

It has been apparent since the mid-1990s that our local land use plans and policies, in aggregate, cannot support the long-range economic and population growth that is anticipated for the region. In part, this is because the local plans typically have a shorter horizon year than the forecast does. They are intended to guide development over a certain period of time, and then be updated to reflect changing conditions.

In October 2002 the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the Preliminary 2030 Cities/County Forecast for distribution, review, and use in planning and other studies. That forecast, like the two forecasts that preceded it, included some assumptions regarding how local general and community plans might evolve over time in response to continuing job and population growth. The jurisdictions were asked to identify areas within their planning boundaries where they thought future smart growth development and redevelopment would be appropriate.

Although this process resulted in some additional capacity for housing units within the region’s boundaries, it was insufficient to stem interregional commuting. The Preliminary Forecast indicated that over time, an increasing number of people would opt to work within the region, but live outside its
boundaries. By 2030 approximately 47,000 additional households would be, in effect, “exported,” mostly to southwestern Riverside County and northern Baja California.

Long-range forecasts that include assumptions about how the local plans might change over time allow us to simulate various land use alternatives and test different scenarios. On the other hand, such forecasts may mask the likely impacts and outcomes of our current plans and policies.

The creation of the first Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is one of the catalysts for taking a different approach to the Final 2030 Forecast. Rather than including assumptions regarding potential future plan changes, this forecast is based solely on the general and community plans of the 18 cities as they stand today. For the unincorporated area, the forecast is based on the most recent (December 2002) version of the County’s GP2020 plan update, as the Board of Supervisors feels that it most accurately reflects the County’s future direction. Hence, the Final 2030 Cities/County Forecast provides an assessment of where our plans of today, if left unchanged, will likely take us over the upcoming decades.

However, general plans do and will change over time. While the forecast looks out to the year 2030, the horizon year of current local plans is typically 2010 or 2020. As those plans evolve, future forecasts may result in different outcomes. The RCP is intended to provide guidance for future plan changes. Basing our forecasts on existing plans and policies provides us with an important tool to help monitor the RCP’s progress in maintaining and improving the region’s quality of life.

Forecast Results

By 2030 the region is expected to add about one million more people,* over 300,000 new homes, and more than 400,000 additional jobs. However, the region’s growth rate has slowed markedly over the last 10 to 12 years, and that pattern will continue. By the mid-2020s, our growth rate is expected to fall below that of the nation as a whole. The attached tables present summary forecast data by jurisdiction. Please note that a few of the numbers on Tables 1 and 2 have changed slightly from the November report due to minor technical adjustments. The forecast has several implications:

- The 314,000 new homes needed by 2030 is roughly equivalent to the entire remaining housing capacity of the region under today’s general and community plans and County GP2020. Furthermore, almost one-quarter of the remaining capacity is in the form of redevelopment and residential infilling on land that is already developed. On currently vacant land, the remaining housing unit capacity of the region in 2000 was about 244,000 homes. Today, just three years later, the remaining capacity on currently vacant land is down to approximately 200,000 homes.

- Over the next 15 to 20 years, most cities fully develop under their current plans. Between 2020 and 2030, most of the growth in housing units (about 86 percent), occurs in just two areas: within the higher density central areas of the City of San Diego, and in the very low density unincorporated areas well outside of the cities.

- Interregional commuting increases substantially. In this forecast, about 93,000 additional households are “exported” to Riverside County, Baja California, and even Imperial County over the 30 years. People will seek lower-cost housing elsewhere, but continue to work within the region.

- Household size (the number of persons per household) rises by about five percent between 2000 and 2030, from 2.73 to

---

* About two-thirds of the forecasted population growth is the result of natural increase (births minus deaths), and one-third is due to net migration.
2.88. This small increase accounts for an additional 200,000 people living in the region.

It is important to note that the Final 2030 Cities/County Forecast is not a prescription for the future. It simply portrays the likely outcomes if we continue operating under our current plans and policies. As a region, we can choose another path. The draft Regional Comprehensive Plan addresses these possible outcomes in further detail, and sets forth a planning and policy framework for addressing these issues.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Paul Kavanaugh, (619) 595-5349; pka@sandag.org
### Table 1
#### Final 2030 Cities/County Forecast

**Total Population**

**By Jurisdiction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>78,247</td>
<td>107,305</td>
<td>120,631</td>
<td>128,772</td>
<td>50,525</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>173,556</td>
<td>247,885</td>
<td>268,970</td>
<td>278,183</td>
<td>104,627</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>24,778</td>
<td>25,152</td>
<td>25,524</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>94,869</td>
<td>98,634</td>
<td>103,749</td>
<td>109,070</td>
<td>14,201</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>58,014</td>
<td>64,904</td>
<td>68,372</td>
<td>71,025</td>
<td>13,011</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>133,559</td>
<td>144,657</td>
<td>153,395</td>
<td>163,299</td>
<td>29,740</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>26,992</td>
<td>27,899</td>
<td>30,026</td>
<td>32,797</td>
<td>5,805</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>54,749</td>
<td>57,043</td>
<td>59,837</td>
<td>62,542</td>
<td>7,793</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>24,918</td>
<td>26,171</td>
<td>27,830</td>
<td>29,679</td>
<td>4,761</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>54,260</td>
<td>56,095</td>
<td>59,019</td>
<td>62,837</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>161,029</td>
<td>188,974</td>
<td>201,526</td>
<td>208,561</td>
<td>47,532</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>48,044</td>
<td>51,814</td>
<td>54,468</td>
<td>56,078</td>
<td>8,034</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,223,400</td>
<td>1,370,328</td>
<td>1,507,794</td>
<td>1,656,820</td>
<td>433,420</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>54,977</td>
<td>77,645</td>
<td>82,448</td>
<td>86,036</td>
<td>31,059</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>52,975</td>
<td>55,340</td>
<td>60,996</td>
<td>71,063</td>
<td>18,088</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>12,979</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>13,568</td>
<td>13,674</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>89,857</td>
<td>97,612</td>
<td>104,578</td>
<td>111,614</td>
<td>21,757</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated *</td>
<td>442,919</td>
<td>496,623</td>
<td>581,566</td>
<td>682,791</td>
<td>239,872</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>3,211,721</td>
<td>3,528,605</td>
<td>3,855,085</td>
<td>1,041,252</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The County's proposed general plan is designed to accommodate a higher population in 2020 than is forecasted, in part because not all areas that could be developed by 2020 will develop, and some areas will develop at a lower density than contemplated by the plan.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>33,798</td>
<td>45,321</td>
<td>48,975</td>
<td>50,728</td>
<td>16,930</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>59,495</td>
<td>81,465</td>
<td>86,403</td>
<td>87,537</td>
<td>28,042</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>9,494</td>
<td>9,564</td>
<td>9,746</td>
<td>9,908</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>35,190</td>
<td>35,772</td>
<td>36,594</td>
<td>37,524</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>23,843</td>
<td>26,243</td>
<td>26,934</td>
<td>27,174</td>
<td>3,331</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>45,050</td>
<td>47,976</td>
<td>49,622</td>
<td>51,646</td>
<td>6,596</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>9,739</td>
<td>9,802</td>
<td>10,260</td>
<td>10,919</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>24,943</td>
<td>25,316</td>
<td>25,685</td>
<td>26,015</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>8,722</td>
<td>8,958</td>
<td>9,289</td>
<td>9,676</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>15,422</td>
<td>15,724</td>
<td>16,231</td>
<td>17,029</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>59,581</td>
<td>67,829</td>
<td>69,837</td>
<td>70,674</td>
<td>11,093</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>15,714</td>
<td>16,678</td>
<td>17,085</td>
<td>17,244</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>469,689</td>
<td>519,996</td>
<td>558,075</td>
<td>604,399</td>
<td>134,710</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>18,862</td>
<td>27,230</td>
<td>28,595</td>
<td>29,183</td>
<td>10,321</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>18,833</td>
<td>19,387</td>
<td>20,839</td>
<td>23,724</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>6,456</td>
<td>6,527</td>
<td>6,564</td>
<td>6,593</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>29,814</td>
<td>31,880</td>
<td>33,279</td>
<td>34,635</td>
<td>4,821</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>152,947</td>
<td>167,849</td>
<td>198,037</td>
<td>236,869</td>
<td>83,922</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| REGION              | 1,040,149| 1,166,094| 1,254,647| 1,354,088| 313,939| 30%  |

Source: SANDAG, December 2003
### Table 3
**Final 2030 Cities/County Forecast**
**Total Employment**
**By Jurisdiction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>50,787</td>
<td>57,324</td>
<td>65,656</td>
<td>79,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>53,731</td>
<td>59,805</td>
<td>68,891</td>
<td>79,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>29,913</td>
<td>30,091</td>
<td>30,244</td>
<td>30,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>3,842</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>4,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>41,341</td>
<td>42,771</td>
<td>44,518</td>
<td>47,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>24,240</td>
<td>26,061</td>
<td>28,337</td>
<td>29,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>49,716</td>
<td>52,963</td>
<td>56,879</td>
<td>63,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>3,931</td>
<td>4,397</td>
<td>4,753</td>
<td>4,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>25,424</td>
<td>26,011</td>
<td>26,639</td>
<td>27,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>8,582</td>
<td>8,910</td>
<td>9,353</td>
<td>9,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>24,763</td>
<td>25,192</td>
<td>25,745</td>
<td>27,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>39,610</td>
<td>44,540</td>
<td>51,381</td>
<td>62,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>21,796</td>
<td>26,403</td>
<td>31,580</td>
<td>35,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>777,600</td>
<td>866,059</td>
<td>931,941</td>
<td>975,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>30,353</td>
<td>34,009</td>
<td>38,612</td>
<td>47,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>16,088</td>
<td>17,416</td>
<td>19,213</td>
<td>21,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>9,569</td>
<td>9,913</td>
<td>10,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>33,820</td>
<td>39,885</td>
<td>47,031</td>
<td>55,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>140,269</td>
<td>153,176</td>
<td>178,126</td>
<td>211,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGION</strong></td>
<td>1,384,676</td>
<td>1,528,522</td>
<td>1,672,883</td>
<td>1,824,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG, December 2003
FINAL ARJIS/SANDAG CONSOLIDATION PLAN

Recommendation
It is the Executive Committee’s recommendation that the Board of Directors approve the Final ARJIS/SANDAG Consolidation Plan, including the necessary policy and legal actions to consolidate ARJIS within SANDAG, contingent upon supporting actions by the JPA jurisdictions, and including formation of a policy advisory committee on Public Safety to cover both ARJIS and criminal justice functions subject to JPA approval by member jurisdictions.

Introduction
Since April 2003, the consolidation of the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) into SANDAG has been actively pursued by the ARJIS/SANDAG Consolidation Committee, a working group composed of members from both the ARJIS Board and Chief’s/Sheriff Management Committee. The Attachment contains the Final Consolidation Plan, which has been approved by the Consolidation Committee and the ARJIS Board of Directors. The Board discussed this plan at its November 21, 2003 meeting and directed staff to docket for approval the new ARJIS JPA on the agenda of each city council and County Board of Supervisors, and work with the law enforcement agencies who will appoint representatives to the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee. Subsequent to the last Board meeting, the Chief’s/Sheriff Management Committee approved the final consolidation plan.

Key highlights of the plan are: (1) the creation of a SANDAG Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee (PSPAC), (2) the transfer of administrative and financial functions to SANDAG to assist with ARJIS day-to-day operations, (3) modifications to the ARJIS JPA and SANDAG Board Policy No. 002, and (4) the creation of a new SANDAG Board Policy to accomplish consolidation.

Significant modifications to the ARJIS JPA include the PSPAC which will replace the current ARJIS Board and Executive Committee. ARJIS consolidation also requires changes to SANDAG Board Policy No. 002 to allow voting rights for non-elected officials. The modified ARJIS JPA and proposed new SANDAG Board Policy incorporate all the required information from the current ARJIS Bylaws; therefore, under consolidation separate ARJIS Bylaws are no longer required.

Benefits of Consolidation
The ARJIS consolidation with SANDAG is viewed as very beneficial for SANDAG, ARJIS, the community, and regional public safety activities. Significant benefits include:

- Seamless Regional Public Safety Policy - The addition of a Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee would provide a uniform regional approach to public safety functions, and operate similar to the four other SANDAG policy committees. Plus, the inclusion of a public safety component with voting powers will combine the practical, users’ side of the information systems and research with policy decision-making, resulting in improved delivery of information to enhance both officer and public safety.
- Broadened Regional Public Safety Role – ARJIS and SANDAG are recognized as leaders in their respective roles as regional entities. The synergy with the SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division will bring an enhanced and centralized view of public safety to the region, and awareness and promotion of a national model across a broad spectrum of public safety functions.

- Enhanced Legislative Outreach and Funding Opportunities – SANDAG’s state and federal legislative services and outreach efforts would be expanded to seek support and funding opportunities for homeland security and public safety state and federal grants.

- Consistent ARJIS Identity – No change would be made to the ARJIS name, so the consolidation would be transparent to external parties.

- Protected ARJIS Revenues – The existing and any future ARJIS revenues will be “fire walled,” similar to what SANDAG does with its many specialized grants.

- Enhanced Administrative Benefits – There is a similar relationship between the ARJIS and SANDAG Board composition, so duplication can be minimized, time saved, and board administration improved. The resources of SANDAG staff and professionals will be able to assist ARJIS in the day-to-day operations. ARJIS is already located in SANDAG offices, making the consolidation easy to accomplish.

- Cooperation with Federal Partners – The consolidation was executed with the cooperation of our federal public safety partners to insure their ability to participate and share information.

- Regional Technology Hub – The consolidation will enhance ARJIS as the convening agency for public safety information technology that will ensure officers are provided with state-of-the-art information to enhance both officer and public safety.

Next Steps

The next steps to consolidation are:

1. Adoption and Execution of the Modified ARJIS JPA by ARJIS Member Agencies
   - January – March 2004

2. Complete Consolidation Implementation
   - July 2004

Key Staff Contact: Pam Scanlon
(619) 533-4204; psc@arjis.org

Gary L. Gallegos
Executive Director
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over the past several years, the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) has grown from 10 member agencies to 50 justice agencies representing local, state and federal government within San Diego and Imperial Counties. Strong governance structure and a track record of successful implementations have made ARJIS a national model for justice sharing initiatives.

A consolidation with SANDAG would enhance the visibility of ARJIS at the federal and state level by providing advocacy services and enhancing funding opportunities. This merger would create a policy advisory committee for criminal justice policy, research, and information sharing and tracking. This committee would strengthen the coordination and relationships between the elected officials and key public safety agencies and provide a prominent regional forum for public safety matters. Additionally, the consolidation will assist with managing the growth of ARJIS and providing access to a wider range of resources. The consolidation also would provide potential for increased collaboration and activities among SANDAG’s Criminal Justice Research Division, ARJIS, and other SANDAG divisions.

Since April 25, 2003, the consolidation has been actively pursued by the ARJIS/SANDAG Consolidation Committee, a working group composed of members from the ARJIS Board of Directors and Chief’s/Sheriff Management Committee. The Consolidation Committee, ARJIS Board of Directors, and ARJIS Management Committee have met monthly to review, discuss, and make recommendations for the consolidation. These committees view the consolidation as very beneficial for SANDAG, ARJIS, the community, and regional public safety activities. The ARJIS Vision 2008 on page 3 illustrates the commitment ARJIS had made towards regional public safety issues.

Documentation in this report indicates substantial progress has been made on the consolidation effort. Policy and legal implementation issues related to the consolidation have been addressed. Legal Counsel has reviewed and made recommended modifications to the ARJIS JPA, Bylaws, and SANDAG Policy Committee procedures. Significant modifications to the ARJIS JPA include the creation of the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee and the transfer of administrative and financial functions to SANDAG. The adoption of SANDAG policies previously addressed by the ARJIS Bylaws, result in the ARJIS Bylaws no longer being necessary. Building security is being addressed in the SANDAG consolidation office space plan, and IT staff is ensuring data security and integrity. Finance and Administration staff are addressing MOUs, finances, and staffing. The timeline for completing the consolidation is July 2004.
VISION 2008

We are internationally recognized for leadership, collaboration, information sharing, and regional acquisition of effective information technology.

We use community partnerships and regional information technology to address and anticipate public safety issues and to improve quality of life.

VISION ELEMENTS

SAFETY:
- The San Diego region provides its officers with state-of-the-art information technology that enhances both officer and public safety.
- We use information technology in coordination with community partners to proactively address community concerns.

EFFECTIVENESS:
- The San Diego region provides the training and tools necessary to ensure the highest quality public safety services.
- Public safety personnel have seamless, cross-jurisdictional access to essential data in a timely manner.
- We are committed to a collaborative which includes public/private partnerships and federal, state, county, and municipal public safety agencies.
- We extend that collaboration to other counties, states, and the nation.

REGIONAL:
- ARJIS is the convening agency for regional information technology.
- Leaders of public safety agencies are accountable for regional cooperation and collaboration in the acquisition, maintenance, and sharing of technology and information.
- We continuously scan the environment to create opportunities, develop new strategies, and identify new partners.

PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS:
- The community is a partner in the decision-making process and has confidence in their public safety agencies.
- The community feels well-informed about public safety issues and has easy access to timely, accurate, and appropriate information.

The San Diego region is internationally recognized as the model for technological innovation, cooperation, and the effective use of resources.
2. PROPOSED ORGANIZATION
PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee (PSPAC) would replace the current ARJIS Board of Directors and Executive Committee and have direct support and input from the Chief’s Management Committee (see chart on page 5). The Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee (PSPAC) would become a fifth SANDAG policy committee that reports directly to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

1) PSPAC Membership (15 Total: 11 Voting, 4 Non-Voting)
   - 6 SANDAG Board Members – (Voting)
     o 4 sub regions
     o City of San Diego
     o County of San Diego
   - 5 Public Safety Members – (Voting)
     o 1 County Sheriff (representing 7 cities)
     o 1 State Public Safety Agency Member
     o 2 Members of the County Chiefs/Sheriff Association
     o 1 Regional Homeland Security Committee Member
   - 4 Public Safety Advisory Members - (Non-Voting)
     o 2 Federal Public Safety Agency (e.g. US Attorney, FBI)
     o 1 County (DA/Probation)
     o 1 Courts

2) Meeting Frequency
   Monthly meetings are recommended. The day and time of the meetings need to be finalized. The Committee will determine the mission of the PSPAC.

3) Appointing Advisory Committee Members
   Elected officials to the PSPAC would be appointed based on the current SANDAG policy for Policy Advisory Committee appointment and rotations. There would be a primary and alternate designated for each member of the PSPAC. Consistent with Board policy, the SANDAG Board Chair would appoint the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee, who would be SANDAG Board members. Modifications to SANDAG Board policy are required to allow non-SANDAG Board Members to vote on the PSPAC as noted on page 18.

The following organizations would appoint the remaining members on an annual basis:

   a) County Chiefs/Sheriff Association – 2 voting members
   b) Regional Homeland Security Committee – 1 voting member
   c) State Public Safety Agency Association – 1 voting member
   d) County Criminal Justice Association – 1 advisory member
   e) Federal Agency Association – 2 advisory members
   f) Courts – 1 advisory member
Board and Policy Advisory Committee Organization with ARJIS Consolidation

**SANDAG Board of Directors**
Makes regional public policy

- **Executive Committee**
  Sets agenda; oversight for budget and work program; reviews grant applications; makes recommendations on legislative proposals & agency policies

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

- **Public Safety Committee**
  Policy recommendations on public safety & Homeland Security related to ARJIS & Criminal Justice Research activities

- **Borders Committee**
  Policy recommendations on interregional programs & projects

- **Regional Planning Committee**
  Policy recommendations on Regional Comprehensive Plan development & implementation

**Chiefs Management Committee**

12/19/03
3. **LEGAL AND POLICY ACTIONS**

To accomplish the Consolidation significant modifications have been made to the following three existing documents, and the creation of a fourth document:

1. **ARJIS JPA**  
   Significant modifications to the ARJIS JPA include:  
   1) Designation of SANDAG’s Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee as the governing board of the ARJIS.  
   2) Transfer of administrative and financial functions and responsibilities to SANDAG.  
   3) Adoption of polices previously covered by the ARJIS Bylaws that are proposed to be dissolved.

2. **ARJIS Bylaws**  
   Recommend dissolution since policies and procedures are now covered in the amended ARJIS JPA and SANDAG policy documents.

3. **SANDAG Board Policy #04-01-002**  
   Addition of the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee.

4. **Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee (PSPAC)**  
   New policies pertaining to the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee.
JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT – AS AMENDED JANUARY 2004

AUTOMATED REGIONAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM JOINT POWERS AGENCY

THIS AGREEMENT is made among those Public Agencies named below that execute this Agreement.

REcITALS

WHEREAS, Public Agencies realize that there is a need for continued operation, maintenance, enhancement and implementation of the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) in order to provide improved public safety capabilities to the San Diego region by an effective and efficient use of electronic data processing technology capabilities; and

WHEREAS, Public Agencies believe that the joint exercise of their powers as a Joint Powers Agency (JPA) will provide a decision-making body capable of continuing the operation, maintenance and implementation of the Automated Regional Justice Information System; and

WHEREAS, Public Agencies believe that the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) should serve as the administrator of the ARJIS JPA in order to efficiently incorporate the work done by ARJIS with the work done by SANDAG in the San Diego region,

WHEREAS, this Joint Powers Agreement of December 1, 1980, was amended on July 1, 1990, and January 23, 1998, and the Public Agencies wish to amend it again to implement a consolidation of effort with SANDAG.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of recitals and the mutual obligations of the parties as herein expressed, Public Agencies agree as follows:

1. Definitions

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

a) “Administrative Member” shall mean SANDAG. As the “Administrative Member” SANDAG shall have the same rights as any of the Public Agencies, shall provide in-kind contributions rather than membership financial support, and shall have the additional responsibilities set forth in this Agreement. SANDAG shall not have a separate vote, but shall be represented by all of the Public Agency representatives.

b) “Advisory Members” shall mean those members who serve on the ARJIS governing board in an advisory capacity, without voting rights. Advisory Members may contract with SANDAG for the services provided to the Public Agencies.

c) “Associate Members” shall mean those agencies other than Member Agencies who conduct public safety activities or general purpose local governments outside San Diego County, who are at any given time asked to serve on the ARJIS governing board as
voting members. Associate Members may contract with SANDAG for the services provided to the Public Agencies.

d) “Fiscal Year” shall mean that year beginning July 1, and ending June 30.

e) “Member Agencies” shall collectively refer to all of the voting members on the ARJIS governing board, whether they be the Administrative Member, Associate Members, and/or Public Agencies.

f) “Public Agencies” shall mean those units of government who are at any time a party to the Agreement, including, but not limited to, the Administrative Member, SANDAG.

2. Status

There is hereby created a JPA to be known and denominated as the ARJIS which shall be a public entity separate and apart from any Member Agency or Associate Member with the exception of the Administrative Member. ARJIS shall be governed by the terms of this Joint Powers Agreement, by any policies passed and adopted by the ARJIS governing board, and by the statutes, rules, regulations, policies or procedures that govern SANDAG. The ARJIS governing board shall serve and be known as SANDAG’s Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee (“PSPAC”).

3. Purpose

The specific and primary purpose for which the ARJIS is created is to assist the Public Agencies by providing the Public Agencies and those who contract with ARJIS, state-of-the-art criminal justice information technology that enhances both officer and public safety. ARJIS is the convening agency for regional justice technology, and provides its members with seamless, cross-jurisdictional access to essential, accurate real-time data via a secure criminal justice enterprise network.

4. Liabilities & Powers

a. The debts, liabilities and obligations of ARJIS shall not constitute any debt, liability or obligation of any of the Public Agencies that are parties to this Agreement except SANDAG. All ARJIS debts, liabilities, and obligations shall be paid from the separate assets and accounts of the ARJIS, which shall be maintained by the Administrative Member.

b. The ARJIS shall not have power to contract or to sue or be sued in its own name. All claims for money or damages against the ARJIS shall be made against SANDAG and shall be governed by Division 3.6 (commencing with Section 810) of Title 1 of the Government Code except as provided therein, or by other statutes or regulations expressly applicable to SANDAG.

c. The ARJIS shall not hire a staff, but shall use the staff of SANDAG and shall compensate SANDAG for the use of those staff services. The ARJIS may also utilize staff from other public agencies under contractual agreements.
d. As of the effective date of this Agreement, the ARJIS may not make new contracts or enter into stipulations of any nature whatsoever, including, but not limited to, contracts and stipulations to indemnify and hold harmless, or to employ labor. All such powers shall be held by SANDAG. SANDAG shall carry out these powers and do all other acts necessary and convenient for the full exercise of the ARJIS powers. Effective July 1, 2004, all contracts, stipulations, or agreements previously entered into by the ARJIS shall be transferred to SANDAG.

5. Financial Matters

a. Auditor/Comptroller & Treasurer. SANDAG shall be the depository of funds of ARJIS and the SANDAG Director of Finance shall be the ex-officio Treasurer of ARJIS. The Treasurer of the ARJIS shall file an official bond in the amount of $100,000. The Auditor/Comptroller of SANDAG shall be the ex-officio Auditor/Comptroller of ARJIS and shall draw warrants or check-warrants against the funds of ARJIS in the Treasury when the demands are approved by the PSPAC, or such other persons as may be specifically designated for that purpose in ARJIS policies. Said Auditor/Comptroller and Treasurer shall comply with all duties imposed under Article 1, Chapter 5, Division 7, Title I, of the California Government Code commencing with Section 6500. SANDAG shall determine reasonable charges to be made against ARJIS for the services of the Treasurer and Auditor/Comptroller. At the end of each fiscal year there shall be an audit conducted by an independent, accredited certified public account.

b. Accounts & Reports. The Auditor/Comptroller of ARJIS shall establish and maintain such funds and accounts as may be required by good accounting practice or bylaws passed and adopted by this Agency. The books and records of ARJIS in the hands of the Auditor/Comptroller shall be open to inspection at all reasonable times by representatives of the Public Agencies. The Auditor/Comptroller of ARJIS, within 120 days after the close of each fiscal year, shall give a complete written report of all financial activities for such fiscal year to the Member Agencies and Advisory Members. Said financial report shall be accompanied by a financial/compliance opinion by an independent, accredited certified public accountant. The independent, accredited certified public accountant shall be the accounting firm selected by SANDAG.

c. Funds. The Treasurer of ARJIS shall receive, have the custody of and disburse ARJIS funds upon the warrant or check-warrant of the Auditor/Comptroller (i) pursuant to the accounting procedures developed under this Agreement, and (ii) in accordance with normal SANDAG procedures, shall make the disbursements required by this Agreement or to carry out any of the provisions or purposes of this Agreement. ARJIS funds and accounts shall be segregated from SANDAG’s general funds and accounts. The Treasurer of ARJIS may invest ARJIS funds in accordance with general law. All interest collected on ARJIS funds shall be accounted for and posted to the account of such funds.

d. Budget. The PSPAC shall recommend approval of a preliminary budget to the SANDAG Board no later than April 1 of each year. The PSPAC shall recommend approval of a final budget no later than June 1 of each year and have it approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors by July 1 of each year. After adoption by the SANDAG Board, a copy of the preliminary budget shall be filed with each Public Agency.
e. Public Agency Financial Support. With the exception of SANDAG, responsibility for supplying funds for that portion of the budget for ARJIS which is to be supplied by the Member Agencies for operation, maintenance, enhancement and implementation of the system as adopted by the PSPAC and the SANDAG Board of Directors, shall be divided among the Public Agencies, including within its budget as funds to be supplied to the ARJIS that sum of money determined by taking the ratio its population bears to the total population of the region and multiplying it by that portion of the approved budget to be supplied by the Public Agencies. SANDAG shall supply the PSPAC with the official January 1 population figures from the California State Department of Finance Population Research Unit on an annual basis for purposes of this calculation. Payment of membership funds shall be made by each Public Agency by July 15 of each year. If payment by a Public Agency has not been made by September 1 of each year, that Public Agency shall cease to be a participating member of the ARJIS, and its representative shall no longer participate or vote as a member of the PSPAC. A delinquent Public Agency will be reinstated to participating membership and its representative allowed to participate on the PSPAC when full payment has been made, including interest computed from July 15 at the average interest earning rate as determined by the Treasurer.

f. Associate and Advisory Members Financial Support. All Associate and Advisory Members who use the system shall be individually charged and pay to the ARJIS a reasonable share of the total cost of operation, maintenance, enhancement and implementation of the system as determined by the PSPAC. Associate and Advisory Members who access the computer shall be charged for computer time, network time, and application development at a rate agreed to by the Board of Directors. Associate and Advisory Members shall also make an annual payment of a determined sum in accordance with the provisions of the contract between SANDAG and the Associate or Advisory Member. If payment by an Associate or Advisory Member has not been made by September 1 of each year, that member shall cease to be a participating member of the ARJIS, and its representative shall no longer participate or vote as a member of the PSPAC. A delinquent member will be reinstated to participating membership and its representative allowed to participate on the PSPAC when full payment has been made, including interest computed from July 15 at the average interest earning rate as determined by the Treasurer.

g. Administrative Agency Financial Support. SANDAG shall determine charges to be made against the ARJIS for the services provided by SANDAG, which SANDAG deems are appropriate for reimbursement. Notwithstanding SANDAG’s status as a Public Agency Member, SANDAG shall not be required to contribute funds toward ARJIS under Section 5(e), but shall instead provide in-kind contributions in an amount to be approved by the PCPAC and the SANDAG Board.

6. Governance

a. All powers of the ARJIS shall be exercised by the SANDAG Board of Directors. The SANDAG Board of Directors shall delegate responsibilities to the PSPAC consistent with its purpose. The membership of the PSPAC shall be composed of one primary representative selected by the governing body of each Member Agency and Advisory Member Agency to serve until recalled by the governing body of said member. Each Member Agency representative must be a mayor, council-person, or supervisor of the governing body which selected him/her, or other appropriate official selected by the governing body. Each Advisory Member Agency representative
must be selected by the governing body of that agency. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as originally selected. Each Member Agency and Advisory Member Agency shall also select, in the same manner as the primary representative, one alternate to serve on the PSPAC when the primary representative is not available. Such alternate shall be subject to the same restrictions and have the same powers, when serving on the PSPAC, as the primary representative.

b. At its discretion, each Member Agency and Advisory Member Agency may select a second alternate, in the same manner as the primary representative, to serve on the PSPAC in the event that neither the primary representative nor the regular alternate is able to attend a meeting of the PSPAC. Such alternate shall be subject to the same restrictions and have the same powers, when serving on the PSPAC, as the primary representative.

c. Upon recommendation of the PSPAC, SANDAG may at any time authorize other agencies to join the ARJIS as Associate or Advisory Members. Each Associate Member shall be allowed to vote in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement. SANDAG may allow for the appointment of additional Advisory Members to sit with the PSPAC, but in no event shall said representatives be allowed a vote. Each Associate and Advisory Member shall designate a primary representative and, at its discretion, one or two alternates.

d. Each PSPAC representative, or designated alternate acting in a representative’s absence, may receive reimbursement from ARJIS for out-of-pocket and travel expenses incurred by such representative or alternate on approved ARJIS business. Except where prohibited by the charter, or any ordinance, rule, regulation, or policy of a Member Agency, each Member Agency representative, or designated alternate acting in a Member Agency representative’s absence, shall receive $100.00 from ARJIS for each PSPAC meeting attended, as well as travel expenses incurred.

e. The Chair of the SANDAG Board of Directors shall appoint the Chair and Vice Chair of the PSPAC in accordance with the policies and procedures that apply to all SANDAG policy advisory committees.

7. Membership of the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee

The members selecting the representatives to serve on the PSPAC as of the effective date of this Agreement shall be:

a. Public Agencies: The Public Agencies shall be represented by four elected officials selected from each of the four subregions defined in the SANDAG Bylaws, one elected official selected by the City of San Diego, and one elected official selected from the County of San Diego. All six of the Public Agency representatives must be SANDAG Board Members or alternates and shall represent SANDAG. Each Public Agency that has selected a representative to serve on the PSPAC must be a member in good standing with all dues fully paid to ARJIS in order to participate on the PSPAC.

b. Associate Members: One person selected by the County Sheriff, one person selected by the State public safety agencies, one person selected from the Regional Homeland Security Committee, and 2 persons selected by the County Chiefs & Sheriffs Association. The number and representation of Associate Members may be modified by a SANDAG Board action amending SANDAG Board Policy.
c. Advisory Members: Two persons selected by the Federal public safety agencies, one person selected from the San Diego County District Attorney’s or Probation Department Offices, and one person selected by the courts. The number and representation of Advisory Members may be modified by SANDAG Board action amending SANDAG Board Policy.

8. Voting

(a) The PSPAC shall vote on all items on the basis of one vote per Member Agency.

9. Meetings

The PSPAC shall conduct monthly meetings in conjunction with regularly scheduled SANDAG meetings during the year and at such other times as the PSPAC or SANDAG Board shall direct. Parliamentary procedure at all meetings shall be governed by Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised, except as otherwise modified by this Agreement.

10. Ralph M. Brown Act

All meetings of the ARJIS, including without limitation regular, adjourned regular, and special meetings of the PSPAC, and meetings of all standing committees, shall be called, noticed, held and conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act (commencing with Section 54950 of the Government Code).

11. Quorum

A majority of the voting members of the PSPAC shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

12. Procedures to be Followed

a. Pursuant to Government Code Section 6509, which requires that the powers of ARJIS be limited by the legal restrictions placed upon a named Member Agency, the powers of ARJIS shall be subject to those legal restrictions imposed upon SANDAG by the Constitution of the State of California and the laws governing it.

b. The PSPAC shall adopt SANDAG’s administrative regulations establishing the procedures and policies for contracting and approving change orders.

13. Duration of Agreement

This Agreement shall continue in full force and effect until Public Agencies representing more than 50% of the population of the San Diego region withdraw from this Agreement by resolution.
14. Disposition of Assets Upon Termination

Upon termination of this Agreement any money or assets in possession of SANDAG on behalf of the ARJIS after the payment of all liabilities, costs, expenses and charges validly incurred under this Agreement shall be returned to the Public Agencies in proportion to their contributions determined as of the time of termination. In-kind contributions made by SANDAG shall be included in this determination.

15. Effective Date of Agreement

This Agreement became effective for all purposes at 12:01 a.m. July 1, 1990. The most recent amended version of the Agreement shall become effective January 1, 2004. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the consolidation of ARJIS finances with SANDAG will not occur until July 1, 2004. Applicable portions of Section 5 of this Agreement will not go into effect until the consolidation of finances occurs.

16. Later Participating Member Agencies

a. Any San Diego County incorporated city that incorporated after January 1, 2004, that may desire to participate in the activities of ARJIS may do so by executing this Agreement without prior approval or ratification of the Public Agencies and shall be bound by the terms of this Agreement as of the date of execution. The County of San Diego, and the cities in the County which were incorporated on December 1, 1980, who did not execute this Agreement by December 1, 1980 which desire to participate in the activities of ARJIS may do so by executing this agreement without prior approval or ratification of the existing Public Agencies and paying an initial membership charge which may be established and required by SANDAG to offset a portion of the initial start-up costs paid by the Charter Public Agencies, and shall be bound by the terms of terms of this Agreement as of the date of execution. Said membership charge shall not be required of cities that as of December 1, 1980, contracted with the County of San Diego for public safety services, and become a Public Agency after December 1, 1980. Any later participating Public Agency shall receive one (1) vote under the single vote procedure.

b. Any entity that contracts for ARJIS services that wishes to become an Associate or Advisory Member of the PSPAC may submit a written request to the PSPAC identifying how their membership on the PSPAC will further the mission of the PSPAC and/or SANDAG, their history and purpose, and at what level they would like to participate with regard to voting rights and membership fees. If the PSPAC determines the addition of the potential member is advantageous, it may make a recommendation to the SANDAG Board to add the potential member. The SANDAG Board shall make the final determination regarding whether to supplement the PSPAC with additional or different Affiliate or Advisory Members.

17. Agreement Repository

A fully executed copy of this Joint Powers Agreement and any amendments thereto shall be filed with the authorized representative of each Public Agency.
18. **Information Privacy & Ownership of Data**

   a. In order to protect the privacy of individuals as set-forth in Section 1 of Article I of the Constitution of California and in the United States Constitution, the maintenance and dissemination of the information in the ARJIS system shall be undertaken in compliance with Federal and State laws and regulations including the Information Practices Act of 1977 (commencing with Section 1798 of the California Civil Code). An appropriate agency as determined by the PSPAC shall, at the call of the PSPAC, conduct an annual certification of the information to assure compliance.

   b. All intellectual property owned by the ARJIS as of the effective date of this Agreement (pursuant to Section 15 herein) including, but not limited to, electronic data, shall remain the property of the ARJIS. If pursuant to agreement, the ARJIS serves as a custodian of data it does not own, that data shall presumptively remain the property of the contributing entity and may not be treated as a public record. The ARJIS may not disclose electronic data or other intellectual property for which it is a custodian to third parties without the approval of the entity that owns the property.

19. **Amendments**

   Proposed amendments may be originated by any member of the PSPAC or by the SANDAG Board of Directors. Amendments to this Agreement shall require the vote of two thirds (2/3) of the Member Agencies who are members of ARJIS at the time the amendment is proposed.

   IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the following Public Agencies has caused this Joint Powers Agreement to be executed by having affixed thereto the signatures of the agent of said Agency authorized therefore by the legislative body of that Agency.
Adopted 12/80
Amended 7/90
Amended 1/98
Amended 1/04
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

1. Membership

1.1 Executive Committee: Six members to include the City and County of San Diego Board members, and a Board member from each subregion (South County, East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland).

1.1.1 Alternates may be the second City of San Diego Board member or Board alternate, the County of San Diego Board alternate, and alternates selected from each subregion who shall be members of the Board.

1.2 Transportation Committee: Nine members to include a member from the City and County of San Diego governing bodies, a Board member or alternate from each subregion, and a member of NCTD, MTDB and the Airport Authority appointed by those agencies. There may be nine alternates chosen in the same manner.

1.3 Regional Planning Committee: Six members to include a member from the City and County of San Diego governing bodies, and a Board member or alternate from each subregion. There may be six alternates chosen in the same manner.

1.4 Borders Committee: Seven members to include a member from the City and County of San Diego governing bodies, a Board member or alternate from each subregion, and a mayor, councilmember, or supervisor from the County of Imperial. There may be seven alternates chosen in the same manner.

1.5 Public Safety Committee: Six members to include a member from the City and County of San Diego governing bodies and a Board member or alternate from each subregion. The five Associate Member organizations taking part in this committee shall have the following representation: two members from the County Chiefs/Sheriff Association, a member selected by the County Sheriff, a member of the Regional Homeland Security Committee, and a member selected by the State public safety agencies. In addition, there will be four non-voting Advisory Members selected as follows: Two persons selected by the Federal public safety agencies, one person selected from the San Diego County District Attorney’s or Probation Department Offices, and one person selected by the courts. There may be alternates chosen in the same manner.

---

1 South County includes Chula Vista, Coronado, Imperial Beach, and National City. East County includes El Cajon, La Mesa, Lemon Grove and Santee. North County Coastal includes Carlsbad, Del Mar, Encinitas, Oceanside, and Solana Beach. North County Inland includes Escondido, Poway, San Marcos and Vista.
2. Limitation on Committee Memberships

No Board member or alternate may serve as the regular member of more than three Policy Advisory Committees ("PACs") at any one time. Committee membership may be expanded by the Board.

3. Ex-Officio Members

A PAC may include Ex-Officio members if appropriate to roles and responsibilities of the committee. The Board Chair and Vice Chair may serve as Ex-Officio members on any of the PACs.

4. Appointments

4.1 Public Agencies

4.1.1 The City and County of San Diego will make their appointments in December or January and when vacancies occur.

4.1.2 The SANDAG Chair will provide notice requesting that Board members from each of the subregions appoint a Board member or alternate as authorized to serve as a regular member on each PAC and one to serve as an alternate to each PAC. Each Board member shall be provided a reasonable opportunity to participate in the selection. Appointments will be made in January or as vacancies occur.

4.2 Associate Members

In addition to the members appointed pursuant to Section 4.2, the Public Safety Committee shall have voting members appointed from the organizations listed below by their respective appointing authorities in January of each year:

4.2.1 County Chief’s/Sheriff Association – 2 voting members
4.2.2 County Sheriff – 1 voting member
4.2.3 Regional Homeland Security Committee – 1 voting member
4.2.4 State Public Safety Agency Association – 1 voting member

4.3 Advisory Members

In addition to the voting members appointed pursuant to Sections 4.2 and 4.3, the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee shall have the following non-voting members appointed from the following organizations by their respective appointing authorities in January of each year:

4.3.1 County Criminal Justice Association – 1 advisory member
4.3.2 Federal Justice Agency Association – 2 advisory members
4.3.3 Courts – 1 advisory member

4.4 If any subregion fails to make an appointment to a PAC within three weeks of mailing of the notice to proceed to appoint, the Chair of SANDAG shall make the appointment. If any organization referred to Sections 4.3 or 4.4 fails to make an appointment to the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee, the current representative shall continue to serve until a replacement appointment is made by his/her organization.
5. Vacancies

Vacancies on PACs shall be filled as they occur in the same manner as appointments.

6. Chair/Vice Chair

The Chair and Vice Chair of the PAC, other than the Executive Committee, shall be appointed by the Board Chair in July or as vacancies occur. The Board Chair, and the Vice Chair when serving as a member of the Executive Committee, shall serve as the Chair and Vice Chair of the Executive Committee. The Vice Chair conducts the meetings in the absence of the Chair. In the event of the absence of both the Chair and Vice Chair for a PAC or other standing committee, the quorum of members present shall elect a chairperson pro tempore to preside for that meeting. The Executive Director or a Chief Deputy Executive Director, with a quorum present, shall call the meeting to order and preside during such election of chairperson pro tempore; he/she shall immediately relinquish the chair upon completion of the election.

7. Attendance

7.1 Regular and alternate members are encouraged to attend all Committee meetings. Roll call shall be taken by the Chair at the beginning of the meeting to determine the voting members present at that time. The voting members shall be seated collectively in order for the public to recognize them as such. Other non-voting alternates in attendance may participate in Committee discussion but shall not be authorized to act on any item.

7.2 If a regular member misses three consecutive Committee meetings without justification, the position on the Committee will be considered vacant and shall be filled in the same manner as appointments.

8. Quorum

A simple majority of members (either regular or alternates) constitute a quorum.

9. Voting

Regular members vote on all committee actions. Alternates vote only when their corresponding regular member from their area is absent. A simple majority of the quorum of regular and eligible alternate members voting constitutes approval. A quorum shall be required for the conduct of any business of a PAC.

10. Compensation

Regular and alternate members of the PACs will be compensated $100 per meeting attended subject to the limitations on number of meetings per month set forth in the SANDAG Bylaws.

11. Meetings
PAC meetings should normally be held on Fridays or when called by the committee Chair. Parliamentary procedure at all meetings shall be governed by Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

Working Groups & Subcommittees

The PACs shall have the authority to appoint PAC working groups and may provide for the appointment of alternates to these working groups. Ad hoc working groups may be appointed by the Board or PACs as the need arises to accomplish specific tasks. Upon completion of its assignment, each working group shall disband. Standing subcommittees may be appointed by the Board as may be required to carry out general and continuing functions and may be abolished only upon specific action by the Board. As the Board creates standing subcommittees, it shall specify the method for appointing persons to those subcommittees.
Subject: Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee (PSPAC)

1. Purpose

The purpose of the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee (PSPAC) is to advise the Board on matters concerning the Automated Regional Justice Information System and the Criminal Justice Division.

2. Governance

2.1. The PSPAC shall be overseen by the Board and shall govern itself in accordance with the Automated Regional Justice Information System Joint Powers Agreement ("ARJIS JPA"), as amended on January 1, 2004, and the policies and procedures applicable to all of SANDAG's policy advisory committees.

2.2. If the ARJIS JPA is in conflict with state or federal statutes or regulations, the statutes or regulations shall supersede the conflicting provision of the JPA. If the ARJIS JPA is in conflict with SANDAG Board policy or procedure, SANDAG Board policy or procedure shall supersede the conflicting provision of the JPA.

3. PSPAC Subcommittees

3.1. There shall be a standing Management Subcommittee composed of standing members who shall be the Chief of Police, Sheriff, or Public Safety CEO of each Member Agency. The term “Member Agency” as used in this Policy shall have the same meaning as in the ARJIS JPA and shall refer to the voting members on the PSPAC. The Management Subcommittee may appoint advisory members to the Subcommittee as needed and shall serve at the pleasure of the Management Subcommittee.

3.2. Each Member Agency representative of the Management Subcommittee shall have one vote.

3.3. Whenever a member is not present at a meeting of the Management Subcommittee, a designated alternate selected by the member may act as a member.

3.4. The Management Subcommittee shall appoint members to standing working groups known as the Users, Technical, Business, and Crime Analysis working groups. The membership of these working groups shall be composed of members of public safety agencies who operate or use the ARJIS. Each member of these working groups shall have one vote.

3.5. The Management Subcommittee meetings shall be at least monthly or whenever called by its Chairperson. The Chairperson of the Management Subcommittee shall notify the members of the Management Subcommittee of any such scheduled meetings at least five days prior.
to the scheduled date of the meeting. Upon a finding by the Chairperson that an item has arisen that requires immediate action, he/she may call a meeting on 48 hours notice.

3.6. Other standing subcommittees and standing or ad hoc working groups shall meet whenever called by their respective chairperson.

3.7. Standing subcommittees and working groups shall have as elected officers a chairperson and vice chairperson, who are members or alternates of their respective Member Agency. The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of each standing subcommittee or working group shall be elected from among its membership.

3.8. The functions of the Management Subcommittee shall be to: (1) review, evaluate, and provide preliminary approval of the ARJIS and Criminal Justice Division work plan and budget for final approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors; (2) evaluate and prioritize the ARJIS and Criminal Justice Division work plan; (3) oversee the implementation of the ARJIS and Criminal Justice Division work plan and budget; (4) establish policies and procedures; (5) approve and oversee the implementation of the recommendations from other subcommittees and working groups; and (6) perform other functions delegated by the PSPAC.
4. IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

The attached Scope of Work on page 24 indicates the progress to date on the major components relating to the Consolidation.

A summary of the progress on the key policy tasks shown on page 25 contains significant progress or completion towards:

1) Establishment of a Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee
2) Review and modifications of legal documents
3) Addressing DOJ/FBI mandates for security
4) ARJIS membership

The Public Safety Policy Advisory Committee has been established subject to approval of the revised ARJIS JPA by its member agencies. All necessary legal documents have been modified including the ARJIS JPA and SANDAG Board Policies. Building security issues have been addressed in the office space plan, which would house ARJIS on the 5th floor at 401 B. Street, the current location of SANDAG. ARJIS continues to work with SANDAG IT staff to ensure continuation of appropriate measures related to data integrity and security.

A summary of key implementation and transition tasks, and status to date shown on page 26 also represents significant progress in support of the consolidation. Major administrative implementation tasks include:

1) ARJIS organization and staffing
2) ARJIS financial and budget
3) ARJIS administrative function moving to SANDAG

ARJIS is working with SANDAG Finance and Administrative staff on Management Control Agreements and ARJIS personnel and financial responsibilities. ARJIS, SANDAG, and the City of San Diego are addressing financial and budget responsibilities that will transfer from the City of San Diego to SANDAG. The ARJIS program and related budget will be incorporated into the SANDAG FY05 Work Program and Budget.
1. **(Completed)** Form ARJIS Board of Directors, Police Chiefs/Sherriff, Federal public safety agencies, SANDAG staff, and ARJIS staff into an ARJIS/SANDAG consolidation team to prepare consolidation plan, scope of work and schedule. The consolidation team would meet as needed on a monthly basis to complete the consolidation plan and oversee the implementation.

The composition of the consolidation team includes: 1) Members from the Board of Directors: Art Madrid, Christy Guerin, Mark Lewis, Lori Holt Pfeiler, Phil Monroe, Ramona F Pinsila, and Pam Slater; 2) Members from the ARJIS Chief’s: Chief Jim Davis (El Cajon), Chief Robert Hutton (Coronado), Commander Robert Apostolos (SD Sheriff) Chief John Welter (SD Police) and one or two representative from DA, US Attorney, FBI, or other federal agency; 3) Members from SANDAG staff: Tom Larwin, Debra Greenfield, and Cindy Burke, and 4) Pam Scanlon from ARJIS staff.

2. **(Completed)** The Consolidation Team would meet as needed to complete the tasks outlined in the scope of work. Monthly meetings of the Consolidation Team will be held on the 1st Wednesday of each month at 8:00 a.m. at the Western Division offices of SDPD, 5215 Gaines Street. The first meeting is scheduled for Wednesday June 4th (June)

3. **(Completed)** ARJIS staff prepare resource guide for each member of the consolidation team with ARJIS work program and projects (current and planned), budget, current contracts and planned contracts, staff organization chart, description of current committees and working groups, recent Board agendas representing issues bought before the ARJIS Board, and information systems being used. (Review at June 4th meeting of consolidation team)

4. **(Completed)** Discussion by consolidation team on advantages, disadvantages, and issues of the ARJIS/SANDAG consolidation to both agencies. The advantages and disadvantages, and transitions issues should be documented along with a recommendation by the team to the ARJIS Board of Directors. (August 6th)

5. **(Completed)** ARJIS Chiefs provide their vision 2008 for ARJIS. The ARJIS Strategic Plan goals and objectives will also be provided for consideration of consolidation into a common strategy. At September meeting team will confirm common vision, elements, goals and objectives for ARJIS that should be considered as part of the consolidation. (August –October)

6. **(Completed)** Consolidation Team will identify issues and options to address each of the issues. Bring in necessary outside parties to help develop solutions. Where appropriate obtain policy direction from the ARJIS Board of Directors. (June – November)

7. **(Completed)** Identify appropriate committee and working group make-up under the SANDAG Board, including membership and selection of members. (September)

8. **(Completed)** Identify needed changes to ARJIS JPA and Bylaws to address identified implementation and policy issues related to consolidation, and to help achieve vision, goals and objectives (October)

9. **(Completed)** Prepare Draft Consolidation Plan for review and action by the ARJIS Management Committee, ARJIS Board of Directors, and SANDAG Board of Directors. (October - December)

10. **(In-Progress)** Develop ARJIS work program that addresses agreed upon vision, goals and objectives for incorporation into SANDAG Overall Work Program and Budget. (November – May)

11. **(In-Progress)** Finalize Consolidation Plan and proceed with implementation steps. (November – June)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Work Completed / Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Legal Documents | 1) Amendments to the JPA  
2) Amendments to Bylaws | Larwin/Scanlon/Wiley/SANDAG/ARJIS Consolidation Committee | Completed |
| 2. Public Safety Policy Committee | Develop Policy Committee:  
1) Mission  
2) Structure/Membership  
3) Roles/Responsibilities  
4) Voting Rights  
5) Meeting Frequency  
6) Chair/Vice Chair Selection  
7) Interface with Chiefs Management Committee | Larwin/Scanlon/Wiley/SACC/Burke Committee | Committee Structure Completed. Membership and procedures in-progress |
| 3. ARJIS Membership | Review:  
1) ARJIS agency membership  
2) Determine if changes need to occur for non-SANDAG members | Larwin/Scanlon/SACC/Chiefs | Completed |
| 4. Security: DOJ/FBI Mandates | Review and ensure compliance:  
1) Policies relating to DOJ/FBI compliance  
2) Management Control Agreements  
3) Data Integrity/Security  
4) Personnel-Public safety status | Larwin/Scanlon/SACC/Chiefs | To be completed with move to 5th floor in January. Finance and Admin reviewing Management Control Agreements. |
## ARJIS/SANDAG Key Transition/Implementation Tasks 12/19/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Work Needed/Completed - Remaining Tasks – Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. ARJIS Organizational Structure</strong>&lt;br&gt;ADMIN</td>
<td>1) Modify ARJIS organizational chart  &lt;br&gt;2) Document reporting structure, staff and other meetings, status and periodic updates.</td>
<td>Scanlon/Tayman</td>
<td>1) Org chart completed  &lt;br&gt;2) Reporting structure completed – status and update procedures in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. ARJIS Work Program</strong>&lt;br&gt;ADMIN</td>
<td>1) Incorporate ARJIS program/projects into SANDAG work program methodology  &lt;br&gt;2) Adopt program metrics, reporting procedures, etc.</td>
<td>Scanlon/Tayman</td>
<td>1) First draft of FY2005 work program completed  &lt;br&gt;2) Program Metrics and reporting procedures in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. ARJIS Staff</strong>&lt;br&gt;ADMIN</td>
<td>1) Determine Staffing Allocation – Public Safety vs. SANDAG  &lt;br&gt;(Vacant - ARJIS Technical Program Manager)  &lt;br&gt;2) Review DOJ/FBI mandates for staffing.  &lt;br&gt;3) Consolidate Benefit Package Requirements for transfer of contract employees.</td>
<td>Scanlon/Tayman/Campbell</td>
<td>1) Initial meeting held with Campbell.  &lt;br&gt;2) Criminal Justice and ARJIS will conduct background checks on all personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Contract Negotiation/Signing</strong>&lt;br&gt;ADMIN</td>
<td>1) Determine approval and signing authority for adding new member agencies and/or contracts  &lt;br&gt;2) Implement new authority.</td>
<td>Scanlon/Tayman/Wiley/Campbell</td>
<td>1) Completed - SANDAG is signatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Detail</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Work Needed/Completed - Remaining Tasks – Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. ARJIS Ownership of Data/Equipment/Programs | 1) Ensure ARJIS copyright is maintained  
2) Confirm ownership of hardware/software/equipment/programs. | Scanlon/Wiley/Campbell       | 1) ARJIS Copyright in Progress  
2) Request to SDDPC 9/3 for ownership clarification. Ownership clarified in JPA. |
| 6. Physical Location               | 1) Ensure ARJIS meets DOJ/FBI security standards for physical location – locked doors  
2) Ensure secure data, etc. | Scanlon/Campbell/FBI – Kingston | 1) Completed - addressed in 5th floor move  
2) Completed - Separate ARJISNET network. SANDAG employees w/ARJIS access will go through background checks |
| 7. ARJIS Office Supplies           | Migrate Office Supply Procurement from Corporate Express to SANDAG supplier. | BJHarris/Rose                  | 1) In Progress |
| 8. ARJIS Contracts                 | 1) Determine if amendments or policy changes are needed for major contracts. Elisabeth Eisner’s continued review of IT contracts?  
a) SDDPC  
b) City of San Diego Auditor (Budget and financials)  
c) Member agencies  
d) U of Arizona – COPLINK | Scanlon/Campbell/BMontgomery | Initial meetings held with Campbell and Wiley. Legal review of IT contracts in progress – COPLINK Completed 10/1 |
<p>| 9. ARJIS Phones                    | Research costs of migrating phone system to SANDAG. | B. Montgomery/Rose            | Completed – SANDAG #s will reside on ARJIS existing phones |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Work Needed/Completed - Remaining Tasks – Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **10. ARJIS Procurement Policies**  
  **ADMIN** | 1) Review SANDAG procurement practices for any need of policy revision  
  2) Adopt SANDAG procurement policies. | **Scanlon/Tayman/Campbell** | In Progress - Initial Meeting held with Campbell |
| **11. ARJIS Budget**  
  **BUDGET** | Incorporate ARJIS budget into SANDAG budget. | **Scanlon/Wasmund/B. Montgomery** | First draft of FY2005 budget completed |
| **12. ARJIS Financials**  
  **BUDGET** | Incorporate ARJIS financials and invoicing for 50 member agencies. | **Scanlon/Wasmund/B. Montgomery** | Meeting scheduled with City and SANDAG staff |
| **13. ARJIS Reserve Funds**  
  **BUDGET** | Determine best manner for protecting reserve funds and ensuring proper maintenance and disbursement of the fund balance. | **Scanlon/Wiley/Wasmund** | Initial meeting held with Wasmund |
| **14. ARJISNET Network**  
  **IT** | Ensure ARJISNET secure network is in compliance with DOJ policies. | **Scanlon/FBI/SDDPC/Kroninger** | Completed – ARJIS will remain on ARJISNET |
| **15. SANDAG Calendar**  
  **IT** | Enable ARJIS admin access to SANDAG meeting calendar. | **Salus/Kroninger** | Scanlon on SANDAG remote email/calendar |
| **16. SANDAG Email System**  
  **IT** | Migrate ARJIS GroupWise email system to SANDAG Outlook email system. Convert archives, distribution lists, aliases, etc. | **Salus/Kroniger** | 2 Meetings have been held |
2004 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Recommendation

It is the Executive Committee’s recommendation that the Board of Directors approve the attached 2004 Legislative Program.

Introduction

Each year, the Executive Committee recommends action on the legislative program for the next calendar year to the Board of Directors. Consistent with past programs, the proposed 2004 Legislative Program includes policies and proposals for possible federal and state legislation. This year, staff is proposing a change to the presentation of the goals as shown in Attachment 1. The intent of the change is to provide the Board with a more focused, yet comprehensive list of priorities. The proposed format identifies each goal by subject matter, consistent with the Board’s committee structure. The format also provides a recommended priority and whether the goal pertains to federal, state or local decision making bodies. As shown, some goals affect more than one subject and decision-making body.

Discussion

Next year will be tremendously challenging for the SANDAG Board and staff. It is staff’s belief that a more focused, achievable program will provide the road map for all of us to follow. Reauthorization of both TransNet and TEA-21 (Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century), and pursuit of FY 2005 Appropriation Earmarks are among the highest areas of priority. Other areas of high priority include pursuit of Homeland Security funds, various issues related to housing, growth management, habitat preservation and management, fiscal reform, energy, shoreline preservation, and implementing legislation similar to the I-15 High Occupancy Toll lanes necessary for implementing all of the managed lanes in MOBILITY 2030.

The summarized goals as shown in Attachment 1 are ones that have previously been adopted by the SANDAG Board. The proposed new goals are shown in bold Italics. It is our intent to provide periodic status reports on legislative activity using the attached table.

The Executive Committee reviewed and prioritized the 2004 Legislative Program on October 5, 2003. In addition to the goals as presented to them, the Committee recommended the addition of two stand-alone goals. The first addition supports the Statewide Ballot Initiative sponsored by the League of California Cities Political Action Committee (CITIPAC). The initiative, a constitutional amendment slated for the November 2004 ballot, would allow voters to decide whether state government may appropriate local tax funds to fund state government operations and responsibilities. The second addition supports efforts to
backfill the loss of revenues due to the reversal of the Vehicle License Fees (VLF). SANDAG incorporated the transit boards' legislative program into the regional program for the first time last year, with SANDAG acting as the coordinator for the multi-agency program. The memorandum of understanding among SANDAG, MTDB, NCTD, and the City of San Diego concerning a coordinated lobbying program, signed earlier this year, supports the continuation of this approach. The MTD Board approved their legislative goals on December 11. The NCTD Board will be taking action on their goals on December 18. Project specific goals included in their agenda will be addressed at the SANDAG Transportation Committee in January. The respective programs are included as Attachments 2 and 3.

Also included as Attachment 4 is the City of San Diego position paper on TEA-21 Reauthorization.

Last year, in addition to the 2003 Legislative Program, the SANDAG Board approved a listing of projects to submit for federal funding both in the Transportation Reauthorization Bill and the FY 2004 Transportation Appropriations bill. The list of projects, with associated materials, was presented to the San Diego congressional delegation throughout the year. The unified approach was received positively and we are very close to achieving success. Although the FY 2004 Transportation and Treasury Appropriation Bill is still pending, the conference report which is almost final includes over $123 million in transportation funds for San Diego. In January 2004, an updated project list will be presented to the Transportation Committee for their review and recommendation.

To monitor the Legislative Program, the Executive Committee requested a monthly information report identifying bill numbers and associated status.

Gary L. Gallegos
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Ellen Roundtree, (619) 5950-5631; ero@sandag.org
## SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE GOALS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF GOAL</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BOARD POSITION</th>
<th>POSITION DATE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reauthorization of ½ Sales Tax (TransNet) for 30 years, which is estimated to bring over $9.5 billion (2002 dollars) to San Diego.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highest Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower the current 2/3 voter requirement for special purpose taxes, such as transportation, to a simple majority vote.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Highest Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reauthorization of a six-year transportation bill, including increased levels of funding for highway and transit programs, railroad and highway safety, goods movement and other programs such as the New Starts and Small Starts Program, Intelligent Technology Systems (ITS), Borders, Bus and Bus Related, including the eligibility Bus Rapid Transit. Support for inclusion of Board adopted principles including increased flexibility, environmental streamlining, change to the requirement for Regional Transportation Plans 3 years to 5 years, and requests for earmarks for projects as included in list of priority projects.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highest Support/ Sponsor</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005 Appropriation Requests as included in project priority list.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highest Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation rewarding jurisdictions producing more housing, especially affordable housing, e.g. housing trust funds and other smart growth housing related programs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highest Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation assisting in the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, especially through funding incentives for smart growth (including, but not necessarily limited to, mixed use projects, transit oriented development, and/or walkable communities).</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highest Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal reform initiatives enabling regions to develop their own fiscal strategies and oppose unfunded mandates on local government.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Highest Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to backfill the loss of Vehicle License Fees (VLF) to Cities and Counties</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Highest Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: T: Transportation; R: Regional Planning; P: Public Safety; B: Borders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Description of Goal</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Board Position</th>
<th>Position Date</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efforts that would reduce transportation funding and challenges existing regional decision-making authority.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Higher Oppose</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts assisting in the implementation of key environmental efforts including habitat conservation, planning; beach restoration and replenishment; and water quality related issues.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Higher Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms and funding providing for the implementation of Mobility 2030 including Congestion Pricing Program, Managed Lanes, High Occupancy Toll Lanes, the alleviation of current constraints on transponder technology; and other mechanisms that provide for more efficient use of highways and local roads.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>High Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending the housing element self-certification pilot program; participating in activities related to legislative and administrative reform of the state housing element law.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>High Sponsor/ Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit boards' legislative programs consistent with SANDAG policy.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>High Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In accordance with Border Committee and COBRO recommendations, enhancing of border security and reducing border wait times; pursuit of funding and legislation supporting interregional partnerships and bi-national trade and border projects.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>High Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek funds to implement the Regional Energy Strategy (RES); respond to legislation related to energy consistent with RES Principles.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>High Sponsor/ Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Ballot Initiative, a constitutional amendment sponsored by CitiPac, would allow voters to decide whether state government may appropriate local tax funds to fund state government operations and responsibilities.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>High Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressively seek Homeland Security Funding for ARJIS, Transit and Freight corridors.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Medium Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of new revenue sources; maximize flexibility in use of federal and state dollars and increase regional decision-making authority.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lower Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation resulting in cost efficiencies and savings.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lower Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: T: Transportation; R: Regional Planning; P: Public Safety; B: Borders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF GOAL</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BOARD POSITION</th>
<th>POSITION DATE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislation relating to personnel matters, i.e. workers compensation, PERS, benefits.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Monitor/Respond</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation affecting solid waste, water supply, and storm water; support funding opportunities to assist in these areas.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Monitor/Respond</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other organization’s legislative programs where consistent with SANDAG policy, i.e. CALCOG (California Association of Councils of Governments) APTA (American Public Transportation Association), AMPO (Association of Metropolitan Planning Organization), NARC (National Association of Regional Councils), CTA (California Transit Association).</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: T: Transportation; R: Regional Planning; P: Public Safety; B: Borders
Subject:

PROPOSED STATE LEGISLATIVE GOALS FOR 2004

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Directors approve the state legislative goals for 2004 as set forth herein.

Budget Impact

None at this time.

DISCUSSION:

Amendments to Existing MTDB Legislation

As the completion of the consolidation of MTDB and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) continues, much of MTDB's enabling legislation, California Public Utilities Code section 120000 et seq., will become moot or obsolete. For example, Section 125260 provides "The board shall plan, construct, and operate (or let a contract to operate) public transit systems in conformance with the regional transportation plan." Pursuant to SB 1703, the planning and programming and construction duties have now been transferred to SANDAG. It will therefore be necessary at some point in time to repeal the unnecessary portions of our enabling legislation. In addition, our statutes created the legal entity known as the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) and authorized MTDB to operate a Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). As MTDB is transitioning to become known as MTS, it will be necessary for the legislature to authorize MTDB to change its legal name to MTS. In the interim, our agency is continuing to identify itself publicly as MTS except we are legally required to execute documents in the name of MTDB. At this time, we recommend that we pursue a specific statute changing the legal identity of MTDB to MTS. We also recommend waiting until the 2005-2006 legislative session to make the remaining changes to delete planning and programming and construction functions, which will allow for MTS to fully develop and determine its role and structure after the consolidation process is completed. This would also coincide with the completion of our existing construction projects – Mission Valley East, 12th Avenue Park-to-Bay Link, and San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center.
California Transit Association (CTA) Program

The CTA has adopted its annual legislative program (Attachment B). We recommend adoption of the following general principles for our legislative program, consistent with the CTA.

1. **Create Patterns of Land Use that Efficiently Combine Transit and Development**
   
   A. **Enact Comprehensive Policies to Enable Transit-Supportive Development and Smarter Growth.** This action would include supporting AB 1320, providing tax-increment financing for transit-oriented developments (TOD’s) in transit village planning areas, and seeking introduction of legislation to impose congestion mitigation fees on new developments.

2. **Promote a Multimodal Transportation System Offering Choices to Transportation Consumers**
   
   A. **Clarify the Public Utilities Commission’s Rail Oversight Authority to prevent inappropriate regulatory actions from being imposed on rail public transit.**

   B. **Enhance Penalties for Crimes Against Transit Staff and/or On Transit Vehicles/Property by continuing to support AB 1474.**

3. **Preserve the Environment Through Better Transportation Planning**

4. **Promote Social Equity Through Better Transportation Planning**

5. **Create Financial Stability for Public Transit**
   
   A. **Explore and Enact a Comprehensive Transit Funding Program**

   (1) **Increase Operating Revenue.** The Senate Resolution 8 report of 1999 indicates that California transit operators require at least an additional $400 million per year over the next 10 years to meet the state’s growing demands for mobility, access, and economic development. In 2003, AB 1065 was introduced to allow counties to double their local TDA quarter-cent sales tax. Continued support for this bill and similar legislation will be necessary throughout the year.

   (2) **Create a New Transit Capital Funding Program.** The Association advocates for additional revenue for transit capital investment programs.

   (3) **Enact Transit Supportive Development Funding.** Seek additional revenue to provide transit agencies with a dedicated funding source for transit-friendly development.
(4) Add Revenue to Address Air Quality Requirements. Seek additional revenue to comply with newly imposed engine emission requirements.

(5) Protect and Recover Transit’s Property Tax Base. The state annually shifts property tax revenue of several transit agencies to nontransit purposes. The Association supports legislation to protect and recover the property tax base of these agencies and opposes state budget action to divert such property tax funds to the state’s general fund.

B. Remedy Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino. The Association supports legislation to remedy the impact of this case, which required a two-thirds vote for sales tax elections. Such legislation would reduce the currently required two-thirds supra majority vote and make it easier to enact or continue existing local county sales taxes for transportation purposes.

C. Remedy Bonanno v. Central Contra Costa Transit Authority. Earlier this year, the California Supreme Court upheld a lower-court decision holding the Central Contra Costa Transit Authority liable for injuries sustained by a patron crossing the street to reach a bus stop. The ruling substantially broadened the liability exposure of transit agencies as nearly any bus stop could now arguably be a dangerous condition. The Association supports a legislative change to this case.

D. Protect Existing Transit Revenue. The Association supports action to protect against the transfer or expenditure of Transportation Development Act (TDA), Public Transportation Account (PTA), Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP), and other transit funds to state and local agencies for purposes other than those specified in the Act. This includes support for funding of transit bond debt service payments from the state’s general fund.

E. Support Transit Efficiency. Transit performance efficiency measures that streamline and improve state accountability requirements would be supported. The Association is proposing to sponsor legislation to extend the design-build authority currently granted to transit operators and seek a remedy from Caltrans’ duplicative applications for Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Programs.

F. Exempt Small Operators from Administrative Burdens. The Association will consider and support exemptions from small business operators from financially burdensome or regulatory requirements, or to minimize their impact on small operators.

G. Protect Integrity of Collective Bargaining Agreements. The Association will support efforts to preserve the collective bargaining process at the local level and oppose efforts to mandate benefits or working conditions through state statutes.
H. Educate Governor Elect and New Administration. The Association will work with the Governor and his Administration regarding the benefits of public transportation in California.

Jack Limber
Interim General Manager

Key Staff Contact: Tiffany Lorenzen, 619.557.4568, Tiffany.Lorenzen@sdmts.com

Attachments: A. Draft 2004 State Legislative Program
B. Matrix of Significant Transit Legislation

Board only
Denotes a goal included in NCTD’s 2003 Legislative Agenda (possibly modified to reflect current legislative language)

☑ Denotes a new goal for this year

**FEDERAL GOALS**

**Higher priorities**

- Aggressively support Transportation Equity Act (TEA) reauthorization.
- Seek a New Starts earmark for the Sprinter (Oceanside-Escondido) rail project in the new TEA bill.
- Seek a $55 million FY 05 Congressional Appropriation for the Sprinter rail project, consistent with the Federal Full Funding Grant Agreement schedule.
- Support an earmark in the TEA reauthorization bill for Coastal (Oceanside-San Diego) Rail Corridor upgrades and other corridor enhancements.
- Support an earmark in the TEA reauthorization for the expansion of the Sprinter Rail Line, including double tracking, the extension to North County Fair and other corridor enhancements.
- Seek a $7.0 million FY 05 Congressional Appropriation for the Solana Beach Intermodal Facility project.
- Seek a $2.4 million FY 05 Congressional Appropriation for the Oceanside Security and Maintenance project.
- Seek a $2.4 million FY 05 Congressional Appropriation for the San Luis Rey Transit Center project.
- Seek federal funding opportunities through the Department of Homeland Security and other agencies for safety and security projects and related costs.
- Support a $20 million earmark for San Diego regional grade separations in the reauthorized TEA bill.
- In partnership with interested cities, seek federal funding that is specifically dedicated to grade separation projects.
- Support MTDB’s highest legislative priority requesting a $65 million FY 05 Congressional Appropriation for Mission Valley East Light Rail Transit extension.
- Support advocacy efforts strengthening the LOSSAN (Los Angeles- San Diego-San Luis Obispo) Corridor.
- Monitor and respond to legislation related to finances, operations, employment, and safety, including issues related to contractors.
Lower priorities

- Continue to support legislation that brings federal dollars to railroad corridors, such as the Rail Infrastructure Development and Expansion Act for the 21st Century and the Amtrak High Speed Rail Investment Act.

- Support and respond to Congressional actions related to adhering to the guaranteed funding levels established in TEA-21 and aggressively support increased annual appropriation levels up to the maximum amounts authorized in TEA-21.

- Monitor and respond to legislation that would designate the Surface Transportation Board as a forum to improve passenger rail and other fixed guideway passenger transportation by allowing improved access to freight track and rights-of-way for fixed guideway transportation in consideration for just and reasonable compensation to freight railroads.

- Monitor and respond to legislation that will extend existing rail safety and rail labor rules to other rail entities currently not covered, such as commuter rail operators who contract out the operational service.

- Support legislation that will increase transit efficiency and delivery of projects through the streamlining and consolidation of requirements.

- Participate with the New Agency in securing funding for “Showcase Transit First” Pilot Projects.

- Support the legislation that will implement a Fuel Cell Bus Program.

- Support the 2004 legislative agenda of the American Public Transit Association (APTA). APTA has not yet distributed its 2004 legislative agenda. When the agenda has been distributed staff will update the Board. NCTD will not support any activity that the Board determines to be inconsistent with the goals of the agency.

Education and Communication Efforts

- Continue education and communication efforts with legislators to foster a full understanding of the challenges facing transit in terms of funding needs for important infrastructure improvements, such as railroad bridge replacements and grade separation projects, as well as the need for sustainable revenues to provide an effective transit system for our growing region.

- Work with APTA’s TEA Reauthorization Task Force, conveying NCTD’s desire to seek inclusion of a railroad bridge and other infrastructure rehabilitation program in new TEA bill.
STATE GOALS

Higher Priorities

✓ Protect transit funding through the opposition of the transfer or expenditure of Transportation Development Act, Public Transportation Account, Traffic Congestion Relief Fund, and other transit funds, for purposes other than those specified in existing transit funding laws.

❖ Support legislative efforts that would lower the voter approval for the passage of special transportation sales tax, such as TransNet, to a simple majority vote. Existing law requires a 2/3 vote.

✓ In partnership with other transit agencies and the California Transit Association, seek legislation limiting inappropriate regulatory actions of the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

✓ Support legislation that will allow the NSDCTDB to alter the board’s compensation. The review period for an increase in compensation will be possible every two years and the review for a decrease possible on an annual basis.

❖ Support legislation that will generate new revenue sources for transit projects, services, and operating costs.

❖ In partnership with interested cities, seek state funding that is specifically dedicated to grade separation projects.

✓ Support legislation that would reverse or mitigate the recent California Supreme Court ruling that held transit agencies are liable for pedestrian injuries sustained as a result of the “dangerous” location of a bus stop. (Bonanno v. Central Contra Costa Transit Authority)

❖ Support advocacy efforts that will strengthen the LOSSAN (Los Angeles- San Diego-San Luis Obispo) Corridor.

❖ Monitor and respond to legislation related to finances, operations, employment, and safety, including issues related to contractors.

Lower Priorities

❖ Support legislation, if introduced that maximizes flexibility of state and federal funding.

✓ Support legislation that will increase transit efficiency and delivery of projects through the streamlining and consolidation of requirements.

❖ Participate in efforts to identify state funding for “Showcase Transit First” Pilot Projects.

❖ Support the California Transit Association (CTA) 2004 Legislative Program

Education and Communication Efforts

❖ Continue education and communication efforts with legislators to foster a full understanding of the challenges facing transit in terms of funding needs for important infrastructure improvements, such as railroad bridge replacements and grade separation projects, as well as the need for sustainable revenues to provide an effective transit system for our growing region.
LOCAL/REGIONAL GOALS

Higher priorities

- Support the reauthorization of TransNet. The ½ penny sales tax benefiting regional transportation will go before county voters in 2004. The current iteration of TransNet has a twenty-year authorization and will sunset in 2008. TransNet revenues are responsible for partially funding vital regional transportation projects including the Sprinter, the SR-78 widening to six lanes, and local road projects.

- Participate with the New Agency in developing the TransNet Reauthorization Extension Expenditure Plan.

- Participate with the New Agency in identifying and pursuing local funding opportunities.

- Develop a regional transit coalition to effectively and comprehensively educate, communicate, work with and respond to local legislative transit needs, thereby furthering the vision of a seamless, integrated transit system.

PROJECT FUNDING PRIORITIES

Our legislative delegation consistently asks, “What is our priority for project funding?” Due to limited resources available and numerous agencies with critical projects competing for these funds, it is important to be able to communicate to our legislative delegation what are the Board’s highest priority projects. The following listing is a recommendation that will assist staff in effectively communicating our priorities to the delegations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Funding Priority Order</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source(s)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sprinter Rail Project</td>
<td>Section 5309 New Start</td>
<td>$55.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solana Beach Intermodal Facility</td>
<td>Section 5309 Bus Program</td>
<td>$7.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oceanside Security and Maintenance</td>
<td>Section 5309 Bus Program</td>
<td>$2.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• San Luis Rey Transit Center</td>
<td>Section 5309 Bus Program</td>
<td>$2.4 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This position paper assesses issues important to the City of San Diego as Congress rewrites the Transportation Enhancement Act, by which Federal transportation funds are distributed. Final action is anticipated by Congress in early 2004.

**Background**

The Draft 2030 Regional Transportation Plan currently projects a likely spending level of $42 billion. Approximately $11 billion of these funds are anticipated from Federal sources. The Transportation Enhancement Act (TEA) Reauthorization will determine:

1. The level of Federal funding provided to transportation for the next 5 years
2. How funds will be distributed between states, and between categories of projects (e.g. highways and transit)
3. The list of projects eligible for “demonstration grant” funding
4. Other rules and regulations governing transportation

**Funding Issues**

Federal transportation funds are generated by collection of a 22.5 cent tax on each gallon of gas, as well as additional user fees. In aggregate, these funds will generate between $225 billion and $300 billion nationally during the next 5 years. At least three reauthorization proposals are expected – one each from the Bush Administration, the House of Representatives and the Senate. The following chart summarizes what is known of these proposals, and compares it with the past 5 year funding level.
House Transportation Committee Chairman Don Young is known to favor a significant increase in transportation spending, citing conclusions of a Department of Transportation study that existing funding levels are not even maintaining the system adequately, much less addressing increasing congestion. Chairman Young suggests four sources for the possible funding increase:

1. **Trust Fund:** $9-$13 billion can be added by spending down the existing Transportation Trust Fund balance of $17 billion to a still prudent reserve of between $4 billion – $8 billion. The balance, once reaching nearly $30 billion, was reduced by contributions to deficit reduction.

2. **“Transportation Fees for Transportation:”** A variety of transportation fees are NOT spent on transportation purposes, including ethanol subsidies.

3. **Indexing Gas Tax:** The current $18.3 cent gas tax is NOT indexed for inflation. Doing so would keep revenues consistent with construction, maintenance and operation cost inflation.

4. **2 cent Gas Tax Increase:** The gas tax was last increased by President Clinton – 5 cents per gallon in 1992, though the revenues were dedicated to deficit reduction. In 1998, Congress redirected those funds to transportation.

The Bush Administration proposal, by contrast, assumes existing revenues from gas taxes and fees during the 5 year period.

**Defining San Diego’s Interests**

**Funding Level**
- All three proposals will likely meet the short term federal funding assumptions of the RTP for the years 2003-2007
- The House proposal would begin to fulfill the long term RTP funding assumption of increased federal revenues

**Local Earmarks:** During the last reauthorization, the San Diego region received $405 million in earmarks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Projects</th>
<th>Earmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$80 million</td>
<td>Acquire right-of-way and construct SR905 $5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Olympic Training Center Access Road, Chula Vista</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct San Diego and Arizona Eastern Intermodal Yard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construct SR-78/Rancho Del Oro interchange in Oceanside $3.75 million
Complete Citracado Parkway project in San Diego County $2.25 million
Extend State Route 52 in San Diego $2.25 million
Complete State Route 56 in San Diego $3 million
Construct State Route 76 in Northern San Diego $7.5 million

Transit Projects: $325 million
San Diego Mid-Coast LRT Corridor
San Diego Mission Valley East Corridor
San Diego Oceanside-Escondido Corridor

SANDAG has submitted a list of project proposals for reauthorization – which is enclosed as appendix 1

**Transit Issues:** The priority of our region is to complete existing light rail transit lines, and, to embark upon the “Transit First” strategy that relies heavily upon “Bus Rapid Transit” (BRT). Regional strategy will emphasize eligibility of BRT for transit funding.

**Border Issues:** San Diego serves as a through-way for the busiest international border crossing in the world. The majority of this traffic is destined for areas outside of the San Diego region; much of it going to places even outside of California. Our regional priority has been to identify appropriate federal funding to address projects which ultimately benefit other regions of the country. $800 million was dedicated to border and trade corridors in the last 5 year program.

**Environmental reforms:** States that have extensive project review requirements to ensure environmental protection, have sought ways to eliminate duplication of federal requirements – resulting in faster opening of new transportation projects.

Senate: Planning Review expedite provisions

**Ethanol:** Gasoline containing ethanol is taxed at a lower rate – thus costing the trust fund revenues
INTRODUCTION

This staff report recommends the approval of the attached Notice and Proposed Amendment to Conflict of Interest Code for distribution. Approval for distribution will commence the public comment period required by the Political Reform Act (Government Code Sections 81000 et seq.). The Proposed Amendment reflects necessary updates to the list of designated positions subject to filing annual economic disclosure statements and the financial disclosure categories applicable to such designated positions.

DISCUSSION

The Political Reform Act, Government Code Sections 81000, et seq., requires SANDAG to adopt and promulgate a Conflict of Interest Code. The Fair Political Practices Commission has adopted a regulation, 2 Cal. Code ofRegs. Section 18730, which contains the terms of a standard model conflict of interest code. The standard model conflict of interest code can be incorporated by reference. The SANDAG Board has adopted a Conflict of Interest Code that incorporates the provisions of a standard model conflict of interest code set forth in a regulation of the Fair Political Practices Commission (2 California Administrative Code Section 18730). Government Code Section 87302 requires specific enumeration of the positions within SANDAG which involve the making or participation in the making of decisions which may foreseeably have a material effect on any financial interest. Each enumerated position must also state the specific types of investments, business positions, interests in real property and sources of income which are reportable. SANDAG’s existing Conflict of Interest Code specifies the designated positions subject to the reporting requirements and includes appendices listing each designated position along with the categories of financial interests which each must report. The Conflict of Interest Code incorporates the regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission set forth at Title 2, Division 6 of the California Code of Regulations (formerly 2 California Administrative Code) pertaining to provisions of conflict of interest codes. Changes in the organization and classification of divisions and staff positions, including changes of title, and additional staff positions, have occurred since adoption of the existing Conflict of Interest Code in September 2002. If adopted following the public comment period, the proposed amended version would result in an updated Conflict of Interest Code, accurately reflecting the current list of designated positions and consultants and their respective financial disclosure categories, resulting from agency consolidation under SB 1703.
The attached Proposed Amendment includes all newly designated positions, reclassifications, renaming or deletion of previously designated positions, and addition, deletion or modification of the specific types of investments, business positions, interests in real property and sources of income which are reportable by each designated position.

Gary L. Gallegos

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Julie Wiley,
(619)595-5647; jwi@sandag.org

No Budget Impact
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO AMEND SANDAG’S EXISTING CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE

Additional positions have been added to SANDAG’s staff that include significant involvement in the processes SANDAG uses to select and contract with consultants, contractors, and vendors, reflecting agency consolidation under SB 1703. Also, some of the relevant job titles have changed. Therefore, modifications need to be added to the list of designated employees covered by SANDAG’s Conflict of Interest Code. SANDAG has prepared a written explanation of the reasons for the additional designations and the disclosure responsibilities, and has available all of the information upon which its proposal is based.

A copy of the proposed amended Conflict of Interest Code, including the titles of the additional designated employee positions, is attached to this Notice. Written comments and oral inquiries concerning the proposed amended Code may be submitted to: Julie Wiley, Interim General Counsel, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101, (619) 595-5647. Written comments must be received by the close of the written comment period in order for them to be considered by SANDAG before it amends its Conflicts of Interest Code. The closing date for the written comment period is January 19, 2004.

Any interested person or his or her duly authorized representative may request, no later than 15 days prior to the close of the written comment period, a public hearing on SANDAG’s proposed amended Conflict of Interest Code.
PROPOSED AMENDED CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE

Pursuant to the Political Reform Act, Government Code Sections 81000, et seq., SANDAG hereby adopts 2 Cal. Code of Regs. Section 18730, which contains the terms of a standard model conflict of interest code. The standard model conflict of interest code can be incorporated by reference, and may be amended by the Fair Political Practices Commission to conform to amendments in the Political Reform Act after public notice and hearings. Therefore, the terms of 2 Cal. Code of Regs. Section 18730 and any amendments to it duly adopted by the Fair Political Practices Commission along with the attached appendices in which officials and employees are designated and disclosure categories are set forth, are hereby incorporated by reference and constitute SANDAG’s Conflict of Interest Code.

Designated employees and consultants shall file statements of economic interests with SANDAG’s Deputy General Counsel annually during the month of March and those statements will be made available as public records. (Gov. Code Section 81008). Statements for all designated employees will also be sent to the San Diego County Board of Supervisors.

Consultants will be added to the list in Appendix A if SANDAG enters into contracts with persons who, in the opinion of SANDAG’s Executive Director, may reasonably be expected to make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his or her position as a consultant to influence a governmental decision in which the person might reasonably be expected to have a financial interest. If SANDAG enters into such a contract, the position shall be listed by the name or job title of each person classified a designated employee in any contract that SANDAG enters into for consulting services with a person or business entity (whether or not a nonprofit entity).
### SANDAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE

#### APPENDIX A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated Positions</th>
<th>Disclosure Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members and alternate members of the Board of Directors</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members and alternate members of the five Policy Advisory Committees</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Deputy Executive Director</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Counsel and Deputy General Counsel</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Directors and Department Directors</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Economist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Relations Director</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Regional Planner / Analyst</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Regional Planner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects Director</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator of Financial Programming &amp; Project Control</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Financial Planning &amp; Budgeting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Sales Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Contract Administrator</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Analyst</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Compliance Specialist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Consultant</td>
<td>Designated Name/Job Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Advisor</td>
<td>Public Financial Management/Managing Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positions shall be listed by the name or job title of each person classified as a “designated employee” in any contract in which SANDAG enters into with a person or business entity (whether or not a nonprofit entity) for the consulting services. Such a designation will be made in the contract with respect to any person who, in the opinion of SANDAG, may reasonably be expected to make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his/her position as a “consultant” to influence a governmental decision in which the person might reasonably be expected to have a financial interest.
APPENDIX B

When a designated employee is required to disclose investment and sources of income, he or she need disclose investments in business entities and sources of income that do business in SANDAG’s jurisdiction, plan to do business in the jurisdiction, or have done business in the jurisdiction in the past two years. In addition to other activities, a business entity is doing business within the jurisdiction if it owns real property within the jurisdiction. When a designated employee is required to disclose interests in real property, he or she need only disclose real property that is located in whole or in part within or not more than two miles outside the boundaries of the jurisdiction or within two miles of any land owned or used by SANDAG.

Employees designated in Appendix A shall disclose their financial interests pursuant to the appropriate disclosure categories described in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosure Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All investments and sources of income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>All interests in real property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>All investments, interest in real property, and sources of income subject to the authority of SANDAG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Investments in business entities and sources of income of the type which, within the past two years, have contracted with SANDAG to provide services, supplies, materials, or equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM FOR FY 2005

Recommendation
It is the Shoreline Preservation Committee’s recommendation that the Board of Directors approve Resolution 2004-10 authorizing the Executive Director to:

1. Accept up to $75,000 in local funds to continue the basic Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program in FY 2005; and
2. Use up to $45,000 from SANDAG’s state and federal Regional Beach Sand Project funds for expanding the FY 2005 Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program to cover the additional beach monitoring requirements for the Regional Beach Sand Project.

Introduction
At its December 4, 2003 meeting, the Shoreline Preservation Committee recommended that SANDAG continue the Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program in FY 2005. 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 additional cost of the program expansion due to the Regional Beach Sand Project is $45,000 and is available from the Project’s budget. The total cost of the FY 2005 monitoring program is $120,000. All costs and funding sources are the same as in FY 2004.

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, 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 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 2005 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 2005 budgets following SANDAG approval. Invoices will be sent in July 2004.

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 2004-10 are needed to allow the continuation of the program in FY 2005.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Rob Rundle,
(619) 595-5649; rru@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3002800
AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ACCEPT UP TO $75,000 IN LOCAL FUNDS TO CONTINUE THE BASIC REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM IN FY 2005; USE UP TO $45,000 FROM SANDAG’S STATE AND FEDERAL REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT FUNDS FOR EXPANDING THE FY 2005 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 2005

WHEREAS, SANDAG’s Overall Work Program Work Element #3002800 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 2005 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 #3002800; and

WHEREAS, the Shoreline Preservation Committee has recommended that the Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program be expanded in FY 2005 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 2005; and

2. Use up to $45,000 from SANDAG’s state and federal Regional Beach Sand Project funds for expanding the FY 2005 Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program to cover the additional beach monitoring requirements for the Regional Beach Sand Project.

3. Contract with consultants for up to $120,000 to carry out the basic and expanded Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program in FY 2005.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of December, 2003.

ATTEST: ________________________________
SECRETARY

CHAIRPERSON

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit Development Board, North San Diego County Transit Development Board, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, S.D. Unified Port District, S.D. County Water Authority, and Baja California/Mexico.
## REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING

### Basic Program FY 2005

<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>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State and Federal</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<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.
DRAFT REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP)

Recommendation

The SANDAG Board of Directors is being requested to accept the draft RCP for distribution to member agencies and the public for an initial review period, beginning on Friday, December 19, 2003 and lasting through Monday, March 1, 2004. At its November meeting, the Regional Planning Committee unanimously recommended that the Board accept the draft RCP for distribution.

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) serves as the long-term planning framework for the San Diego region. It defines a vision and lays a foundation to connect local and regional policy decisions that support our shared vision of the future. It balances population, housing, and employment growth with habitat preservation, agriculture, open space, and infrastructure needs. It moves us toward a more sustainable future - a future with more choices and opportunities for all residents of the region.

Introduction

Over the past year and a half, citizens of the region, elected officials and staff members of the local governments, stakeholders from throughout the region, and regional infrastructure providers have been working together with SANDAG to prepare the draft RCP and one of its key components, the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS).

The RCP emphasizes the critical link between transportation and land use planning and development, and demonstrates how these connections can be strengthened. It calls for focusing transportation and other infrastructure investments in smart growth opportunity areas, introducing an incentive-based approach to achieving our urban form goals and meeting our infrastructure needs.

Building upon existing local general plans and regional infrastructure plans, the RCP sets forth a preferred regional planning approach based on smart growth principles. It better integrates our local land use decisions with our regional transportation and infrastructure investments, and focuses attention on where and how we want to grow, providing a vital alternative to where we could end up if we continue with business as usual.

The RCP looks beyond our borders and takes into account the planning and growth underway in Imperial, Orange, and Riverside counties as well as in Baja California, Mexico. It looks at the equity in our planning processes: do all communities have access to the region’s resources and do all residents have an equal opportunity to participate in the process.

Discussion

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary for the Regional Comprehensive Plan is attached. It
highlights the major concepts contained in each chapter of the RCP and will be incorporated into the final version of the RCP.

The complete Draft RCP is available on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/rcp, or by contacting SANDAG at (619) 595-5399.

Next Round of Public Outreach and Environmental Documentation

If approved by the SANDAG Board, the initial public review period for the draft RCP will extend from December 19, 2003 through March 1, 2004. During this time, SANDAG staff, working with members of the Regional Planning Committee and its working groups, will actively seek opportunities to make presentations on the draft RCP to local member agencies, regional infrastructure providers, clubs, associations, and organized events throughout the region. Input obtained during the initial review period will be used to help prepare the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The draft EIR will be presented to the SANDAG Board on March 26, 2004, with a request to accept the draft for a 45 day public review period. During that timeframe, SANDAG will conduct a final series of public workshops to obtain further input on both the draft RCP (including any substantive changes resulting from the earlier review period) and the draft EIR.

The Board’s consideration of the certification of the EIR and approval of the final RCP is scheduled for the Board meeting in June 2004.

Technical Appendices

A key component of the draft RCP is the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS). The IRIS consists of two interrelated parts. The first is an integrated infrastructure strategy that is featured in Chapter 7 of the RCP; the second is a series of detailed technical appendices containing all of the data and information for each of the infrastructure areas included in the IRIS. The IRIS Technical Appendix is available on the SANDAG Web site.
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Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3000200
Prosperity. Though we often think of it in economic terms, its true definition is “to succeed, thrive and grow.” The Regional Comprehensive Plan is comprehensive, bold and ambitious, yet it can be reduced to a single, unifying theme, that of prosperity.

Equitable, environmental, and economic prosperity are not short-term achievements. Thriving communities are built upon firm foundations laid by prior generations. That’s why the Regional Comprehensive Plan was prepared, to ensure that we strengthen, not erode, the foundation of prosperity for our generation and those to come.

Abraham Lincoln said, “You cannot escape the responsibility of tomorrow by evading it today.” As citizens of the greater San Diego region, we all share the responsibility for tomorrow. But what should that tomorrow look like? Many would say: less traffic, more home ownership, great schools, better transit, pristine open space, and a higher standard of living.

These goals are within our reach, but will require bold actions and serious commitment to upholding effective public policies, making course corrections where needed, and taking risks in the creation of new programs.

The rewards of such efforts can be great. A regional approach, backed by local commitment, will make a significant difference in our regional prosperity in 10, 20, 30 years and beyond.

A REGIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR LOCAL ACTION

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is the long-term planning framework for the San Diego region. It defines a shared vision of the future and lays a foundation to connect local and regional policy decisions and land use and transportation decisions to achieve that vision.

Based on principles of smart growth and sustainability, it balances population, housing, and employment growth with habitat preservation, agriculture, open space, and infrastructure needs. It moves us toward a more sustainable future – a future with more choices and opportunities for all residents of the region.

The Regional Comprehensive Plan is not timid. True to its name, the RCP looks beyond our borders and factors in the planning and growth underway in Imperial, Orange, and Riverside counties as well as in Baja California, Mexico. It sheds new light on equity – and inequities – in our planning processes by asking: do all communities have access to the region’s resources and do all residents have an equal opportunity to participate in the process?
As our region suffers the impacts of urban sprawl, particularly traffic congestion, the RCP places the highest priority on better linking future transportation and land use planning decisions. It shows how these connections can be strengthened and defines smart growth opportunity areas where these linkages will have the most positive effect.

These transportation and land use linkages can be better achieved with “carrots” rather than “sticks.” The Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy, the investment component of the RCP, will be a key to the region’s ability to establish an incentive-based approach to achieve our urban form goals and meet our infrastructure needs.

Most important, the RCP respects local decision making and celebrates the unique character of the cities and towns that make up the San Diego region. The RCP builds upon the best elements of our existing local general plans and regional infrastructure plans to provide a regional blueprint for where and how we want to grow. It provides a viable alternative to where we will end up if we continue with business as usual.

A SHARED VISION OF THE FUTURE

The RCP was crafted by the citizens of the region and by the 18 cities and county government, working together as the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG).

The RCP is founded on the ideas of thousands of citizens including residents, business owners, and local public officials. Together, they endorsed the following vision statement for the Regional Comprehensive Plan:

“To preserve and enhance the San Diego region’s unique features – its vibrant and culturally-diverse communities, its beaches, deserts, mountains, lagoons, bluffs, and canyons, and its international setting – and promote sustainability, economic prosperity, and an outstanding quality of life for everyone.”

They also helped to articulate a series of Core Values, referenced throughout the RCP, which guide the local and regional policy actions recommended in the RCP.

The policy recommendations were heavily shaped by principles of “sustainability” and “smart growth.”

Sustainability means simultaneously meeting our current economic, environmental, and community needs while also ensuring that we aren’t jeopardizing the ability of future generations to meet their needs. Sustainability also means a commitment to the “Three Es:” Economy, Environment, and
Equity—advancing a prosperous Economy, supporting a healthy Environment, and promoting social Equity. Another important “E” is Environmental justice: ensuring that plans, policies, and actions do not disproportionately affect low income and minority communities.

Smart growth means developing our region in a way that provides more housing and transportation choices, a greater mixture of land uses, more public spaces, more open space preservation, more jobs near housing, more urban public facilities, more walkability, and more jobs and housing near transit, all while reducing land consumption in our rural and agricultural areas and reinvesting in our existing communities.

More and more of our local jurisdictions and government agencies are incorporating these principles of smart growth and sustainability into their general plans and policy documents.

That’s good news, because our quality of life tomorrow will be determined, in large measure, by the extent to which we implement these concepts today.

OUR CURRENT PATH

The San Diego region has changed dramatically during the last hundred years. Our regional population today of 2.9 million is roughly equal to the population of the entire state of California a century ago. The region’s growth has fluctuated during economic cycles, but increased the most rapidly in the last 30 years. This is evidenced by the fact that 62 percent of the homes in the region were built after 1970.

Our population is growing - and increasingly more from births than in-migration. SANDAG projects that our regional population will increase by approximately one million people between 2000 and 2030. Many of those newcomers will be our children and grandchildren.

As our numbers have increased, the face of our population has changed, as well. Today our regional population is older and much more ethnically diverse. Consequently, the way we live is changing. Empty nesters are trading large homes in the suburbs for condominiums in vibrant neighborhood and urban centers. An estimated 18 percent of our citizens have some form of disability. More households are made up of single parents with children. Different lifestyles demand different housing solutions.

We face the challenge of providing housing for a growing and diverse population at the same time the region is beginning to run out of viable, open land for new development.

As a result of this imbalance of housing supply and demand, home prices are skyrocketing, forcing many to abandon their dreams of home ownership or move to neighboring areas with lower housing costs. These people, who teach our children, police our neighborhoods, and bag our groceries, often become long-distance commuters, and with few transit options, our freeways become more and more congested. The region is on a slippery slope, hence, the need for a bold new approach to land use and transportation planning.
'RCP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- Focus future population and job growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned job centers and public facilities.
- Create safe, healthy, walkable, and vibrant communities that are designed and built accessible to people of all abilities.
- Develop a flexible, sustainable, and well-integrated transportation system that focuses on moving people and goods – not just vehicles.
- Provide a variety of affordable and quality housing choices for people of all income levels and abilities.
- Preserve and maintain natural biological communities and species native to the region.
- Restore, protect, and enhance the water quality and the beneficial uses of local coastal waters, inland surface waters, and ground waters.
- Reduce or eliminate pollutants in our region’s water bodies.
- Protect our region’s wetlands.
- Preserve and enhance the region’s beaches and nearshore areas as environmental and recreational resources.
- Achieve and maintain federal and state clean air standards.
- Ensure a rising standard of living for all of our residents.
- Ensure a safe, sufficient, reliable, and cost-efficient water supply for the San Diego region.
- Meet the region’s energy needs in a fiscally and environmentally sound manner.
- Minimize the need for additional landfills and provide economically and environmentally sound resource recovery, management, and disposal facilities.
- Exceed the state-mandated 50 percent waste stream diversion rate by the year 2005 and work toward a 75 percent diversion rate.
- Create a regional community where San Diego, our neighboring counties, tribal governments, and northern Baja California mutually benefit from our varied resources and international location.
- Regularly assess the ability of our infrastructure to handle change and maintain our quality of life.
- Align our infrastructure plans and investments with our RCP goals and objectives.
- Address infrastructure needs in the region in a comprehensive manner, not piecemeal.
- Create a planning framework that coordinates and links long term visionary goals with short term capital expenditures across infrastructure providers.
- Provide adequate infrastructure improvements prior to or concurrent with the population growth occurring in smart growth opportunity areas.
- Accept more responsibility locally for addressing our regional and subregional infrastructure needs.
A BETTER APPROACH TO PLANNING

The Regional Comprehensive Plan establishes a new approach to planning in the San Diego region. This approach is based upon:

- A planning framework that parallels those used by cities and counties in preparing their general plans, and thereby strengthens the coordination of local and regional plans and programs; and

- A policy framework that focuses on connecting local and regional transportation and land use plans, and creation of incentives that encourage “smart growth” planning and implementation.

We have known for a long time that unless changed, the general plans of the region’s 19 local jurisdictions will not adequately accommodate our future projected growth of one million more people over the next three decades. As the region continues to grow, the current plans, unless amended, will lead to increased traffic congestion and the continued loss of agricultural land, open space, and critical habitat. The region’s housing crisis will continue for decades unless existing general plan capacities are increased for development of more homes, apartments, and condominiums in our urbanized, incorporated jurisdictions. SANDAG’s and other studies show that smart growth development that links transportation and land use greatly increases our ability to handle our projected growth.

The Preferred Planning Concept

A major emphasis of the RCP is better linking transportation and land use planning. The RCP sets forth policy objectives and actions in several areas to improve transportation and land use coordination including: implement the adopted Regional Transportation Plan “2030 mobility network;” improve connectivity between land use and interrelated modes of transportation; provide adequate funding to meet the needs of our transportation systems; design development to reduce auto dependency; and align the timing and funding of related transportation and land use development.
To address these issues more effectively in the future, the RCP calls for new efforts to engage neighboring local jurisdictions in cross-boundary, subregional planning efforts.

Another key tenet of the RCP is to identify smart growth opportunity areas and to reward communities that create compact, higher density, mixed use, pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods with supportive transportation and infrastructure improvements.

When it comes to transportation funding and smart growth, the RCP directs SANDAG to put its money where its mouth is, and encourages infrastructure providers to link their investments to transportation and land use.

From Local Plans to a Regional Framework

The proposed implementation strategy for the RCP is a collaborative planning approach that springs from the local level to a regional framework. The implementation strategy for the RCP calls for: connecting the plan’s policy objectives to local and regional plans; implementation of actions by various agencies and stakeholders; and development of compacts, which are agreements to implement the RCP’s key actions.

By focusing on the coordination of transportation and land use plans at the local and regional levels, the region will be able to address many of its pressing problems: traffic congestion, housing affordability, protection of sensitive habitats, and strengthening our economy, while ensuring equity in planning and development.

The various chapters of the RCP address each of the major elements of planning for our region: urban form, transportation, housing, healthy environment, economic prosperity, public facilities, and borders issues. Each chapter begins with a vision for our region in 2030 and includes a description of existing conditions, existing plans and programs, an analysis of key issues, and recommended goals, policy objectives, and actions.

Taken together, these chapters, along with the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS), form the core of the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

URBAN FORM: WHERE AND HOW SHOULD THE REGION GROW?

Where should we provide places in our region for people to live, work, shop, and play as our population continues to grow? How should we design our communities so that they provide us with a high quality of life? Will the impacts of future growth overwhelm the natural blessings of our environment?
How our land uses are distributed across the region has a wide-ranging impact on our quality of life. Previous analyses have demonstrated that the way land has been developed in the region over the past half century cannot be sustained as the region continues to grow. Dispersed, low density housing separated from auto-oriented commercial development pushes urban development into areas better suited for rural land uses and regional open space.

The separation of land uses (when jobs are far from housing) combined with low density development results in auto-dependent communities where residents have to drive far for work, school, or services. As homes and jobs are more dispersed and trips become longer, it is more difficult to travel any other way but in a car. Alternatives like transit and carpooling work best where travel is focused along corridors conveniently close to transit centers, light rail, or park and ride lots. Bicycling and walking are practical alternatives only when the distances are relatively short between shops, jobs, school, or services, or when they can be easily combined with transit.

While a significant number of the region’s population will continue to live in moderate to low density residential communities, more choices in both housing type and location are necessary to meet our mobility and housing needs. A better mix of jobs and housing, and better access to jobs are needed at both the regional and interregional levels. In particular, we need to reduce the number of lengthy commute trips across the county and across our borders everyday.

Designing Livable Places

A strong sense of community identity in a vibrant and diverse urban landscape is the hallmark of great urban places. Good design reflects the unique character of the community. It enhances the identity of the community by improving existing public facilities and providing high quality design in new facilities. An over-dependence on the automobile as a means of travel results in communities that are dominated by the infrastructure necessary to accommodate the car. Healthy communities support a variety of transportation choices.

The RCP’s recommendations are based upon the following basic elements of good urban design:

- Public participation and education,
- Quality architecture and design,
- Walkable and human-scale communities,
- Preserving community character,
- Mixed land uses and street networks,
- Redevelopment, infill, and parking,
- Healthy communities,
- Accessibility, and
- Public safety.
Coordinating Transportation and Land Use

SANDAG already uses land use and urban design factors in its funding criteria for highways, transit, and regional arterials. However, the RCP establishes a planning and policy framework to strengthen that approach, by including an initial identification of smart growth opportunity areas and the use of transportation infrastructure funding to encourage development in these areas.

Determining Smart Growth Opportunity Areas

The first step toward focusing SANDAG’s infrastructure investments in support of smart growth is to identify the location of potential smart growth opportunity areas. Because the San Diego region is so diverse, these smart growth areas will vary in character from place to place, but some general principles apply. These areas should reflect and enhance the special and unique features of our neighborhoods. It is not a “one size fits all” approach.

Under SANDAG’s adopted smart growth principles, smart growth areas are places that accommodate, or have the potential to accommodate, higher residential and/or employment densities. They are pedestrian-friendly activity centers that are connected to other activity centers by transit or could be in the future. The RCP identifies four general categories for potential smart growth opportunity areas:

- Areas within and adjacent to stations along the regional transit network,
- Areas of relatively high residential and employment intensities along conventional bus routes,
- Community, town, and activity centers in cities and the unincorporated area of the County, and
- Rural villages in the unincorporated area of the County.

Some smart growth opportunity areas already demonstrate a high degree of consistency with smart growth principles, while others require changes to general plans and zoning ordinances, as well as infrastructure improvements, to realize their potential. Although these areas may differ in their density and mix of uses, they should be planned and developed to promote higher residential and employment densities than the areas that surround them; a mix of residential, employment, and civic uses; and a high degree of walkability.
Another aspect of identifying smart growth opportunity areas is to establish urban form characteristics and guidelines that reflect the differences in these areas.

Between the release of the draft RCP and the adoption of the final plan, SANDAG will work with local jurisdictions and stakeholders to identify the actual locations of smart growth opportunity areas; develop more specific guidelines for smart growth implementation in the opportunity areas; and develop more detailed recommendations for using transportation funds to encourage smart growth.

Providing Incentives for Smart Growth

The RCP proposes several levels of funding decisions to help guide the region’s urban form and provide incentives to implement smart growth in smart growth opportunity areas.

Regional Transportation Network Funding Based on Smart Growth

As the region moves toward a more robust transit network, project funding priorities will be based, to a significant extent, on where the land use best supports that transit service, and conversely where transit service best supports good land use. In addition, criteria for prioritizing other transportation projects like highways and regional arterials will be more heavily influenced by how well they support the region’s smart growth goals and Regional Transit Vision.

Smart Growth Incentive Program

The Smart Growth Incentive Program established in MOBILITY 2030, the current Regional Transportation Plan, is a five-year, $25 million program that will provide resources to help local agencies fund the planning and infrastructure necessary to develop communities that meet the region’s smart growth goals. The Smart Growth Incentive Program will invest in those areas of the region where there is a commitment to the RCP’s smart growth principles.

Private Sector Participation

The private sector plays a critical role in achieving the RCP’s objectives. Incentives should be offered that promote redevelopment and infill development. Overall, we should implement development projects and plans that:

- Provide a mix of housing types, and a better mix of housing, jobs, services, and recreational land uses with good access for pedestrians and people with disabilities;
- Preserve our natural resources;
- Create buffers between agriculture and urban development; and
- Avoid and mitigate incompatible land uses (e.g., by establishing buffer zones between housing and industrial uses).
The planning concepts, funding strategies, and development priorities proposed in the RCP in many ways revolutionize today’s planning process. The result can be attractive, sustainable mixed use communities that resolve some of our biggest housing and infrastructure challenges today, while providing a better future for our region’s children and grandchildren.

TRANSPORTATION: MOVING PEOPLE AND GOODS

Our current regional transportation system will not meet the needs of a growing and mobile population. Land use decisions and development patterns affect our transportation systems and the travel choices we make. Where we choose to build homes and businesses and the intensity of these land uses directly affect local roads and trolley/bus services as well as freeway and rail efficiency. Too often, the local land use decisions do not include transit planning and needs with the typical road improvements required of new development. It’s time for a change.

MOBILITY 2030 serves as the adopted SANDAG regional transportation plan to achieve smarter, more sustainable growth. But the implementation of MOBILITY 2030 requires regional and local land use agencies to work together.

Low density, scattered development that expands beyond existing, developed areas make it harder to get around the region and forces more people to rely on their cars. This impedes our ability to provide effective public transit, ridesharing, biking, and walking opportunities. Our local cities will play a significant role in creating communities that support the adopted Regional Transit Vision to integrate transit into our more populous urban neighborhoods, and surround transit with supportive land uses. Bus and trolley stations could serve as hubs not only for transit, but also for shopping, employment, and recreation. Local jurisdictions should support development of a dynamic mix of land uses near transit including homes, offices, and retail. These well-designed, mixed use neighborhood and community centers of moderate to higher densities will encourage walking and bicycling to jobs and services as well as to transit. The result will be shorter trips, with a higher proportion of them made within the neighborhood.

Transportation investments can be particularly important to low-income communities. While most people still use their cars to reach a job site, the availability of good transportation choices, such as affordable public transit, can mean the difference between employment and unemployment for many hovering on the fringes of poverty.
The RCP encourages a mix of land uses and more concentrated housing, offices, and retail around transit stations. These may result in more traffic in certain areas and some localized congestion. But the regional payoffs are significant. These efforts can reduce overall traffic congestion, make more efficient use of resources, and significantly decrease overall land consumption.

The transportation chapter of the RCP includes a variety of recommended actions to improve our mobility network, not the least of which is securing needed funding. It also calls for increasing the use of Transportation Demand Management programs, preparing new subregional transportation studies, identifying priority transportation corridors for investment, incorporating pedestrian and bicycle access into urban design and development plans, and finalizing a regional airport solution with strong, multi-modal access.

HOUSING: PROVIDING HOMES FOR ALL RESIDENTS

The San Diego region is in the midst of a housing crisis. Our region is regularly ranked as one of the areas with the highest priced and least affordable housing in the nation. The costs of renting or owning a home have risen dramatically during the past ten years.

Where and how we build our housing are two of the most important decisions we can make in shaping our region’s future. If we continue to build homes at a slower pace than we add people, interregional commuting and traffic congestion will increase. During the next 30 years, it is estimated that more than 90,000 households will, in effect, be “exported” to Riverside County or Baja California unless there are significant changes to add more housing to today’s plans. Long-distance commuting puts a tremendous strain on our roads, freeways, and infrastructure, as well as a strain on the quality of life for those commuters.

Currently, the San Diego region is not planning for or building the amount or type of housing necessary to meet the needs of its growing population and to accommodate its changing demographics. Adding to the lack of housing capacity is the fact that not all of the planned land supply and densities reflected in existing plans are likely to be developed due to a variety of factors including owners unwilling to sell, community opposition, environmental constraints, and lack of infrastructure or funding for infrastructure.

The San Diego region is projected to grow by almost a million more people by 2030. To meet the needs of our growing population, we need to build more than 407,000 new homes, or an average of 13,500 a year between 2000 and 2030. However, existing local land use plans and policies only provide the capacity for about 314,000 new homes. The reason is that the development planned for our remaining vacant residential land is mostly for single family homes on large lots, instead of the smaller single family homes, condominiums, and apartments that are urgently needed. Currently,
just nine percent (about 2,900 acres) of the remaining 32,000 acres of vacant residential land in the 18 cities is planned for densities of 12 or more homes per acre.

Lower income residents are often hit the hardest by high housing costs. A number of social equity and environmental justice concerns arise in a tight housing market. Overpayment, substandard housing, housing discrimination, and unfair lending practices exacerbate an already bleak housing situation for lower income residents.

The region is beginning to address its housing needs by implementing smart growth projects. Smart growth development is underway in communities throughout the region with small lot single family homes, townhomes, condominiums, and apartments offering homeownership or rental opportunities for residents close to shopping, schools, services, and planned transit. Additionally, older shopping centers, business complexes, and blighted areas are being redeveloped into attractive mixed use and housing projects. But a much stronger commitment to smart growth, redevelopment, and infill are needed regionwide.

The RCP calls for a number of coordinated actions to give the region’s residents more housing choices – more apartments, condominiums, and single family homes in all price ranges, affordable to persons of all income levels, and accessible to persons of all abilities. The RCP advocates for locating additional housing choices in our urban communities close to jobs and transit to help conserve our open space and rural areas, reinvigorate our existing neighborhoods, and lessen interregional commuting.

The housing chapter includes specific actions including incentives, infill development, rezoning, rehabilitation, sustainable or “green” building techniques, inclusionary housing measures, rental assistance, replacement housing requirements, and expedited permit processing to increase and diversify our region’s housing supply and to achieve smarter growth.

HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT: ENHANCING OUR NATURAL HABITATS, AIR, WATER, AND BEACHES

San Diegans share a strong attachment to the regional landscape. When asked what they like most about San Diego, natives and newcomers alike consistently cite the enviable climate, beaches, bays, urban canyons, local mountains, and deserts.

To protect these special places and ensure a healthy environment, the region must protect key open spaces and sensitive habitat areas, ensure that the air and water are clean, and restore eroding beaches.

To balance the need for development and sensitive lands conservation, local jurisdictions within the region have adopted regional habitat conservation plans and subarea plans. These play an important role in defining areas where development is appropriate. Also important
to our healthy environment is urban ecology: those natural areas that remain in or around urbanized areas.

Clean air and water, viable natural habitats, and a well-managed shoreline are critical components to the overall economic prosperity of our region. They also are critical to the health and well being of our residents. Rising incomes are part of the solution to making housing more affordable.

A number of activities in recent years have cleaned up our water, improved our air quality, and preserved open space. However, much more needs to be done. We still have sewage spills, polluted runoff still flows into the ocean, and our open space is threatened. We must increase our commitment to improving these resources. Just like urban infrastructure, our natural resources require funding as well as a commitment from residents, local, state and federal agencies.

The RCP identifies funding opportunities, details actions, and outlines how agencies and communities can work together to preserve and improve our environment. Among many recommendations, the plan calls for linking habitat corridors within San Diego County with surrounding counties and the Republic of Mexico to create interregional and international preserve systems; securing a reliable funding source to ensure development and implementation of comprehensive regional storm water plans and programs; and implementing programs that support the construction of energy-efficient buildings and the use of energy-efficient vehicles.

ECONOMIC PROSPERITY: CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR AN IMPROVING STANDARD OF LIVING

Our economy functions within a regional and global economic setting. The San Diego-Baja California binational region faces increasing domestic and global competition. Many people are aware of globalization; however, few understand that regionalization or the increasing importance of regional economies is the other side of the coin. In economic terms, our region is directly connected to the greater Los Angeles area and Baja California, which are our gateway to the domestic and international marketplaces. Access to international markets is critical for the economic prosperity of the region. To our south, we depend on Baja California for an important part of our labor pool. Southwestern Riverside is becoming an increasingly important source of labor and an alternative housing choice for many.

Our region and its workforce are ideally situated to benefit from this economic landscape. One way to increase the region’s competitiveness is to encourage collaborative efforts by private-sector organizations and government agencies responsible for maintaining and improving the region’s access to domestic and international markets.

The adopted SANDAG Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS) serves as the primary economic element of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. The strategy’s recommended actions call for infrastructure investment and public policy support in key areas to strengthen the region’s economic foundation. The prosperity strategy makes the connections among a strong economy and
sufficient land for jobs and housing, a superior infrastructure system to support business and industry, and an education system that prepares residents to succeed in the workforce.

The strategy calls for retaining and expanding local businesses, creating more well-paying jobs, and preparing our residents to fill these jobs. The primary objective is to increase, through these jobs, personal income, and thus raise the standard of living for all of the region’s residents. Rising incomes are part of the solution to making housing more affordable.

Other actions outlined in the economic prosperity chapter include attracting venture capital to retain and attract industries that will produce more high-quality jobs in the region; providing infrastructure that enables emerging technologies and existing businesses that provide high-quality jobs to flourish; and implementing a state-local fiscal reform proposal that provides financial incentives to local jurisdictions to increase the supply of housing and helps achieve the smart growth goals of the RCP. Increasing the supply of housing, and therefore stabilizing housing prices, is part of the solution to making housing more affordable.

PUBLIC FACILITIES: STRENGTHENING THE SOCIAL AND PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE OF OUR COMMUNITIES

Most of us give little thought to the origins of the water that flows from our faucets, or to the final destination of the trash that disappears from our curbsides. Similarly, many of us are not very familiar with how our schools, parks, libraries, hospitals, and police stations are provided, yet, we consider these public facilities essential to the quality of our daily lives.

A sometimes complicated mix of public agencies and funding sources are responsible for our public facilities and services. It is imperative that these agencies coordinate efforts, search for greater efficiencies, and have the resources necessary to provide public facilities that meet our current and future needs. Residents require reliable supplies of water and energy, opportunities to reuse and recycle materials, and sufficient disposal options for waste.

The region needs to make more efficient use of its resources. We can do this by locating public facilities where they will most effectively provide access and availability of needed services and protect public health and safety. At the same time, we need to ensure that lower income and minority communities are not disproportionately affected.

The RCP focuses on a number of key issues that relate to improving our public facilities infrastructure: meeting our regional water demand; diversifying our water sources; maintaining water quality; stabilizing the cost of energy; upgrading aging energy infrastructure; and dealing with dwindling landfill space.
The public facilities chapter of the RCP calls for new policies and programs that, among many things, maximize water resources through diversification strategies such as transfer agreements, water recycling and reclamation, seawater desalination, and sustainable groundwater development; promote the local production of energy to reduce our dependence on imported energy; and “incentivize” composting, recycling, and household hazardous waste collection programs.

The overall goal of this chapter is to ensure that the region provides public facilities that meet our current and future needs in a timely, efficient, and sustainable manner. Although this chapter primarily focuses on water supply, energy, and waste management, it also calls for the enhancement of important assets such as parks, libraries, police, fire, hospitals, and schools.

BORDERS: FORGING A BETTER FUTURE WITH OUR NEIGHBORS

The RCP strives to create a regional community where San Diego County, our 18 local cities, neighboring counties, 17 tribal governments, and northern Baja California mutually benefit from our varied resources and international location.

To achieve that goal, the RCP calls for the promotion of shared infrastructure, efficient transportation systems, integrated environmental planning, and economic development with all of our regional neighbors. It recognizes that our region is a unique and dynamic place to live—one that embraces cultural diversity, promotes interregional understanding, and benefits from our varied history and experience.

Improving Access to Jobs and Housing

One of SANDAG’s most active interregional programs is the state-funded I-15 Interregional Partnership, a voluntary partnership between elected officials representing communities along Interstate 15. Three regional government agencies, including SANDAG, the Southern California Association of Governments, and the Western Riverside Council of Governments, are working together to address the inaccessibility between jobs and housing that has caused increasing traffic conditions between San Diego and Riverside counties. It has been a successful, ongoing collaborative effort.

Although struggling to meet its own demand for housing units, Tijuana could represent an opportunity to accommodate the growing number of people that live and work on both sides of the border. Similar to the partnership created with Western Riverside County, the RCP calls for developing a partnership with authorities in Tijuana and Tecate, Mexico, to address the issues surrounding the jobs/housing accessibility in the binational region.
Enhancing Transportation Systems and Trade Routes

As growth continues in this region and the surrounding areas, maintaining major transportation systems will be an even greater challenge. Agencies must work together to provide reliable and efficient transportation systems associated with interregional commuting corridors, key trade corridors, tribal reservations, and ports of entry.

Improvements to our regional transportation infrastructure also will strengthen trade corridors in the region. In 2002, more than 725,000 trucks crossed northbound at the San Diego region-Baja California border, carrying more than $25 billion in freight. Almost 60 percent of these trucks were destined for other California counties, while 20 percent were headed outside the state.

Given the importance of maintaining these key market entry routes, we need support from our northern and eastern neighbors regarding funding acquisition for trade corridor infrastructure in the international border zone.

Energy, Water Supply, and the Environment

Water, energy, and the environment are other key areas that span our regional, international, and intergovernmental borders. Policies and infrastructure are needed to meet binational, tribal reservation, and interregional long-term energy and water needs in a fiscally and environmentally sound manner. Maintaining habitat corridors, and improving air and water quality will contribute to a healthy binational and interregional environment.

Specifically, the borders chapter of the RCP calls for increasing the use of renewable energy resources throughout the binational and interregional region; coordinating long-term water planning with surrounding counties and tribal governments; and establishing a transborder environmental impact assessment process for projects on either side of the U.S.-Mexico border.

Economic Development

There is a key role for the interregional partnerships to contribute to the success of the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy and improve the position of the greater binational and interregional area as a strong competitor in the global marketplace. Specific actions include supporting the I-15 Interregional Partnership’s economic development strategies; enacting policies and measures that promote economic development along the border in Mexico, such as the Maquiladora Program; and establishing a forum for increased communication with tribal governments regarding economic development.
Homeland Security

In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, homeland security presents an increased challenge for our international border region. Local, state, and federal officials for both countries have been charged with keeping the nation secure while protecting the quality of life in the greater border region. European countries provide helpful models for maintaining security and fluidity in border areas. The RCP outlines how improvements can be made to binational ports of entry through the application of new technologies and increased involvement of local agencies.

SOCIAL EQUITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ASSESSMENT: FAIR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT FOR ALL COMMUNITIES

Social equity and environmental justice considerations in the RCP ensure that in the future, all communities thrive as the region grows. Many communities have traditionally been left behind or excluded from the planning and development process, including low income and minority communities, persons with disabilities, and seniors.

Ensuring social equity does not necessarily guarantee equality – but it does mean giving every community an equal voice and opportunity. Social equity is providing all residents with access to affordable and safe housing, quality jobs, adequate infrastructure, and quality education. It means providing the opportunity for children and families of all races, abilities, and income levels to live in the best possible environment.

This chapter analyzes the RCP’s equity level, much like an environmental impact report, but with an emphasis on social impacts. We know from experience that regions grow healthier when all communities are strong, which is why social equity is one of the three “E”s of sustainability (equity, environment, and economy). Without it, the region cannot have true prosperity.

Equity considerations are essential when discussing urban form (where and how our region grows.) In the discussions of where we should grow, the focus is often on the environmental consequences of sprawl, such as increased traffic, air pollution, loss of open space, and energy consumption. However, sprawl also has social and economic consequences. It can accelerate urban infrastructure decline, concentrate poverty in urban areas, create a spatial mismatch between urban workers and suburban job centers, and negatively affect public health.

Social equity means investing in transportation systems that provide urban residents with opportunities to work, shop, study, invest, and play in the region. However, without proper planning and development, transportation systems also can disrupt communities. The construction of roads, freeways, and rail-transit systems can place burdens on lower income and minority communities.
Promoting equity in the region means building healthy, mixed-income neighborhoods with sufficient affordable housing. Housing is one of the most important factors in our residents’ quality of life. Unfortunately, high housing costs are leading to hardship for low income residents in the San Diego region.

Air and water quality in low income and minority communities also needs to be addressed. While clean air and water are goals for the entire region, we need to work diligently to ensure that the benefits of a healthy environment are shared by all our residents, regardless of income or ethnicity. We also must ensure that potentially polluting facilities are not disproportionately sited in low income and minority communities.

Promoting social equity in the region also means providing economic opportunity and access to high-quality jobs for all residents. It means ensuring access to the education and skills necessary for all individuals to participate fully in regional growth industries and the competitive economy. And, it means creating high-quality, middle-income jobs that lower income residents can move up into with proper training.

The RCP also identifies four key steps that must be taken to promote social equity and environmental justice in the San Diego region:

1. Monitor the performance of the RCP;
2. Expand current social equity and environmental justice analysis;
3. Evaluate future plans, programs, and projects; and
4. Expand public involvement.

Monitoring our performance, identifying shortfalls, making improvements, and increasing access to the region’s resources and decision-making processes results in a better quality of life for all residents.

INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY: ENSURING THE FOUNDATION OF OUR VISION FOR THE FUTURE

Demand for infrastructure is driven by population growth. How well we respond to the challenges of our population growth will define our region’s quality of life for decades to come. In drafting this Regional Comprehensive Plan and the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS), the region is developing a long-term blueprint to help achieve our goal of responding to population growth, and creating sustainable development.

The IRIS outlines a forward-looking investment and financing strategy that will help the San Diego region meet its collective infrastructure needs. All infrastructure needs cannot be met immediately. Timing is the key to ensuring the adequacy of infrastructure services and funding. The IRIS
recommends a phased and incremental approach. If expenditures are working toward a long-term goal, then we are making progress toward addressing our needs in an efficient and targeted manner.

The IRIS focuses on eight important infrastructure areas:

- Transportation (including regional airport, maritime port, transit, highways, and international ports of entry)
- Water supply and delivery system
- Wastewater (sewage collection, treatment and discharge system)
- Storm water management
- Solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal
- Energy supply and delivery system
- Education (including elementary and secondary schools, community colleges and universities)
- Parks and open space (including parks and recreation, shoreline preservation, and habitat preservation)

Over time, if the RCP goals and objectives are implemented, an increasing proportion of our region’s growth will occur as redevelopment and urban infill. To adequately prepare for this change, the urban form and design goals in the RCP should be universally embraced to help ensure that infrastructure is in place prior to or concurrent with the land use decisions that implement the urban form goals.

Today, however, most infrastructure planning is done without a framework that would coordinate long-term visionary planning with short-term capital expenditures. Integration of long range planning with current expenditures should be the standard practice, as it is with transportation and water supply.

If growth in demand for infrastructure capacity outpaces growth in population, development impact fees and other traditional population-based sources of revenue may not be enough. The region will likely need to identify funding sources beyond impact fees, such as higher user fees, increased use of bond measures, or application of special assessment districts.

Most of the region’s infrastructure providers have a system in place to address their needs and prioritize their expenditures. However, not all share the same issues driving their planning processes (beyond population growth). In addition, some of the infrastructure providers do not have integration between their long-term, visionary, and strategic planning and their short-term capital budgeting processes. Also, some providers are dependent upon sources of funding or behavioral changes that must take place in order for them to implement their strategic plans and accomplish their goals. For example, implementation of the RTP requires an extension of the TransNet ½-cent sales tax program, and meeting the energy, water, and solid waste needs of the region will require additional levels of recycling and conservation beyond what occurs today. If these assumptions do not occur as hoped, the implementation of the strategic planning and capital budgeting may fail.
The IRIS recommends the following actions to help align our infrastructure plans and investments with our RCP goals and objectives:

1. Local jurisdictions, acting individually and collectively through SANDAG, should use funding for transportation projects to provide incentives for changes in land use to achieve the urban form and design goals of the RCP. This action provides a link to other infrastructure providers.

2. Infrastructure providers should develop and implement strategic plans to bridge annual expenditures of a capital improvement program to long-term goals of a facilities master plan. The facility master plans of each infrastructure provider should be linked to each other and the RCP.

3. Local jurisdictions and infrastructure providers should formally establish procedures and mechanisms, such as memorandums of understanding (MOUs) or compacts, to coordinate planning and investment in regional infrastructure facilities to support the RCP.

The IRIS recommends that local jurisdictions and infrastructure providers undertake a three step process in the financing of infrastructure investments and operations. First, they are encouraged to use existing funds efficiently by prioritizing expenditures in accordance with smart growth objectives, and coordinating expenditures of the various infrastructure services in those areas. Next, they are encouraged to implement demand management, system management, and policy changes to “incentivize” the efficient use of existing infrastructure systems and services to achieve more smart growth. And finally, they are encouraged to seek new funding only when the first two steps have been completed and essential goals remain unmet.

In cases where there is no significant funding, local jurisdictions and infrastructure providers are encouraged to secure a regular funding source, even if small, and then apply the steps listed above. Local jurisdictions and service providers also are encouraged to seek funding for infrastructure investments and operations primarily from user fees and other charges to benefit those being served. The region should make a concerted effort to treat all infrastructure providers equally by supporting legislation that reduces the voter requirement for bond approval to 55 percent. This approval level would be consistent with the level currently required for education bond measures (Proposition 39). More specific funding actions, tied more directly to each infrastructure area discussed in the RCP, are included in the IRIS chapter of the RCP.

As the San Diego region continues to change, we must regularly assess the ability of our infrastructure to keep pace and to maintain our quality of life.
MEASURING OUR PROGRESS

How will we track our progress? In many cases, we are talking about making major changes in our current ways of doing business, looking out 30 years and beyond. Many of the actions and paradigm shifts discussed in the plan may take years to develop, fund, and implement. Some short-term impacts are likely to be subtle. Some will be more noticeable. Over time, however, smart decisions and the cumulative effects of our actions will result in the future that the plan envisions.

Over the first several months of 2004, SANDAG will work with many of the same committees, working groups, organizations, and individuals that helped to produce the draft RCP to establish specific indicators, standards, and criteria for tracking the plan’s progress.

SANDAG will work with the Regional Planning Committee, its advisory working groups, and the public to determine exactly what set of indicators is the most realistic, reliable, and measurable, and would provide a clear assessment of the region’s progress over time. These will be included in the final draft of the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

TRANSLATING VISION INTO ACTION

The Implementation Framework of the RCP serves as a starting point in organizing how the plan’s goals will be met and policy objectives carried out. Recognizing that the plan is still in draft form, this chapter establishes a framework for working with SANDAG’s Regional Planning Committee, its advisory groups, and others in formulating a more detailed implementation program that specifies concrete timeframes by which certain actions will be accomplished.

The RCP was not designed as a regulatory plan, but rather as a guidance plan. As such, the preferred implementation approach is that local and regional agencies incorporate the recommended policy objectives and actions into their local and regional plans within short-range, mid-range, and long-range timeframes, as they update their plans in the future.

Additionally, the RCP recommends that incentives be provided to member agencies for including the policy objectives in their plans, and for helping to implement the actions contained in the plan.

The implementation strategy for the RCP rests on these fundamental building blocks:

1. Policy Objectives that should be incorporated into local and regional plans.

2. Actions that should be taken within certain timeframes by the various agencies and stakeholders in order to implement the ideas contained in the RCP and secure necessary funding sources.

   The actions are broken down into three categories within each chapter: Planning and Design; Programs and Project Implementation; and Funding. The implementation framework outlines a process for prioritizing actions through “Strategic Initiatives,” that is, prioritized sets of related
actions that could be undertaken by various groups of stakeholders to implement some of the key concepts contained in the plan.

The framework also describes a process for achieving proposed actions through subregional planning and implementation programs for issues that may best be addressed at a subregional level; that is, at a geographic level that is smaller than the San Diego region, but larger than a single local jurisdiction or service provider.

3. Compacts, which are agreements among the various stakeholders to implement the key actions identified in the plan.

Other key implementation components of RCP important across all areas of the plan are: public participation, social equity and environmental justice, funding actions, intergovernmental review, performance monitoring, and analytical tools.

The RCP will only succeed with strong partnerships that include local governments, public agencies at all levels, community interest groups, the private sector, and the public; and specific timeframes in which to achieve the proposed policy objectives and actions.

CONCLUSION: MOVING FORWARD, TOGETHER

Better connecting our land use and transportation plans is critical for our region to grow in a smarter, more sustainable way. One of the most powerful incentives to implement smart growth rests in SANDAG’s decisions about regional transportation funding and programming.

The RCP provides a roadmap for coordinating transportation and other regional infrastructure investments, and directing these investments into smart growth areas.

SANDAG’s transportation funds can be invested to provide incentives for local agencies to make land use decisions that support good urban form and many of the RCP’s policy objectives. SANDAG is already including land use and urban design factors in its funding criteria for highways and regional arterials. The RCP provides the framework to strengthen that approach through the development of new transportation funding criteria that would extend to a broader range of funding decisions.

The Regional Comprehensive Plan is intended to function as a “living” document; evolving over time as specific policies and programs are advanced. It will be updated every few years to reflect our accomplishments and changing needs as a region.

Now and in the future, SANDAG welcomes your input into this dynamic and vital process.

December 2003
MID-COAST LRT ALIGNMENT SELECTION AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Recommendation
The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the UCSD West LRT alignment (with both the Regents Road/Executive Drive and Genesee Avenue variations) in the University City area (Attachment 1) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for federal consideration and approval to begin preliminary engineering and environmental document preparation, and

The Board is also asked to provide input on a phasing plan for the entire Mid-Coast LRT project from Old Town to University City.

Recommendation
The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the UCSD West LRT alignment (with both the Regents Road/Executive Drive and Genesee Avenue variations) in the University City area (Attachment 1) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for federal consideration and approval to begin preliminary engineering and environmental document preparation, and

The Board is also asked to provide input on a phasing plan for the entire Mid-Coast LRT project from Old Town to University City.

Introduction
On November 14, 2003, the Transportation Committee endorsed staff’s recommendation to move the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) West light rail transit (LRT) alignment into the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Documentation phase. This alignment would serve both the west and east sides of campus and would integrate the LRT with other existing and planned transit at University Towne Centre (UTC) Shopping Center where a major transit center exists today. This alignment takes advantage of a renewed desire to directly serve the UCSD west campus and the heart of north University City. There is also the opportunity to incorporate the LRT design with potential UTC expansion plans, supporting MOBILITY 2030 goals for land use and transit integration. The status and recent analysis on the alignment alternatives for the University City LRT segment through the (UCSD) campus was presented to the Transportation Committee on October 17 and November 14, 2003, and focused on alignment variations, design issues, environmental issues, cost estimates, and public input.

Discussion
Background
In 1995, the MTD Board of Directors adopted LRT as the preferred alternative for the Mid-Coast Corridor between Old Town and University City, generally along I-5. This action was consistent with the light rail expansion plan approved by San Diego County voters in the 1987 Proposition A (now referred to as TransNet) ballot measure. In October 2000 the MTDB adopted the Transit First strategy which evolved into SANDAG’s Regional Transit Vision (RTV). Transit First prompted the MTDB to ask whether there were other more appropriate transit options
for the Mid-Coast Corridor in light of the new information regarding market segments, changing land use and employment patterns, funding potential, and implementation schedules. In February 2003, we conducted a comparison of LRT and BRT along I-5 in the Mid-Coast Corridor that led the MTD Board to adopt a comprehensive strategy for transit service enhancements and investments for the area that includes implementation of the Super Loop BRT, conversion of existing transit routes to BRT, implementation of a new BRT on I-805, the addition of local circulators, and the Mid-Coast LRT.

Based on the comparative analysis, the MTD Board concluded that the I-5 corridor justifies an exclusive transit facility that provides for full transit priority to address the travel and market demands along the corridor between downtown San Diego and University City. The MTD Board confirmed that, given the choice between a bus-based service on an exclusive busway or an extension of our LRT system along I-5 in the Mid-Coast corridor, both at a substantial capital investment, LRT is the more appropriate option because it would:

- attract higher ridership;
- connect with the existing high capacity transit system (i.e., LRT);
- integrate with existing LRT at Old Town for direct service to downtown;
- accommodate demand with available capacity;
- better accommodate special events;
- have similar net operating costs (i.e., subsidies) to a BRT on busway system; and
- have a more positive impact on traffic.

LRT Alignment Analysis

To move the LRT project forward, MTDB/SANDAG has been undertaking work to update the 1995 LRT alignment in the University City area. The following is a description of the LRT alignment alternatives and a summary of the alignment analysis performed and presented to the Transportation Committee in October and November 2003 (more detail is in Attachment 2).

**Interstate 5 (I-5) East Side Alignment** – The I-5 East Side LRT alignment option (Attachment 3) stays entirely on the east side of I-5 with a single UCSD station near Thornton Hospital. The alignment then continues easterly crossing to the south side of the canyon, south of the UCSD Science Research Park and north of Miramar Street. It crosses Regents Road and enters the median of Executive Drive, where it transitions to an aerial section along Genesee Avenue on its way to the terminus at UTC.

**UCSD West Alignment** – The UCSD West alignment (Attachments 1 and 3) traverses the UCSD campus to a station north of Pepper Canyon and just east of the Price Center, which serves the heart of the campus. From there, the alignment follows Voigt Drive eastward to cross back to the east side of I-5 to a station at either Scripps or Campus Point, serving the east side of campus. The alignment then extends to its terminus at the UTC shopping center. There are variations on the UCSD West alignment related to side (Variation 1) and center-street (Variation 2) running along Voigt Drive. In addition, two alignment variations were identified from Voigt Drive to UTC, one along Regents Road and Executive Drive (Variation A), and another along Genesee Avenue (Variation B).

**Capital Cost Estimates** – Conceptual level construction cost estimates (2003 dollars) were made for the segment between Nobel Drive and UTC for comparison of alternatives. Although the I-5 East Side ($57 million) alignment is the least costly of the alternatives, it does not serve both the east and west campuses of UCSD. Of the UCSD West alignment variations, the at-grade, side running to Executive Drive (Variation 1A; $87 million) is the least costly. More cost is incurred on the median running (Variation 2A; $95 million) due to a longer tunnel and the depressed sections required, and utility conflicts in Voigt Drive. The UCSD West...
alignment on Genesee Avenue (Variation 1B; $104 million for the side running Voigt to Genesee) has a longer aerial structure, and therefore, is more costly. The most costly variation is the UCSD West median running along Voigt Drive to Genesee (Variation 2B; $112 million). All of the alignments assume an aerial station located on the east side of Genesee Avenue at the west entrance to UTC.

The total Mid-Coast LRT project cost (including construction, right-of-way, vehicles, design, planning, construction management, administration and contingency) from a connection with the existing Blue Line trolley at the Old Town Transit Center to UTC is estimated to range from $638 to $677 million, depending on the alignment selected in the University City area. This translates to approximately $60 to $62 million per mile, which compares favorably to the Mission Valley East LRT costs of approximately $80 million per mile.

Ridership Analysis - The UCSD West alignment is projected to carry 1,600 more riders per day than the I-5 East Side alignment (approximately 500,000 more annual riders). This difference favoring the west campus alignments reflects the proximity of stations that serve the University directly on the UCSD West alignment. The I-5 East Side alignment ridership is less due primarily to its distance from many of UCSD’s trip generators. Also, there would be only one station on the East Side I-5 alignment, while the UCSD West alignment would have stations that serve both the East and West Campuses.

Mid-Coast LRT service from Old Town to UTC is projected to carry 17,600 riders a day, which translates into approximately 5.6 million riders a year.

Environmental Studies - The biological assessment concluded that the UCSD West alignment would traverse less biologically sensitive areas than the I-5 East Side alignment. A focused traffic study evaluated the impacts of the UCSD West alignment at key intersections and driveways along the alignment. The analysis found that only the intersections along Regents Road are projected to have a reduction to a Level of Service (LOS) D, which is an acceptable LOS in the City of San Diego. The at-grade alignment along Voigt Drive would require crossing gates to protect the driveways and street crossings between the UCSD West/Price Center Station and Regents Road, although it may be feasible to eliminate some at-grade crossings by reconfiguring access to the parking lots. A noise and vibration study was conducted to address the proposed project’s potential noise and vibration impacts and sites were identified that could require implementation of mitigation measures. If needed, mitigation measures to reduce the electromagnetic fields (EMF) effects would be developed cooperatively with UCSD. The land use integration with the LRT addressed access, activity centers, circulation, shuttle service, and existing and planned facilities.

Cost Effectiveness - The Transportation Committee requested some measure of cost-effectiveness for the alignment alternatives and variations. While there are several simplified approaches for assessing cost-effectiveness at this phase in the project planning, a consideration of the projected ridership benefits over the life of the project relative to the estimated construction costs provides a general cost-effectiveness comparison.

We did not include operating revenue or cost into the analysis. However, the higher ridership projected for the UCSD West alignments would tip the scale in favor of those alignments for the following reasons:

- The 1,600 additional boardings in the segment north of Nobel Drive would generate approximately 3,200 boardings on the LRT system (i.e., each boarding has a corresponding return trip). These 3,200 additional trips would generate an estimated $800,000 in annual fare revenue (2003 dollars assuming an average LRT fare of $0.79/trip) with a modest increase in operating costs due to the additional 0.94 miles of service.
PRELIMINARY PLANNING PHASE LRT CONSTRUCTION COST EFFECTIVENESS*
(BETWEEN NOBEL DRIVE STATION AND UTC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT</th>
<th>INITIAL CONSTRUCTION COST</th>
<th>COST/RIDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 East Side</td>
<td>$57 million</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West – Side Running Voigt - Executive (Variation 1A)</td>
<td>$87 million</td>
<td>$0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Side Running Voigt - Genesee (Variation 1B)</td>
<td>$104 million</td>
<td>$0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Median Voigt - Executive (Variation 2A)</td>
<td>$95 million</td>
<td>$0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West – Median Voigt – Genesee (Variation 2B)</td>
<td>$112 million</td>
<td>$0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cost Effectiveness = Capital Cost/(Ridership**  x 320 days/year***  x 50 years [project life])
**Ridership based on 2015 projections, not escalated past 2015.
***Annualization factor for LRT ridership that takes into account weekends and holidays.

- The East Side alignment would be heavily dependent upon UCSD shuttle services for transit riders headed to the West campus. This shuttle service presents an additional operating cost burden, albeit on UCSD, and not the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS).

**Conclusion** - Based on the analysis, the most promising alignment and variation from a ridership, access, land use integration, and biological assessment appears to be the UCSD West alignment side running at-grade along Voigt Drive to either Regents Road/Executive Drive (Variation A) or Genesee Avenue (Variation B) (Attachment 1). The early capital cost-effectiveness analysis for this segment indicates a range from $0.72 to $0.86 for the Regents/Executive and Genesee variations, respectively. We believe that the total cost-effectiveness analysis to be conducted in future phases (i.e., considering operating revenue and cost in addition to capital costs) would favor having the West side alignment and station. The alignment variations along either Regents/Executive or Genesee require further analysis during the preliminary engineering and environmental phase to lead to the selection of a single route. The additional analysis in this next phase would also determine the station location on East Campus and other design details.

**Public/Community Involvement**

Over the past several years, we have held or participated in over 30 public meetings to receive input on numerous LRT alignment options in the University City area. In addition, we established a Project Review Committee comprised of community stakeholders to assist in the technical analysis, including an assessment of the appropriate transit mode for the corridor (LRT or Bus Rapid Transit). These public meetings and corresponding policy board actions have led to the narrowing down of LRT alignment alternatives and variations to those presented in this report. The following discussion describes recent meetings with the community stakeholders specific to the alignments and variations discussed in this report.

**UCSD** - We have received a letter of support dated November 13, 2003 (Attachment 4) for the UCSD West alignment recommendation from the UCSD Acting Chancellor. In addition, we presented the UCSD West
alignment analysis to the Campus Community Planning Committee (CCPC) on September 25, 2003. There was general support from the CCPC for the recommended UCSD West alignment and strong sentiment toward selecting the Campus Point station. The Campus Point station seems better from the standpoint of UCSD shuttle operations and accommodating the public shuttles for maneuverability. We would continue to work with UCSD on the UCSD West/Price Center station design, pedestrian connections to the station, shuttle bus area at the station, minimizing impacts to UCSD facilities, at-grade crossings, and access to parking lots. Additionally, we would continue to coordinate on maintaining emergency access to Thornton Hospital.

University Community Planning Group (UCPG) - We presented the LRT alignment alternatives at the October 14, 2003, meeting of the UCPG. The UCPG requested a community public meeting prior to taking an action to support moving the UCSD West alignment and variations into the environmental and preliminary engineering phase. This Community Open House was held on November 3, 2003 to gather public input and present preliminary information on ridership, cost, and environmental aspects on LRT alternatives currently under consideration. The meeting was advertised both locally and regionally. Approximately 40 people attended the meeting. Items that will be further considered are parking at the stations, an LRT connection to Nobel Drive Coaster Station, and performing noise analysis at condos on University Center Lane. On November 11, 2003, we presented the outcome of the Community Open House to the UCPG and the UCPG formally endorsed further study of the UCSD West alignment that serves both east and west campus with an alignment variation on either Regents Road/Executive Drive or Genesee Avenue.

Jewish Community Center (JCC) - We presented the LRT alignment alternatives to JCC representatives on October 9, 2003. At the November 14, 2003, Transportation Committee meeting, JCC representatives relayed their concerns about potential noise and vibration, circulation, and visual impacts to their facility from a potential elevated alignment on Executive Drive. We will conduct further analysis on the Regents/Executive alignment variation to assess how these concerns might be addressed. We will conduct similar analysis on the elevated Genesee variation and, at the direction of the Transportation Committee, will evaluate a variation along Eastgate Mall in this area. Due to the additional analyses needed to assess these issues and potential design mitigation feasibility, we believe it is prudent to move all variations to the UCSD West alignment into the preliminary engineering and environmental phase.

San Diego Chamber of Commerce (Chamber) - We presented the recommended LRT alignment to the Transportation Committee of the San Diego Chamber of Commerce on November 25, 2003. Their comments related to interest in ensuring confidence in the project cost estimate and project coordination with other agencies. They also expressed interest in the public perception of the LRT system overall as it relates to regional mobility. It is anticipated that the Chamber Transportation Committee would take action on the Mid-Coast LRT project at their January 2004 meeting.

San Diego Highway Development Association (SDHDA) - We presented the recommended LRT alignment to the SDHDA on December 8, 2003. They also expressed interest in relating the project cost estimates to our experience with Mission Valley East LRT to ensure confidence in the estimates. They also suggested including a station at the Veteran's Administration Medical Center in the next phase of work, which we will pursue.

Next Steps

To ensure that this project remains eligible for future federal funding, we need to follow Federal Transit Administration (FTA) processes and obtain FTA concurrences as we move...
forward. FTA has indicated that it may approve use of our previous (mid-1990s) work on the Alternatives Analysis as the basis of our federally required Alternatives Analysis and that our current approach should be to update the previously adopted Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). To proceed with this approach, SANDAG would need to approve an updated LRT alignment (with variations) as the Locally Preferred Alternative for further study and provide historical project data to FTA, including the change in conditions in the corridor since the 1995 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that led to the updated LPA (i.e., travel demand, population, employment, land use changes, public involvement, etc.). This would lead to preparation of a Locally Preferred Alternative report for federal approval early next year.

Following confirmation of our approach with FTA, the next step is to obtain permission to enter Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Impact Statement (PE/EIS) preparation. We would need to prepare a Project Management Plan (PMP), which demonstrates our technical capability and capacity to implement the project. The PMP describes how subsequent phases of the project development (preliminary engineering, final design, construction, start-up) will be managed by the lead local agency. FTA would approve the PMP prior to issuing permission to enter preliminary engineering.

We would then begin preliminary engineering and preparation of the environmental documents on the LRT project between Balboa Avenue and UTC along the selected alignment in the UCSD/University City area. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), and FTA requirements, the environmental document would include the selected alignment (and variations) as the “Build” alternative, a “Transportation Systems Management” (TSM) alternative (a low capital cost option that best meets the project purpose and need), and a “No Build” (i.e., do nothing) alternative. The environmental process would document the project purpose and alternatives studied, characterize the affected environment, and identify mitigation for impacts. The environmental document would include analysis on topics such as land use, transportation, socio-economics/demographics, visual, air quality, noise and vibration, natural resources, geotechnical, water resources, cultural resources, parklands, and hazardous materials.

The preliminary engineering/draft environmental document would include more detailed analysis to narrow down the alignment and station variations as well as more investigation into the following:

- UCSD West station
- Shuttle access
- Facilities interface and impacts
- At-grade crossings and re-configuration of UCSD parking lots
- Emergency access to Thornton Hospital
- Design variations along Genesee Avenue, Regents Road/Executive Drive and Eastgate Mall
- UTC Transit Center

Upon completion and approval of the preliminary engineering and draft environmental document, the project would be ready to enter final design, pending FTA approval and availability of funding. Options for how to proceed with final design and ultimate construction are outlined below.

LRT Implementation Strategy

The implementation strategy adopted for the Mid-Coast LRT in 1995 split the project into two segments (Balboa and University City) to address overall project funding issues and take advantage of potential federal funding for the Balboa Segment. At that time, it appeared likely that the Balboa Segment could be constructed relatively quickly since it would be built on existing railroad right-of-way, would be fairly inexpensive since it is a relatively simple design, and that federal dollars for the project would be forthcoming.
particularly since the FTA recognized the positive attributes of the project and the requested federal funding share was small compared to other rail projects in the federal pipeline.

Since 1995, we have held the Balboa LRT Segment’s place in the federal New Starts funding process while we focused staff and funding resources on the Mission Valley East LRT project. The New Starts program is an annual rating process by FTA that evaluates rail projects nationwide for federal funding allocations. It takes into account ridership, transportation network user benefits, cost-effectiveness, and the long-term capital and operating financial plan of the applying agency. For several years, the Balboa LRT Segment received FTA’s highest New Starts rating, putting it in a prime position for up to 50 percent of federal funding. In FY 04, FTA did not rate the Balboa LRT project pending updates of user benefit and cost-effectiveness data in response to new federal New Starts formulas.

We have submitted the FY 05 New Starts application to FTA for project rating next year. Given the financial constraints we have experienced in the past several years, FTA will be paying particular attention to our ability to construct and operate the Balboa LRT Segment, particularly prior to any voter approval of an extension of TransNet funding for the region. As a result, our ability to move the Balboa LRT Segment forward at the federal level this year may be slowed.

Meanwhile, we have been evaluating opportunities for advancing the entire Mid-Coast LRT project (Balboa and University City Segments) in the event the TransNet extension passes in November 2004. The full Mid-Coast LRT project received relatively strong public support in the recent TransNet public opinion survey. One such opportunity for implementing the entire project a year or more earlier than the current schedule for completion through University City could be through the use of a design-build approach.

We are currently evaluating the feasibility, benefits, and risks of using design-build to implement the entire project, including seeking input from the federal project management oversight team. We will return to the SANDAG Transportation Committee and Board with an implementation strategy recommendation for the Mid-Coast LRT project.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Christine Rychel, (619) 557-4540; christine.rychel@sdmts.com

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #5001100
The attachment to this Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Clerk of the Board at (619) 595-5602.
DESCRIPTION OF UNIVERSITY CITY LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT ALIGNMENT
ALTERNATIVES AND VARIATIONS

Mid-Coast Corridor Background

In 1987, with the passage of the Proposition A half-cent transportation sales tax measure (TransNet), San Diego voters approved the Mid-Coast Corridor as a TransNet priority transit project. In 1991, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) began planning studies for the Mid-Coast Corridor in accordance with state and federal environmental processes. The corridor is generally defined from Interstate 8 (I-8) to the south, State Route (SR) 163 to the east, and SR 56 to the north. This is an area of high density development with a variety of major activity centers such as the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and University Towne Centre (UTC).

In 1995, the MTD Board of Directors selected a locally-preferred alternative to extend light rail transit (LRT) from Old Town to University City generally along I-5. The 1995 adopted alignment stays entirely along the west side of I-5 with a station adjacent to the freeway at Gilman Drive, and does not directly serve the UCSD campus. At that time, in response to funding constraints, the MTD Board also approved splitting the project into phases. The first phase, Balboa LRT Segment, extends from the Old Town Transit Center to Balboa Avenue and the following phase, the University City LRT Segment, extends from Balboa Avenue to University City. In 2001, the Final Environmental Impact Statement was completed on the Balboa LRT segment. We are working on project readiness documents for submittal to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Upon FTA approval of the Balboa LRT Segment project readiness, FTA would issue permission to enter final design.

Since 1995, a number of land use developments in the vicinity of the University City area have rendered that portion of the alignment problematic and there is a renewed desire to better serve the UCSD campus and UTC. Numerous alignment options have been considered for the UCSD campus to better serve its growing travel demand. Expansion proposals for the UTC shopping center have provided an opportunity to reconsider an alignment that would serve it directly. The additional alignment analysis included both engineering and environmental considerations.

In February 2003, after extensive consideration of non-rail alternatives, the MTD Board reaffirmed its strategy to pursue the Mid-Coast LRT project. The Mid-Coast LRT is included in MOBILITY 2030, under both the Revenue Constrained Plan and Reasonably Expected Revenue scenarios, and recently received relatively strong support in a TransNet public opinion survey.

In early 2000, MTDB conducted an evaluation of LRT alignments that would better serve the UCSD campus/University City area and better integrate into the UTC shopping center than the 1995 adopted alignment. In November 2000, the MTD Board of Directors selected the most promising of the alignment options to carry into more detailed evaluation. One option stays entirely on the east side of I-5 with a single station near Thornton Hospital. The other traverses the UCSD campus to a station north of Pepper Canyon and just east of the Price Center. From there, the alignment follows Voigt Drive eastward to cross back to the east side of I-5 to its terminal at the UTC shopping center. Two alignment variations were identified from Voigt Drive to UTC, one along Regents Road and Executive Drive, and another along Genesee Avenue. In addition, variations related to side and center-street running along Voigt Drive, below, above, and at-grade options near Pepper Canyon.
and along Genesee Avenue and some design geometrics have been considered but remain unresolved.

Since November 2000, additional analysis has focused on some of the alignment variations, design issues, environmental issues, cost estimates, and public input. The following describes the results of that analysis.

Alignment Descriptions

East Side I-5 Alignment - From the Nobel Drive Station, the alignment continues along the east side of I-5 over La Jolla Village Drive and the canyon south of Medical Center Drive turning east to a station to the south of Thornton Hospital. The alignment then continues easterly crossing to the south side of the canyon, south of the UCSD Science Research Park and north of Miramar Street. It crosses Regents Road and enters the median of Executive Drive, where it transitions to an aerial section along Genesee Avenue on its way to the terminus at UTC.

UCSD West Alignment - Each alignment variation begins at the common station with the East Side I-5 Alignment north of Nobel Drive, between I-5 and University Center Lane.

- **Variation 1A - LRT Side Running in Voigt Drive to Executive Drive** - This alignment starts at the Nobel Drive Station and crosses over I-5 south of La Jolla Village Drive. It continues along the west side of I-5 over La Jolla Village Drive to the northeast corner of the Veterans Administration Medical Center property. The alignment then crosses under Gilman Drive just west of UCSD’s planned Gilman Drive bridge over I-5. It emerges from the tunnel and continues along the west side of Pepper Canyon to a below grade station south of Voigt Drive.

  The alignment then continues north, still below grade, and turns east along the south side of Voigt Drive. The alignment continues easterly emerging from the tunnel section, running at-grade on the south side of Voigt Drive, crossing over I-5 parallel to the Voigt Drive bridge, and continuing to a potential station site south of Scripps Hospital campus. The alignment then runs easterly, crossing Campus Point Drive at-grade, and proceeding to an alternative station site and on to Regents Road. It turns south on Regents Road to Executive Drive where it enters an aerial section along Genesee Avenue on its way to the terminus at UTC.

- **Variation 1B - LRT Side Running in Voigt Drive to Genesee Avenue** - This alignment follows the LRT Side Running variation to the Scripps Hospital Station, where it enters an aerial section crossing over Campus Point Drive. The alignment stays aerial, veering to the north across Regents Road to the median of Genesee Avenue, proceeding aerial to UTC.

- **Variation 2A - LRT Median Running in Voigt Drive to Executive Drive** - This alignment is similar to the LRT Side Running variation described above, except that the LRT would be located in the median of Voigt Drive. The crossing of Campus Point Drive would be at-grade, with at-grade running along the west side of Regents Road and in the median of Executive Drive, transitioning into an aerial structure as it approaches Genesee Avenue.

- **Variation 2B - LRT Median Running in Voigt Drive to Genesee Avenue** - This alignment is similar to the LRT Median Running in Voigt to Executive Drive (2A) variation described above, except that it enters an aerial section crossing over Campus Point Drive. The alignment stays aerial, veering to the north across Regents Road to the median of Genesee Avenue, proceeding aerial to UTC.
Alignment Analysis

Capital Cost Estimates

The table below summarizes the construction cost estimates for the alignments and variations from north of the Nobel Drive Station to UTC. They are conceptual level capital cost estimates in 2003 dollars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIMENT</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST (MILLIONS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 East Side</td>
<td>$57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Side-Running Voigt - Executive (Variation 1A)</td>
<td>$87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Side Running Voigt - Genesee (Variation 1B)</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Median Voigt - Executive (Variation 2A)</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West - Median Voigt - Genesee (Variation 2B)</td>
<td>$112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are construction costs only for the segment between Nobel Drive Station and UTC. The project cost estimate for the entire University City segment between Balboa Avenue and UTC including planning, environmental, design, construction, and vehicles, is approximately $500 million. The total project cost estimate for the Balboa segment is $134 million.

Although the I-5 East Side alignment is the least costly of the alternatives, it does not serve both the east and west campuses of UCSD. Of the UCSD West alignment variations, the at-grade, side running to Executive Drive is the least costly. More cost is incurred on the median running for tunnel and depressed sections and utility conflicts in Voigt Drive. The UCSD West alignment on Genesee Avenue has a longer aerial structure, and therefore, is more costly. All of the alignments assume an aerial station located on the east side of Genesee Avenue at the entrance to UTC. The existing UTC transit center is anticipated to be relocated in advance of the LRT project and would be integrated into the redevelopment of the shopping center. It is possible that the LRT station and transit center would be constructed by Westfield Corporation, owners of the shopping center.

Ridership Analysis

The analysis of ridership potential focused on two areas: the differences between the two basic alignments (UCSD West vs. East Side I-5), and the differences between the two East Campus station sites (Scripps and Campus Point). Order-of-magnitude estimates of daily ridership were developed for each of the stations based on the employment, housing, and special generators in the vicinity of each location. An estimate of the transfers from shuttles on the UCSD campus was included. The estimate of daily boardings for the UCSD stations is reported below.
PRELIMINARY STATION RIDERSHIP ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATION</th>
<th>DAILY BOARDINGS (2015) (WITH SHUTTLE AND WALK ACCESS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Side I-5: Thornton Hospital</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West: Price Center</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West: Scripps Hospital or Campus Points</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preliminary ridership projections for the UCSD West alignment variations would be approximately 4,100 a day, while the preliminary ridership projections for the East Side I-5 alignment would be approximately 2,500 a day. The combined total for the UCSD West alignment stations reflects the proximity of stations that serve the University directly, while the I-5 East Side alignment ridership is less due primarily to the single station and its distance from many of UCSD’s trip generators.

Environmental Studies

- **Biological** – An analysis of the habitats in Pepper Canyon and the presence of sensitive species was conducted. Pepper Canyon was found to have a minor amount (0.05 acres) of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub that would need to be mitigated.

  The East Side I-5 alignment would traverse an undeveloped portion of East Campus that was found to have a higher habitat and wildlife value, a more established and mature wetlands, Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub that is more extensive and of higher quality than in the Pepper Canyon area. It is also a site of past wetlands restoration. Because of the conditions described above, Pepper Canyon is less biologically sensitive than the undeveloped area east of I-5 and is the preferred biological alternative for LRT project development. However, Pepper Canyon provides open space of value to the campus community.

- **Traffic and Circulation** – A focused traffic study looking at the impacts of the UCSD West alignment at key intersections and driveways along the alignment was performed. A Level of Service (LOS) comparison was made for the morning and evening peak periods for future traffic conditions.

  The analysis found that only the intersections along Regents Road are projected to have a reduction to a Level of Service (LOS) D. These three intersections would be minimally affected by the LRT line in both the AM and PM peak periods. The minimal traffic impacts are generally due to the LRT crossing only one leg of the intersections (i.e., side running) and not interfering with the major traffic movements. LRT operation would be phased and coordinated with the major movement of the intersections, and therefore would not significantly impact the overall intersection operation. The LOS D is within acceptable LOS standards for the City of San Diego. No major improvements are anticipated at these intersections with the implementation of the LRT.
• Noise & Vibration – A noise and vibration study was conducted to address the proposed project’s potential noise and vibration impacts on nearby existing and future planned student housing and research buildings at UCSD. On the UCSD West variations, there are three sites that would exceed noise criteria and one site on the East Side I-5 alignment that would require mitigation. For vibration, there are two sites on the UCSD West alignment (one near Pepper Canyon and one on Genesee Avenue) that would require mitigation measures such as ballast mats or sound walls.

• At-Grade Crossings – An analysis of the potential noise impact of an at-grade alignment along Voigt Drive from the trolley horn and the noise of the crossing gates was performed. Gates would be required to protect the driveways and street crossings between the UCSD West/Price Center Station and Regents Road. In addition, the LRT would sound its horn as it enters and/or leaves the East Campus Station at Scripps Hospital or Campus Point Drive. Using field measurements and reference noise levels for the San Diego Trolley, the analysis indicated that horn and gate bell noise would be below the guidelines for maximum airborne noise from train operations. SANDAG staff met with UCSD representatives and determined that 12 at-grade crossings would be required between Gilman Drive and Executive Drive. In reviewing the alignment, it appears that 4 of the 12 at-grade crossings may be eliminated by reconfiguring access to the parking lots. SANDAG staff also met with the California Public Utilities Commission to discuss the alignments and at-grade crossing since the CPUC grants permission for the installation of at-grade crossings. For safety reasons, the CPUC desires to minimize the number of at-grade crossings, so from its perspective, the elevated alignment in Genesee Avenue is preferable. However, CPUC indicated that the at-grade alignment in Voigt Drive and Regents Road is not a fatal flaw.

• Electromagnetic and Pulse – A wide selection of electronic and electrical equipment is sensitive to and may malfunction in environments of elevated fields from Direct Current (DC) used by LRT. The most common example of adverse effects is interference with computer systems and displays. Other than very specialized instrumentation of the electronic or medical devices in common use, the device most susceptible to magnetic field interference is the cathode ray tube (CRT) found in televisions and computer displays. Mitigation measures to reduce the electromagnetic fields (EMF) effects, if needed, would be developed cooperatively with UCSD. An agreement with UCSD could be developed to clarify roles and responsibility for addressing this issue.

• Land Use – The interaction with nearby land uses is an important element of the analysis. A summary of the land use consideration for each station along the UCSD West alignment, and the alignment itself is provided below.

UCSD West/Price Center Station – This station would provide access to West Campus and would be the busier of the two UCSD stations. It would be located just east of the center of campus and Price Center, with convenient shuttle and pedestrian connections to all of the West Campus facilities and the VA Medical Center. It would serve students, faculty, and campus visitors, enhance access to both existing and planned developments, and would become a focal point for transportation on the campus. Close attention will be needed in design to ensure efficient circulation and facilities for the campus shuttles serving the station, and coordination with the future Structural and Engineering Materials building planned adjacent to the station site. A sensitive approach will be needed to ensure the station fits in with the look and feel of the campus and nearby Pepper Canyon, while making sure the station functions well.
Scripps Hospital Station – This station would provide convenient access to several activity centers in the vicinity including Scripps Hospital and attendant medical offices, the Preuss School, and the planned arena. The planned extended studies building, East Campus medical and research facilities, and employment centers on Campus Point Drive could also be served, but the greater distance from the station would require longer walks. Shuttle service would connect the campus destinations with the station. The station would enhance access to the area and would be compatible with most of UCSD’s plans for the area.

Campus Point Drive Station – As an alternative to the Scripps Hospital Station, this station would provide convenient access to the future extended studies facility to be located adjacent to it. It would also provide access to the housing on the east side of Genesee Avenue, although a crossing of Genesee Avenue would be required. The station would also provide access to several major employers on Campus Point Drive. Walking access to the Preuss School would be adequate, while the longer distance to Scripps Hospital and medical offices would provide a lesser level of access. Room would be needed for both campus shuttle vehicles and off-campus shuttles to employment centers, especially along Campus Point Drive. The station could be elevated if the crossing of Campus Point Drive is grade separated. This design would tie well into the future extended studies building, while requiring vertical circulation to reach Voigt Drive to reach other destinations. This site would be supportive of UCSD plans for the area, although access to the Scripps facilities, the new arena, and the Health Sciences facilities would be less convenient than the Scripps Hospital Station.

Executive Square Station – This station would be located in a fully developed portion of the office buildings north of UTC. As an elevated station, it could have direct pedestrian walkways to the offices on both sides of Genesee Avenue. Outstanding access to these employment centers would be provided, with convenient access to others via the pedestrian walkway system. Access to points north of the station would require returning to street level for walking to nearby offices, the Jewish Community Center, and the high-density residential development to the west on Executive Drive. Shuttle connections and the “Super Loop” would provide access to the rest of the employment sites along and north of Executive Drive. The station would enhance access to a large number of sites, and would be compatible with the area’s community plan.

University Towne Centre Station – The elevated station at UTC would provide access to an intensely developed area, including direct connections to UTC as well as Costa Verde on the west side of Genesee Avenue. We have been working closely with the Westfield Corporation (UTC management) to incorporate the station, transit center, and parking into the UTC expansion plans currently being considered. The station is compatible with the scale and intensity of the area, and the transit service and connections it would provide would be an asset for the community. Access to the surrounding area will be enhanced with the planned Super Loop transit project and the other local bus services.

LRT Alignment – The alignment through Pepper Canyon on West Campus would change the nature of this vegetated canyon. After construction, the impact would be minimized with much of the alignment being in a cut-and-cover tunnel. Along Voigt Drive, plans for developments on both sides of the street constrain the right-of-way available for the LRT. Buildings and a new swimming pool are planned north of Voigt Drive, west of I-5. The location and treatments of the alignment will be further refined in preliminary engineering and final design. The
alignment option along Regents Road would affect future developments in that area of East Campus, with access to the planned parking structure a key issue.

Along Genesee Avenue, the alignment would be grade separated, with limited impact to land uses. Along Executive Drive, parking would likely need to be removed and some encroachment into the curb and sidewalk may be required.

Conclusions

The information in the previous section was used to compare the two alignments and variations. The matrix below summarizes the results:

ALIGNMENT COMPARISON MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION COST</th>
<th>RIDERSHIP</th>
<th>SHUTTLE ACCESS</th>
<th>OVERALL ENVIRON.</th>
<th>TRAFFIC</th>
<th>SMART GROWTH &amp; LAND USE</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 East Side</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West/ Side Voigt to Regents/Exec (Variation 1A)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West/ Side Voigt to Genesee (Variation 1B)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West/ Median Voigt to Executive (Variation 2A)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD West/ Median Voigt to Genesee (Variation 2B)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND:
+ Highest positive rating or lowest impact
0 Mid-range rating or some impact
- Lowest positive rating or highest impact

The UCSD West side running on Voigt Drive and to Regents Road/Executive Drive (Variation 1A), has the highest overall rating. It has the highest rating for ridership, shuttle connections, environmental impacts, and land use potential, with mid-range scores for construction cost and traffic impacts. Although the UCSD West median running on Voigt Drive (Variation 2A) has many of the positive attributes of the side-running variation, the median below-grade section conflicts with major utilities servicing UCSD, which results in a much higher construction cost and left-turn traffic conflicts. The UCSD West variations with an elevated section in Genesee Avenue (Variation 1B and 2B) result in the highest construction cost and a lower rating for environmental impacts. The East
Side I-5 alternative has the lowest rating for ridership and land use due to the location of stations at the edge of campus activity centers.

Based on this analysis, the most promising alignment and variation appears to be the UCSD West alignment side running at-grade along Voigt Drive to either Regents Road or Genesee Avenue. The alignment variations along either Regents/Executive or Genesee require further analysis to lead to the selection of a single route. The additional analysis in this next phase would also determine the station location on East Campus, and other design details.
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November 13, 2003

Honorable Joe Kellejian, Chairman
Transportation Committee
San Diego Association of Governments
401 “B” Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

SUBJECT: Mid-Coast University City Light Rail Transit Alignments

Dear Deputy Mayor Kellejian and Committee Members:

Growth on the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) campus over the next 15 years will be unparalleled in our history. It will also be a significant force in shaping the future of the San Diego region. As the UCSD student population increases to 29,000, and the faculty and staff population increases to nearly 20,000, we will continue to give careful attention to comprehensive land use planning. Clearly, improved public mass transit will be critical to the successful implementation of our long range development plan.

Effective transit service to and from the campus will bring multiple benefits to the region. They include: improved transportation opportunities for resident students and public visitors, reduced demand for parking facilities, and less traffic on area roads and freeways. Additionally, a Light Rail Transit (LRT) station on campus will promote public transportation as a basic part of campus life.

We support recent decisions by the Metropolitan Transit Development Board to proceed with transit planning in a comprehensive manner. This includes LRT service to the UCSD/University City area, elevation of regional bus routes to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) status, and development of intra-community transit service (Super Loop).
Honorable Joe Kellejian  
November 13, 2003  
Page 2

Presently, you are considering adoption of a final alignment for LRT service. Our Campus Community Planning Committee has endorsed your staff’s recommendation of an alignment that will provide two stations to serve the UCSD campus and others that will serve the surrounding community. This alternative will provide better service, increased ridership, and a more integrated approach to transit than a “one-station” approach. We realize there are a number of associated project components that will require additional cooperative evaluation, planning and design.

UCSD will be an active and cooperative partner in the work that lies ahead. In addition to on-going planning discussions, UCSD and SANDAG representatives have begun work on a draft Memorandum of Understanding that will guide our future efforts. We look forward to working with you.

Kind regards,

Marsha A. Chandler  
Acting Chancellor

cc: J. Langley  
    J. Woods  
    Campus Community Planning Committee
Introduction

A Freeway Deficiency Plan (the Plan) has been prepared by SANDAG in cooperation with the California Transportation Department (Caltrans) and the Cities of National City and San Diego. State law requires the preparation of a Congestion Management Program (CMP) Deficiency Plan whenever a freeway or arterial on the CMP system fails to meet the CMP Level of Service (LOS) standard. In the San Diego region, the CMP LOS standard is LOS “E”. Portions of freeways within the Central Interstate 5 Corridor are currently operating at LOS “F” and require the preparation of a Deficiency Plan.

The Plan addresses congestion on portions of Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route (SR) 163, as analyzed in the Central I-5 Corridor Study. The Plan first identifies what improvements would be necessary to provide acceptable levels of service on the freeways. It then differentiates between improvements that appear favorable and are recommended for future implementation, and those projects that need further alternatives analysis. Given the potential environmental and community impacts of some projects, the Plan only recommends those projects included in the MOBILITY 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.

Under state law, the Plan must first be adopted by the local jurisdictions affected by the congestion and thereafter must be accepted or rejected by the Congestion Management Agency (CMA). SANDAG is the CMA for San Diego. The Plan was approved by the city councils of San Diego and National City on November 24 and December 2, 2003, respectively. (The City of San Diego resolution adopting the plan is included in Attachment 1.) Preparation of the Plan also meets a requirement of the environmental impact report for the new downtown ballpark. SANDAG must accept the Plan before the Certificate of Occupancy for the ballpark facility is issued by the City of San Diego (currently expected to occur in mid-February 2004).

Discussion

In October of 1999, the San Diego City Council certified the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FSEIR) for the Ballpark and Ancillary Development project in downtown San Diego. In addition to the arterial impacts addressed in the FSEIR, impacts to the freeway system were identified as arising from the build-out of downtown in the longer term. Analysis of the freeway system was combined with other ongoing studies into a comprehensive study of the Central I-5 Corridor, extending from I-8 to SR 54.

The Central I-5 Corridor Study was completed and approved by the Transportation Committee in December 2002, with many of
the projects incorporated into MOBILITY 2030. The analysis conducted for the Central I-5 Corridor Study was the basis for an additional report, called the Freeway Deficiency Plan. This report satisfies a mitigation requirement of the Ballpark FSEIR and identifies near-term and long-term capacity improvements and programs for the segments of I-5 and SR 163 serving Centre City.

The Plan was prepared by SANDAG in cooperation with Caltrans and the cities involved in the corridor study. SANDAG took the lead on this Plan since it is a by-product of the Central I-5 Corridor Study. The Plan needs first to be adopted by the city councils of San Diego and National City, and once submitted to SANDAG, the Board has 60 days to accept or reject the Plan. The Ballpark FSEIR, approved by the San Diego City Council, states that SANDAG must accept the Plan before the Certificate of Occupancy for the facility is issued by the City of San Diego.

In general, a local jurisdiction is required by state law to prepare and adopt a deficiency plan when a freeway segment on the regional Congestion Management Program (CMP) system fails to meet the applicable Level of Service (LOS) standard. A deficiency plan is required to include, among other things, a list of improvements necessary to correct the deficiency and relieve congestion, options to reduce trips on the network, and an action plan for implementing identified improvements.

The Plan draws from several sources to identify improvements necessary to relieve congestion and meet CMP standards. These sources include the MOBILITY 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Central I-5 Corridor Study. Identified improvements in the Plan (Attachment 2) include:

**Adopted in the RTP**
- Two HOV lanes on all of I-5
- Auxiliary lanes on I-5 south of SR 75
- SB/WB and EB/NB freeway connectors at I-8 and I-5

**Not Adopted in the 2030 RTP**
- Widening SR 163
- Centre City Collector Distributor Ramp System
- WB/SB and NB/EB freeway connectors at SR 94 and I-5
- Two general purpose lanes on I-5 south of I-15

While SANDAG's technical studies have identified that these improvements would relieve congestion on the freeway, not all of the projects have universal approval of the agencies and affected communities. In cases like this when proposed projects are too expensive or include large potential impacts, all Freeway Deficiency Plans include alternative ways to improve system performance, such as Transportation Demand Management measures or improved transit facilities. In any event, eliminating any of the congestion-relieving projects from discussion in the Plan could result in an incomplete and legally deficient Freeway Deficiency Plan under state law.

An example of the above situation is the identification of widening SR 163 to achieve acceptable CMP levels of service. Although this measure would relieve congestion on SR 163, the Plan acknowledges that “due to environmental and community concerns” the San Diego City Council already removed any consideration of such improvements to SR 163 from the final FSEIR. A proposal for a new downtown ramp system, called the Collector-Distributor or C/D System, is treated in a similar fashion. The Plan acknowledges that the C/D System cannot be implemented unless the lead agency has completed the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process that includes alternatives analysis and has been publicly reviewed by the community. However, it is important to note that any additional lanes on I-5 through Centre City must be accompanied by some
type of ramp improvements to avoid physically widening the freeway.

The "action plan" in the Plan incorporates the existing timeframes from MOBILITY 2030 but acknowledges that both RTP and especially non-RTP projects must still undergo environmental review, identification of available funding, and further input from the community. Even without a commitment to specific projects, the Plan still serves its intended purpose because it identifies a broad range of technically feasible measures that local jurisdictions can consider as they address congestion issues in the future.

In summary, preparation of this particular Freeway Deficiency Plan will meet the requirements of: (1) the FSEIR for the Ballpark, and (2) state law governing congestion management programs. For other freeway corridors in the region, SANDAG will be preparing and compiling deficiency plans to develop a more comprehensive approach to congestion management and relief.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

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

No Budget Impact

A copy of the “Freeway Deficiency Plan” or the “Central I-5 Corridor Study” may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Publication Hotline at (888) 707-7827 or online at www.sandag.org under Publications.
The attachment to this Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Clerk of the Board at (619) 555-5602.
Attachment 2

Freeway Deficiency Plan
December 2003

ADOPTED IN RTP
- Widening (2 HOV Lanes)
- New Auxiliary Lanes
- New Freeway-to-Freeway Connectors

NOT ADOPTED IN RTP
- Additional Widening (2 GP Lanes)
- Centre City Collector-Distributor System
- Freeway Widening (6 Lanes)
REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Introduction

SANDAG adopted the Regional Energy Strategy (RES) at its July 25, 2003 meeting. The RES is a 30-year plan for development of energy planning and programs to make the region more self-sufficient in energy. The implementation of the RES was centered on four optional implementing structures. The Regional Energy Policy Advisory Committee (REPAC), which provided advice in the preparation of the plan, recommended that SANDAG (one of the four options) be the implementing agency. The Board requested that the Executive Committee study this option and bring back a recommendation. The Executive Committee established an Energy Task Force to conduct the study, with results to be presented by the Executive Committee to the Board at its December meeting. The Task Force members are listed in Attachment 1. This report summarizes the Task Force's recommendations as approved by the Executive Committee. In summary, the recommendations support the acceptance by SANDAG of the responsibility of implementing the RES, the establishment of an Energy Working Group, and direction to seek permanent funds to carry out these responsibilities.

Recommendations

It is the recommendation of the Executive Committee that the Board of Directors approve the following recommendations:

1. SANDAG should assume the responsibility for the coordinating the implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy as described in the Energy Task Force Findings (see Findings section on next page).

2. SANDAG should create an Energy Working Group to advise the Regional Planning Committee, convene the group in January 2004, and provide support as soon as funding is secured. The recommended members of the Energy Working Group are identified in Attachment 2.

3. The Energy Working Group should develop an outreach strategy to explain SANDAG's new role in regional energy planning coordination and seek permanent financial resources to support its efforts, as long as such funding does not divert or use funds earmarked for the region's various Energy Efficiency programs.

4. The Energy Working Group should evaluate SANDAG's energy program and the effectiveness of its expenditures on an annual basis.

5. The Board should direct staff to request the other organizations involved in the Energy Task Force to help provide interim funds for the period from January to June, 2004 in accordance with the budget shown in Attachment 3A. Staff should evaluate SANDAG's FY 2004 Overall Work Program priorities and re-program to make resources available to support the Energy Working Group activities for the same six month period.

Discussion

Energy Task Force Efforts

The RES is the region's energy policy and action plan. It contains specific objectives for increased opportunities for energy development, energy efficiency, renewable
resources and large- and small-scale, highly efficient electric generation facilities. The efficiency, renewable resource and large- and small-scale generation objectives far exceed the region’s current efforts in these areas. Increased efforts in these areas will, according to the RES, create substantial economic and environmental benefits for the region.

The RES contains a recommendation that a single entity be responsible for coordinating the efforts of the many organizations involved in energy planning, programming, and implementation in the region, as a critical necessary step towards meeting the RES objectives. The REPAC, which assisted in the preparation of the RES, recommended that SANDAG consider becoming the region’s lead energy planner, policy maker, and implementation coordinator.

The Energy Task Force was created by the Executive Committee in September to develop a recommendation on the feasibility of coordinating the implementation of the RES through SANDAG. The Energy Task Force assignment was, in addition to evaluating the feasibility of SANDAG taking on this responsibility, to identify:

- The best way to implement the RES under SANDAG’s current structure;
- The roles and responsibilities of the involved jurisdictions and organizations; and
- The funding available to SANDAG and its implementation partners to carry out the RES.

Findings

The Energy Task Force Findings were:

1. The coordination of the implementation of the RES under SANDAG’s leadership is feasible, and SANDAG should pursue this role.
2. The best way to implement this new responsibility is to use SANDAG’s existing structure and create a new Energy Working Group to advise the Regional Planning Committee, as presented in Attachment 4, which shows the relationship of the Energy Working Group within SANDAG.
3. SANDAG should be responsible for (a) energy planning, policy, consensus building and implementation coordination; (b) unified legislative and regulatory advocacy with the state and federal governments; (c) coordination with adjacent areas in the State and in Baja California, Mexico; and (d) evaluation of RES implementation efforts in the region and of SANDAG’s effectiveness in fulfilling these responsibilities.
4. The funding necessary to support these functions should be pursued and is estimated as follows:
   - Interim funding for January – June 2004 is $365,000 (Attachment 3A);
   - First full year funding, FY 2005, is $730,000 (Attachment 3B); and
   - Ongoing annual funding after FY 2006, is $810,000 (Attachment 3C).
5. The actual implementation of programs and projects should continue to be done by existing organizations. The existing roles and responsibilities of the jurisdictions and organizations in the region involved in energy planning and implementation will be an integral part of the RES implementation, as listed in Attachment 5, and would be coordinated and involved with SANDAG’s role for RES coordination.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

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

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3003000
At its July 25, 2003 meeting, the Board of Directors adopted the Regional Energy Strategy and accepted a report on Implementation Strategies from the consultant, the San Diego Regional Energy Office and the Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council (REPAC). The Board directed its Executive Committee to review the recommendation of the REPAC, which was that SANDAG establish an Energy Committee within SANDAG to implement the Regional Energy Strategy.

The Executive Committee appointed members to the SANDAG Energy Task Force at its September 12, 2003 meeting. The Task Force was directed to review the recommendation of the REPAC and to report to the Executive Committee at its December 5, 2003 meeting on its findings of feasibility of SANDAG implementing this recommendation and identification of available funding. The Executive Committee will consider its recommendation for the Board of Directors December 19, 2003 meeting.

Members of the Energy Task Force are:

Hon. Ramona Finnila, Councilwoman (Chair), City of Carlsbad
Hon. Jerry Jones, Councilman (Vice Chair), City of Lemon Grove*
Hon. Steve Padilla, Mayor, City of Chula Vista
Hon. Lori Holt Pfeiler, Mayor, City of Escondido
Hon. Lee Thibadeau, City of San Marcos (appointed at the October 10, 2003 meeting)
Hon. Diane Jacob, Supervisor, 2nd District, County of San Diego*
Mr. John S. Moot, Sullivan Wertz McDade & Wallace, Chair of REPAC*
Mr. James Callaghan, Qualcomm, Inc.*
Mr. Robert Resley, Vice President, Strategy & Resource Planning, SDG&E*
Mr. Dan Perkins, Sierra Club

*Members of REPAC

- N.B.: Mr. Michael Shames, an original invitee to the Energy Task Force, was unable to attend the meetings because of business obligations and thus unable to vote on the Recommendations of the Energy Task Force.
Recommended Membership

Energy Working Group

Following is the recommended list of members of the Energy Working Group. The SANDAG Chairman will appoint the Chair of the Energy Working Group. The Chair likely would be an elected official from the Regional Planning Committee and/or one of the elected officials from the jurisdictions.

Jurisdictions, based on the SANDAG Policy Committee format:
- Representative from each of the four sub-regions
- City of San Diego
- County of San Diego

Others, one each, except as noted:
- Chamber of Commerce/Economic Development Corporation*
- Consumer Advocate
- Department of Defense (DOD)
- Environmental Organizations (2 each)
- Higher Education
- Labor
- Representative of Large Business
- Representative of Small Business
- San Diego County Water Authority
- San Diego Gas & Electric
- San Diego Port District
- San Diego Regional Energy Office

* It is suggested that one representative be from the northern portion of the region and one from the southern portion.
**ESTIMATED COSTS FOR RES IMPLEMENTATION AT SANDAG:
MONTHS 1-6 (JAN-JUN 2004)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Planning Coordination, Policy, Decisions</td>
<td>1/4 FTE Energy/Program Manager</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/4 FTE Associate Planner</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation:</td>
<td>1/4 FTE Energy/Program Manager</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative and Regulation</td>
<td>1/4 FTE Associate Planner</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic and Legal Consultants</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>Advocate in Sacramento/San Francisco</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with State and Federal Energy Policies and Programs</td>
<td>Travel for Region's Representatives</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$365,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESTIMATED COSTS FOR RES IMPLEMENTATION AT SANDAG:
MONTHS 6-18 (FIRST FISCAL YEAR, JUL 2004-JUN 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Planning Coordination, Policy, Decisions</td>
<td>1/2 FTE Energy/Program Manager</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/4 FTE Associate Planner</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation: Legislative and Regulation</td>
<td>1/4 FTE Energy/Program Manager</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/8 FTE Associate Planner</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic and Legal Consultants</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate in Sacramento/San Francisco</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel for Region's Representatives</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$407,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with State and Federal Energy Policies and Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$407,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with Other Areas</td>
<td>1/4 FTE Energy/Program Manager</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/8 FTE Associate Planner</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$57,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$730,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ESTIMATED COSTS FOR RES IMPLEMENTATION AT SANDAG:
ANNUAL COSTS, FY 2006 AND AFTER (FULL PROGRAM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Planning Coordination, Policy, Decisions</td>
<td>1/2 FTE Energy/Program Manager</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/4 FTE Associate Planner</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation: Legislative and Regulation</td>
<td>1/4 FTE Energy/Program Manager</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>1/4 FTE Entry-Level Planner</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with State and Federal Energy Policies and Programs</td>
<td>Economic and Legal Consultants</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate in Sacramento/San Francisco</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel for Region's Representatives</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$415,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with Other Areas</td>
<td>1/4 FTE Energy/Program Manager</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/4 FTE Entry-Level Planner</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of RES Implementation and of SANDAG Energy Work</td>
<td>1/4 Associate Planner</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 FTE Entry-Level Planner</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$810,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4
Organization of RES Implementation at SANDAG

SANDAG Board of Directors

- Executive Committee
- Regional Planning Committee
- Other Policy Committees
  - Energy Working Group
  - Other Working Groups
Attachment 5

Roles and Responsibilities

State and Federal Policy, Funding, Regulating

- **STATE**
  - Legislature
  - CPUC
  - CEC

- **FEDERAL**
  - Congress
  - FERC
  - DOE

Regional Policy Planning and Coordination

- **SANDAG**
  - Regional Planning Committee
    - Energy Working Group
    - Energy Partners

Program and Project Delivery

- **SDG&E**
- Business Industry Residential Economic Development Corporation
- Others to Include: Environmental Higher Education Labor
- Local Governments and Regional Agencies
- San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO)