



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
JANUARY 14, 2005**

Chairman Mickey Cafagna (Poway) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:19 a.m. He welcomed new members: Marilyn Daily from the San Diego County Water Authority, Matt Hall from Carlsbad, Art Madrid from La Mesa, Pam Slater-Price from the County of San Diego, Pia Harris-Ebert from San Marcos, and Ed Gallo representing the North County Transit District (NCTD). The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

REPORTS

2. REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) (DISCUSSION)

Susan Baldwin, Senior Planner, stated that there are three basic components of the RHNA: the overall regional housing need for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle, allocation by jurisdiction, and allocation by income category. She reviewed the RHNA timeline, which leads to adoption of the RHNA at the February 25, 2005, SANDAG Board meeting. She said that there are three major issues: (1) how should the region's future lower income housing needs be distributed among the region's jurisdictions, (2) what changes to the draft RHNA can be made in the short term, and (3) what changes can be made in the long term to improve the next RHNA process.

Ms. Baldwin stated that the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) focuses on smart growth, seeks to improve the link between transportation and land use, and recommends that the region plan for more housing choice and an increase in the region's housing supply. The goal of the RCP's Housing Chapter is to provide a variety of affordable and quality housing choices for people of all income levels. The policy objective is to increase the supply of and variety of housing choices, especially higher density multifamily housing. The recommended actions in the Housing Chapter are to: identify and rezone appropriate sites for entry-level houses, multifamily and mixed-use housing, located close to public transportation, employment, and other services; and identify and develop appropriate underutilized sites for housing.

Ms. Baldwin said that state housing element law assigns local jurisdictions the responsibility of updating their housing elements every five years, and that the next element is due

June 30, 2005. State law assigns SANDAG responsibility for the RHNA process, which determines the number of units the region and local jurisdictions need to plan for. The RHNA is developed in consultation with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to determine the region's share of the state's housing need. The regional share is allocated by jurisdiction and by income category. Jurisdictions need to identify adequate sites to accommodate their overall share of the region's housing needs and provide opportunities for the construction of lower-income housing.

Ms. Baldwin stated that four groups were involved in the RHNA process to date: the Regional Planning Committee and three working groups -- the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, the Regional Housing Task Force, and the Regional Housing Needs Working Group. The draft RHNA numbers represent a general consensus of these groups.

Ms. Baldwin stated that the recommendation for the overall housing need number for the region is 107,301 units, and that this need is consistent with the goals and objectives of the RCP, which calls for increasing housing supply and choice in the region. The second step in the process is to allocate the overall number by jurisdiction. The recommended allocation by jurisdiction was based on SANDAG's growth forecast and each jurisdiction's share of projected employment growth between 2000 and 2010. This recommendation was based on better linking housing with job growth. The third step in the process is to allocate each jurisdiction's number into four income categories: very low (23 percent), low (17 percent), moderate (19 percent), and above moderate (41 percent). (The percentages associated with each income group are the percent of households in the region in each income category as of the 2000 Census.) The allocation by income category must seek to reduce the concentration of lower income households in jurisdictions with a disproportionately high percentage of lower income households. The income limits for a family of four for each income category are as follows: Very Low Income - \$34,250, Low Income - \$54,800, and Moderate Income - \$76,100. Above Moderate households make 120 percent and above of the area median income, which is \$63,400 for a family of four.

Ms. Baldwin described three alternatives by income category: Alternative 1 proposes applying the existing regional percentage of lower income households to each jurisdiction's regional share, Alternative 2 proposes a greater over-concentration adjustment of lower income housing needs, and Alternative 3 proposes the highest over-concentration adjustment of lower income housing needs. The draft RHNA is based on Alternative 3.

Ms. Baldwin reviewed the draft RHNA issues and short-term solutions such as distributing local RHNA numbers by income category using a different methodology, transferring units between jurisdictions, and adjusting the overall 7.5-year number (107,000 units) to a five-year number (71,333 units) using a pro rata methodology.

She stated that several alternative income allocation methodologies have been proposed. The City of Carlsbad asked that the income allocation methodologies used by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which work toward reducing the over-concentration of lower income households to a lesser degree than Alternatives 1 – 3, be considered by SANDAG. During development of the draft RHNA, an adjustment was made between the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego that resulted in the transfer of lower income units (multifamily) from the County to the City, and the transfer of above moderate income units

(single family) from the City to the County. A similar type of transfer is being discussed by the cities of Poway and National City. Another alternative, a modification to Alternative 1, also has been proposed by the City of Poway.

Ms. Baldwin reviewed several potential long-term changes and RCP initiatives that may affect future RHNA processes including: subregional allocations; the Smart Growth Concept Map; the Smart Growth Incentive Program; and participation in efforts focused on the reform of the state housing element law, land use and housing proposals from the Governor's office, and state-local fiscal reform. Ms. Baldwin stated that the next step is for the SANDAG Board to take action on the final RHNA numbers at its meeting on February 25, 2005.

Chair Cafagna recognized Gail Goldberg, Chair of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWG), for a report on this Group's recent meeting.

Ms. Goldberg stated that the RPTWG met on January 13, 2005, to discuss the short-term solutions to address the RHNA process. Carlsbad and Poway presented new alternatives. We are now looking at six potential income distribution alternatives. SANDAG's Alternative 1 was proposed as a compromise solution. However, the RPTWG was not able to reach a consensus on any of the alternatives. She reviewed several of the comments made at that meeting.

Dennis Turner, Carlsbad Planning Department, said that the City of Carlsbad cannot meet the number of units in Alternative 3 because it doesn't have sufficient vacant land. Of the vacant land it does have, over 50 percent is already constrained through entitlements to developers, and all of those entitlements are accompanied by long-term financial plans, infrastructure plans, and fees. The City cannot go back to those developers to turn housing projects into apartments. Mr. Turner reviewed the actions the city has taken related to affordable housing. He suggested that SANDAG consider what other councils of governments (COGs), such as ABAG and SCAG, have been doing with respect to the income allocation issue. He asked that SANDAG take the time to understand the realities and implications of what the jurisdictions are facing, and then make a good decision for the region. Carlsbad cannot achieve the regional percentage in one housing element cycle.

Ms. Baldwin pointed out that none of the SANDAG alternatives would result in jurisdictions meeting the regional percentage of lower income households during the next five-year housing element cycle.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked what Carlsbad's views are on Alternative 1. Mayor Pro Tem Matt Hall (Carlsbad) said that they could deal with the numbers in that alternative if they were given more than one cycle to do so.

Niall Fritz, Poway Director of Development Services, stated that all of the jurisdictions have numbers that they don't believe they can attain. Poway is 97 percent developed today, and 1,025 units is more than twice the housing units built in the City during the last housing element cycle. We built almost 400 low income housing units during this last cycle, and the City has purchased every available multifamily housing site. We expect to build about 200 low income units during the next five years. Of regional importance, the RHNA numbers should be allocated in accordance with the regional plans and in smart growth areas.

Poway doesn't qualify as a smart growth area. Mr. Fritz presented a new proposal (included in the Revised Attachment 5 handout), which is a modification of Alternative 1. The new alternative offered as a compromise would use Alternative 3 in allocating the lower income housing need in the four jurisdictions where the overconcentration of lower income households is greatest.

Chair Cafagna noted that we are facing a population increase of a million more people in our region, and recognized that we have a housing supply deficit in all communities and need to set the stage for the next housing element cycle. We have to deal with the differences between our communities and with the concept of smart growth. The State of California is imposing a number of units and not taking into account the issues prohibiting us from attaining those numbers.

Mayor Art Madrid (La Mesa) did not feel that comparing SANDAG to ABAG or SCAG was a valid comparison. The diversity in those regions is greater than in ours.

Public Comments:

Tom Scott, Executive Director of the San Diego Housing Federation, recognized that all of the alternatives will be a challenge for everyone. One of the goals of this process is to try to achieve a jobs/housing balance. We have an obligation to provide housing for workers in our area. Multifamily housing is really the only product that will help us eliminate our housing crisis. With the land shortage, this is the only viable alternative in the future. The RHNA process used to be called "fair share" and the Federation supports Alternative 3 in light of that goal.

Scott Malloy with the Building Industry Association (BIA) indicated that the BIA has been involved in this process and is a member of the Regional Housing Task Force. They support the draft RHNA numbers but don't feel that they go far enough to meet the housing demand. This is an opportunity for jurisdictions to work cooperatively within the region, take a proactive approach to our housing needs, and set the stage for long, prosperous, and steady economic growth.

Susan Tinsky, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce Housing Committee, stated that this is an important issue for the Chamber of Commerce. For 2005, the Chamber has made housing its top priority. We have been working for several months to come forward with a 90-day action plan to address housing issues within the City of San Diego, but recognize that this is a regional issue. We believe this process should not be delayed any further. The action the SANDAG Board took in September is the right action, and zoning for multifamily housing is critical.

Sherm Harmer with Urban Housing Partners said that on behalf of the Chamber, we respect the premise SANDAG is working under. Housing is a local issue but has regional impacts. The Chamber believes as a business leader that one of the major philosophical paradigms is how to connect jobs with rooftops. The problems that exist here are not unique. We need to deal with the need for infrastructure to help meet the need for housing. We don't have a home price crisis, we have a supply crisis. The Chamber is asking the Board to be as creative as possible, and take advantage of redevelopment, revitalization, and reorganization opportunities. We

do not need to rip up farms to create land for housing. Chula Vista and La Mesa provide good examples of ways to create more housing.

Jim Schmidt, a member of the public, distributed a handout containing various statistics, letters, editorials, and a pamphlet entitled *New Homes and Poor People*. He pointed out that we have the same problem today that we had a number of years ago. He said that new housing does not cause growth. We need to increase the housing supply by planning for and building more homes.

Board Member Comments:

Supervisor Slater-Price said that she has discussed this issue with County staff, and it is her understanding that ten cities agreed with Alternative 1 with the modification. She agreed that we need to have a realty check on what can be done. It is nice to have a vision, but we have to make it work. Building more housing doesn't lead to low prices, and density does not automatically increase affordability; it just creates more high-priced units. Alternative 1 seems to be the most realistic approach.

Chair Cafagna clarified that the only thing we have to do is show there is land zoned for the RHNA numbers. Carlsbad and Poway have a problem in that they cannot show that land is available.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked if Poway could produce land for Alternative 1. Chair Cafagna replied that Poway can live with Alternative 1 with the proposed modification.

Mayor Pro Tem Hall stated that Carlsbad could live with Alternative 1 but they need more time to create the appropriate zoning, and he didn't see that happening in one cycle. He noted that other councils of governments and the state do not constrain themselves with one cycle. *Ms. Baldwin stated that ABAG and SCAG came up with less aggressive overconcentration adjustment methodologies for that next cycle that were accepted by HCD.*

Ms. Baldwin noted that it was her understanding of state law that if a jurisdiction cannot identify the sites in its housing element it will have to indicate how it will create the sites during the cycle through rezoning and changes to its General Plan. Dennis Turner stated that jurisdictions must also provide infrastructure in addition to zoning.

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, stated that a jurisdiction needs to show it can plan for the infrastructure and process the rezoning within the five-year housing element cycle.

Mayor Steve Padilla (Chula Vista) stated that the goal is to bring true balance, support land use planning that encourages housing opportunities, and supply a percentage of low and moderate income units. In a community that has a high level of low income housing, the burden should be less, and in a community with a lesser amount of low income housing, the percentage should be greater. That is the right public policy. We have a housing crisis in this region and it has a huge economic impact. This region should be aggressive in providing this housing balance. The ABAG and SCAG methodologies look static or regressive.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (Coronado) asked about the negotiations between jurisdictions to transfer units. *Ms. Baldwin responded that all of the income methodologies include an adjustment between the City of San Diego and County of San Diego where the City is taking a share of the unincorporated area's lower income units and the County is taking an equal share of the City's above moderate income units. Poway and National City are discussing a similar transfer.*

Chair Cafagna added that in both cases, it doesn't make sense to put high density housing in unincorporated areas where there is no infrastructure. National City is going to be building more units than it is being allocated. The region will not get credit for those units. Poway has been allocated more units than it has land for, which means that the units won't be built. He said that we should look for a way to make adjustments to satisfy the need and not impose something on communities that they are not able to do. We should allow communities to make adjustments during the cycle by thinking regionally and in conjunction with smart growth concepts.

Vice Mayor Ron Morrison (National City) stated that National City is looking at density in the downtown area and incorporating smart growth ideas. Two-thirds of the city is in the redevelopment zone; there is no bare ground. The problem with housing is that it doesn't bring in enough money to pay for infrastructure services, and redevelopment money cannot go to pay for those services. We are looking at service level thresholds. He agreed that we ought to be aggressive. The RHNA numbers do not meet the region's housing needs. He stated that Alternative 1 with the modification makes a lot of sense. We need to set these housing goals for the sake of our children.

Deputy Mayor Christy Guerin (Encinitas) said that we cannot make up our housing deficit in one housing cycle, and Alternative 3 is unrealistic. Alternative 1 with the modification makes sense. The City of Encinitas feels that it could work with this alternative. It is discouraging to use a goal that is unattainable.

Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (Escondido) agreed with Mayor Padilla's comments. In the RCP workshops there was a recognition that the planning and housing of the future is not the same that has been built in the last 20 years. She asked for clarification about Alternative 1 regarding income distribution and the relationship of the RHNA numbers to the total housing stock. *Ms. Baldwin said that Alternative 1 would apply the regional percentage of lower income households to each jurisdictions' RHNA goals, and that the RHNA numbers are addressing only the incremental increase in units during the next housing element cycle.*

Mayor Holt Pfeiler pointed out that planning for incremental growth does not take care of the past housing deficit.

Mayor Joe Kellejian (Solana Beach) supported Alternative 1 with the modification.

Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) said that state law requires the allocation methodology seek to reduce the concentration of lower income households in jurisdictions that already have a higher share of lower income households than the region as a whole. He asked about the consequence of that requirement. *Ms. Baldwin replied that state law requires that when we do the income allocation this issue be addressed in some way. The*

alternatives are different ways of addressing that situation. Mr. Leiter added that we reviewed Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 at the state level and all three alternatives meet that requirement.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if there was a requirement that these units be built or if this is a standard. *Ms. Baldwin clarified that state law requires jurisdictions to identify sites that are zoned to allow the development of the number of housing units assigned; it does not require that these units be built during this cycle.*

Chair Cafagna stated that we should build the number of units allocated to us.

Councilmember Madaffer pointed out that 20 percent of downtown San Diego development is dedicated to the low income category. Redevelopment and incentives are key to being able to do this. We need to make tough decisions as a region and agrees with the points made by Mayor Padilla and Mayor Holt Pfeiler. He asked about a blend between Alternative 3 and Modified Alternative 1. *Ms. Baldwin stated that Alternative 2 is the mid-point between Alternatives 1 and 3. Mr. Leiter added that Alternative 1 received the most support from the planning directors.*

Councilmember Madaffer asked Ms. Goldberg if Modified Alternative 1 would be satisfactory to the City of San Diego. Ms. Goldberg responded that many of the planning directors selected Alternative 3 based on the fact that the SANDAG Board of Directors had adopted that alternative in the last cycle and that it was fairer to the lower income jurisdictions. They did not believe we should be moving backwards. Some jurisdictions like Carlsbad, however, indicated that it would be difficult to identify adequate zoning to meet the lower income objectives of all three SANDAG alternatives. Though there does appear to be room for compromise, none of the alternatives received a consensus. She likes the more aggressive approach to deal with the issue.

Councilmember Madaffer commented that there have been discussions about the possibility of these alternatives being tied to a recipient basis for funding. Ms. Goldberg said she has heard from the state about the possibility of tying transportation dollars and limited resources to smart growth to help meet the state's housing objectives.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if cities who can take in more low income housing will be rewarded. *Mr. Leiter said that if the League of California Cities and the Governor's Office agreed to link transportation and housing funding, we are well positioned because of our RCP and local Smart Growth Incentive Program to implement that kind of state program at a regional level. We wouldn't expect jurisdictions to be willing to increase affordable housing today based on the potential for such changes.*

Mayor Padilla echoed Mr. Madaffer's comments, and agreed that perhaps we should be more aggressive. We should worry less about jurisdictional comfort zones and more about what is right for the region. We need to move in a more balanced direction and in a way that comes closer to meeting the region's goals. We should set the goal higher to get us closer to achieving our goals.

Supervisor Slater-Price said that the County could support Modified Alternative 1, but is not in a position to meet the numbers in Alternative 3. We should look at not just density but

the kind of density that should be rewarded in our incentive programs. As we look at the transportation, housing, and job links we will go in the right direction. She reiterated that ten planning directors supported Modified Alternative 1.

Chair Cafagna commented that we should have a provision to allow jurisdictions to build more affordable housing if they can, and then start looking at the next cycle.

Mayor Pro Tem Patricia McCoy (Imperial Beach) expressed disappointment that the underpinnings of sustainability are not mentioned. She would like to see more emphasis given to sustainability. She could support the Modified Alternative 1.

Mayor Madrid said that whatever approach we take we should be aggressive with the state about retention of local land use control. He referenced the comments by Senate Pro Tem Don Perata regarding the potential removal of local land use authority, and noted that we don't need the state to tell us what to do. Mayor Madrid reminded the Board that he sits on the Board of the League of California Cities.

Councilmember Hal Ryan (Santee) cautioned against continuing to adjust the standard for housing. He said that if we are not going to be proactive about rezoning for housing, someone else will. We need to make sure that we are prudent and do what we can to accommodate the region's housing needs. The City of Santee is comfortable with Alternative 1 with the modification. Councilmember Ryan also stated that we should not let our housing element self-certification program slip away.

Councilmember Ryan asked if self-certification is still an option. *Ms. Baldwin said that jurisdictions have the ability to self-certify their next housing elements based on performance during the current housing element cycle. Legislation would be needed to allow jurisdictions to self-certify their 2010-2015 housing elements. The self-certification issue is being discussed on a statewide basis, and given the meetings in which SANDAG has participated, staff believes that extending or amending our program would be difficult.*

Chair Cafagna asked if we are the only region with the self-certification option. *Ms. Baldwin replied affirmatively.*

Councilmember Ryan commented that we want to keep our self-certification process. Santee has to take on higher density housing in return for the multimillion dollar projects, such as the trolley line, located in our area. The federal government will want to see that its funds are being used efficiently and effectively.

Councilmember Judy Ritter (Vista) said that the income component of the draft RHNA is not just tied to transportation dollars, but to other services as well. Lower income households need more services than higher income households. We also need places for our service workers to live.

Deputy Mayor Guerin agreed that we need to send a signal to the state. She noted that smart growth incentives can be seen as either a carrot or a stick and that some higher cost jurisdictions may walk away from the carrot. We need to provide a high quality environment for our citizens. She supported the new smart growth incentive in *TransNet*, but it is not just quantity but quality as well. For some jurisdictions Modified Alternative 1 is

aggressive. We cannot socially engineer the low income housing market. Building more housing won't lower its cost. Many of her law enforcement friends live in Temecula. That's not a good thing or a bad thing, it's just a fact.

Councilmember Monroe applauded the proposed modification of Alternative 1 as being reflective of good decision-making theory.

Councilmember Madaffer said he was leaning toward Alternative 3. He expressed concern about perpetuating the status quo and questioned what kinds of incentives exist for him to support Modified Alternative 1. He asked what a city gets in exchange for Poway saying that it can't rezone.

Deputy Mayor Guerin questioned what the incentive is for Alternative 3.

Chair Cafagna said that the idea is to build the units and continue to work together to increase that in the future. We should not agree to something we cannot do.

Councilmember Dave Druker (Del Mar) asked when the SANDAG Board would make a decision on this matter. Chair Cafagna replied that action will be taken at the February 25 Board meeting.

Councilmember Druker commented that we need to start working today on the rule changes for the next five-year cycle. The number of units is not achievable. We need to be able to have the state approve the ability to move and allocate units on a regional basis. *Mr. Gallegos stated that there is nothing legally that precludes transfers today. In the next cycle, we should come back and look at subregional numbers as a place to start.*

Mayor Mark Lewis (El Cajon) expressed support for Alternative 3. He noted that even if you fail to attain that number, we'll be farther along than we would be with a lower alternative. He is concerned about the price of housing, and the minimum wage workers clogging the roads. He could support either Modified Alternative 1 or Alternative 3.

Deputy Mayor Guerin pointed out that we are trying to meet our goal of 107,000 housing units. If we reach a consensus on one of the alternatives we will still be meeting our affordable housing goals.

Vice Mayor Pia Harris-Ebert (San Marcos) stated that the differences between alternatives are not significant for San Marcos. We are being very aggressive in building affordable housing, and all jurisdictions need to do their fair share.

Chair Cafagna asked for a show of hands from those cities that believe they can support Modified Alternative 1; 12 hands were raised in favor of this alternative.

Mr. Gallegos asked which members could support Alternative 3; nine hands were raised.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if there was a compromise between Modified Alternative 1 and Alternative 3.

Action: This report was presented for information.

3. PLAN TO END CHRONIC HOMELESSNESS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (INFORMATION)

Fred Baranowski, President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of United Way, stated that they have raised \$25 million annually for homelessness in San Diego. They are developing a plan to end chronic homelessness in the San Diego area. San Diego is one of 100 cities around the United State to put together such a plan. Chronic homelessness, which represents 10 percent of the homelessness in San Diego County, results from mental illness and alcohol and drug problems.

He noted that 14 individuals were tracked across the City of San Diego and the County and it was determined that \$4 million was spent on these individuals. If we put 10 percent of that money into housing for those people, that would reduce the numbers of homelessness. He stated that federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds will flow to those cities with plans in place. A leadership council has been formed to develop this plan. They want to learn from other areas, and the goal is to build more supportive housing. He asked for the assistance of areawide elected officials in helping them to draft this plan.

Mr. Baranowski said that this plan will include data analysis, prevention strategies, and creative housing alternatives. We need to end homelessness, not manage it in the future. We have until June 30 to get the plan in place then go to the City of San Diego and County for approval. The United Way will take a role in implementing the plan and will help mobilize plan implementation.

Councilmember Monroe stated that if someone is on drugs they are not eligible for some programs. Mr. Baranowski agreed that we need to take care of the people who need the most help. We need to break the cycle, and key to that is the case worker. They will keep the Board posted on their efforts.

Mayor Lewis pointed out that we need to look at some of the laws that need to be changed. The homeless problem is larger than just providing adequate housing

Mayor Holt Pfeiler commented that homelessness should not be criminalized; we have to acknowledge the problem and come up with a regional solution.

Action: The report was presented for information.

4. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Board of Directors business meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 28, 2005. The Policy meeting for February has been cancelled in lieu of the SANDAG Board Retreat.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Secretary

DGunn/M/DGU

ATTENDANCE
SANDAG POLICY BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING
JANUARY 14, 2005

JURISDICTION/ ORGANIZATION	NAME	ATTENDING	COMMENTS
City of Carlsbad	Matt Hall (Member)	Yes	
City of Chula Vista	Steve Padilla (Member)	Yes	
City of Coronado	Phil Monroe (Member)	Yes	
City of Del Mar	David Druker (Alternate)	Yes	
City of El Cajon	Mark Lewis (Member)	Yes	
City of Encinitas	Christy Guerin (Member)	Yes	
City of Escondido	Lori Holt Pfeiler (Member)	Yes	
City of Imperial Beach	Patricia McCoy (Member)	Yes	
City of La Mesa	Art Madrid (Member)	Yes	
City of Lemon Grove	Jerry Jones (Alternate)	Yes	
City of National City	Ron Morrison (Member)	Yes	
City of Oceanside	Jack Feller (Member)	No	
City of Poway	Mickey Cafagna, Chair (Member)	Yes	
City of San Diego – A	Jim Madaffer (Member)	Yes	
City of San Diego - B	Scott Peters (Member)	No	
City of San Marcos	Pia Harris-Ebert (Member)	Yes	
City of Santee	Hal Ryan (Member)	Yes	
City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Member)	Yes	
City of Vista	Judy Ritter (Alternate)	Yes	
County of San Diego	Pam Slater-Price (Member)	Yes	
ADVISORY MEMBERS LISTED BELOW (ATTENDANCE NOT COUNTED FOR QUORUM PURPOSES)			
Caltrans	Bill Figge (Alternate)	Yes	
MTDB	Leon Williams (Member)	Yes	
NCTD	Judy Ritter (Member)	No	She attended on behalf of Vista
Imperial County	Victor Carrillo (Member)	No	
US Dept. of Defense	CAPT Daniel King (Member)	No	
SD Unified Port District	Michael Bixler (Alternate)	No	
SD County Water Auth.	Marilyn Dailey (Member)	Yes	
Baja California/Mexico	Luis Cabrera Cuaron (Member)	No	