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- SANDAG SERVICE BUREAU
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MISSION STATEMENT

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

San Diego Association of Governments • 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 • Fax (619) 699-1905 • www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Board of Directors may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

**SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.**
*Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.*
ITEM #                     RECOMMENDATION
+ 1. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 25, 2005, MEETING MINUTES  APPROVE

2. 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 also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 6)

+ 3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES  APPROVE

+ 4. REVISIONS TO POLICY NO. 18: REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION, AND POLICY NO. 25: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/INVOLVEMENT (Toni Bates)  ADOPT

In Spring 2004, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted Policy No. 18: Regional Transit Service Planning that defined the process, roles, and responsibilities for transit service planning and implementation in the region. On February 18, 2005, the Transportation Committee endorsed a revised process for transit service planning and implementation, including shifting responsibility for transit service change public hearings to the transit agencies. On March 4, 2005, the Transportation Committee approved a revision to SANDAG Policy No. 18 that reflects the revised process and changes in responsibilities, and recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors adopt the revised Policy No. 18. The Board also is asked to adopt a revised Policy No. 25: Public Participation/Involvement to conform with the recommended changes to Policy No. 18.

+ 5. NEW CONTRACT WITH STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION (Julie Wiley)  APPROVE

The TransNet Ordinance extension approved by the voters in November 2004 requires SANDAG to contract with the State Board of Equalization to collect the authorized sales and use tax. Staff recommends that the Board authorize the Executive Director to sign an agreement with the State Board of Equalization in substantially the same form as the contract attached to the report by approving Resolution No. 2005-20.
+ 6. UPDATE CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE (Julie Wiley)  

Due to the recent Employee Classification Study, SANDAG’s Conflict of Interest Code must be updated to reflect numerous changes to job titles. No new positions have been added to the list of designated persons, but the job titles have been modified so that they are consistent with SANDAG’s new classifications.

CHAIR’S REPORT

+ 7. REPORT ON NATIONAL CONFERENCES HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.: AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION (APTA) AND ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS (AMPO)

During March, Board members from SANDAG, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD) attended two conferences held in Washington DC: the APTA Legislative Conference and the AMPO Policy Conference. The Chair will provide a summary of these conferences and the various meetings held with the San Diego Congressional delegation and other top officials. These meetings provided Board members the opportunity to present the SANDAG Legislative Program, including requests for federal funding to our Congressional delegation.

REPORTS

+ 8. SANDAG SERVICE BUREAU (Karen Lamphere)  

Member agencies, transit operators, and non-member public agencies and the private sector are currently provided information and technical assistance through three separate programs: Local Technical Assistance, Assistance to Transit Operations and Planning, and SourcePoint. The Executive Committee recommends that the SANDAG Board approve the concept of a Service Bureau, which would combine all three programs under one structure, and use the Executive Committee as its governing body.

+ 9. DRUG USE TRENDS AMONG LOCAL ARRESTEES (Mayor Padilla, Public Safety Committee Chair; Cynthia Burke)

Since 1987, SANDAG has conducted interviews with adult and juvenile arrestees about their recent and past drug use. Locally, this information has been used to assess drug-use trends, identify potential drug epidemics and treatment needs, and monitor drug use within population subgroups. Over the years, this project also has served as a platform for other research with the inclusion of addenda pertaining to such topics as methamphetamine use. Information from interviews conducted in 2003 along with the results of the drug testing will be presented.
10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The Board of Directors Policy meeting for Friday, April 8, 2005, has been cancelled. The next Board of Directors Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 22, 2005, at 9 a.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
Board of Directors Discussion and Actions
February 25, 2005

Chairman Mickey Cafagna (Poway) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:08 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by First Vice Chair Mary Sessom (Lemon Grove) and a second by Second Vice Chair Jack Dale (Santee), the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the minutes from the January 14 and 21, 2005, meetings.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

Mrs. Lisa Stocks, Executive Director of Lifesharing, said that her organization has been designated by the federal government to be the organ procurement agency for San Diego and Imperial Counties to facilitate organ donation and transplantation. In April they will be launching a donor registry. This registry will take the place of the pink dot on driver’s licenses. Currently, there are more than 85,000 people around the nation waiting for organs, and California has 21 percent of that number. There will be a statewide press conference to increase awareness about this registry. She asked that the individual cities issue a proclamation to support organ donation and the registry, and she provided draft language to use. She also invited Board members to attend the press conference. She offered to schedule a registry drive in each jurisdiction.

Vice Mayor Pia Harris-Ebert (San Marcos) asked how this group is funded. Ms. Stocks replied that they have received funding from the federal government.

Mayor Joe Kellejian (Solana Beach) asked if SANDAG has a policy with regard to resolutions of support. Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, replied that agency resolutions are done, but they usually pertain to what SANDAG does; however, he didn’t think there was anything precluding us from doing that.

Mayor Kellejian asked that the Executive Committee review this issue and consult with legal counsel to see if it is within SANDAG’s purview.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (Coronado) asked if the group would be willing to attend a meeting of the Coronado City Council. Ms. Stocks replied affirmatively. Councilmember Monroe noted that since the city council meeting is televised, it would be a good way to raise awareness for this cause.
Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) indicated that the County of San Diego has issued similar proclamations in the past.

Chair Cafagna pointed out that Board Policy No. 6 states that the subject matter of a proclamation must be within SANDAG’s purview and have regional significance. He had no objections to doing this but cautioned the Board about doing this for one cause because it would open the door for other causes. He recommended that we encourage our member jurisdictions to issue a proclamation to support this cause.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, provided information on the new location of Team Water Walk activities on Saturday, April 2. This will occur at the Splash at Frog One in Spring Valley. The people with Multiple Sclerosis can use all the help you can give. On the transportation front, he pointed out where the Governor would take $13 million from gasoline tax from this county for the State budget. He stated that we are all going to get hurt by this action.

Mayor Kellejian congratulated the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NSDCTDB) and the residents of North County on the ten-year anniversary of the Coaster. He said there were people at each Coaster station this morning passing out giveaway items to passengers.

Councilmember Jack Feller (Oceanside) mentioned that he got to the Oceanside station this morning at 5:10 a.m. to hand out the free goodies and there were about 100 people racing to get on that train. He didn’t realize there were that many people getting on the train at that time.

Councilmember Judy Ritter (NCTD) reminded the Board of the “two for one” promotion on Saturdays until the end of May where one person pays and the second person rides for free.

**CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 8)**

Chair Cafagna noted that item No. 8 was pulled from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (APPROVE)

4. APPROACH FOR DEVELOPING SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (ACCEPT)

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) calls for developing a smart growth concept map for use as a planning tool in updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and allocating incentive funding for smart growth. This report presents the proposed approach and timeline for developing the map. The Regional Planning Committee recommends that the Board of Directors accept the proposed approach for development of the Smart Growth Concept Map.
QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS – OCTOBER TO DECEMBER 2004 (INFORMATION)

This quarterly report summarizes the current status of major highway, transit, arterial, traffic management, and transportation demand management projects in SANDAG’s five-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for October-December 2004. The TransNet one-half cent local sales tax and other local, state, and federal sources fund the projects.

TRANSIT OPERATING REVENUE ALLOCATIONS AND ESTIMATES (APPROVE)

The transit operators within the SANDAG region receive various revenues to support both ongoing operations and major capital projects. Each year, SANDAG provides the estimates from various sources of revenues for transit. This report provides the estimates of transit revenues available for FY 2006 to FY 2010 for each fund type. In addition, SANDAG provides local agencies the funding available for the nonmotorized program for the upcoming year. The Transportation Committee recommends that the SANDAG Board adopt the FY 2006 Apportionments and approve the revenue projections for FY 2007 to FY 2010.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (APPROVE)

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and NCTD have developed their Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs) for FY 2006, which form the basis for the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA’s) Section 5307 Urbanized Area formula fund grant, the Section 5309 Rail Modernization formula fund grant, and the 2004 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) amendments for CIP projects. The Transportation Committee recommends that the SANDAG Board approve the CIP for funding for the San Diego region, approve the submittal of the associated FTA grants, and adopt Resolution No. 2005-18, approving Amendment No. 5 to the 2004 RTIP.

Chair Cafagna pointed out that a revised handout of Actions from Policy Advisory Committees (agenda item No. 3) has been distributed. It includes actions from the February 18, 2005, Borders Committee meeting.

Deputy Mayor Crystal Crawford (Del Mar) stated that this February is the third anniversary of the Borders Committee. The Borders Committee met with tribal government representatives and received information on tribal activities and two groups, the Southern California Tribal Chairman’s Association and the Reservation Transportation Authority. Deputy Mayor Crawford also mentioned that the Borders Committee held a joint meeting with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in San Juan Capistrano on February 24, 2005. Staff will be providing follow-up information from that meeting.

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Mayor Ron Morrison (National City) and second by Vice Chair Sessom, the SANDAG Board voted to approve Consent Item Nos. 3 through 7, including Resolution No. 2005-18. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – Chula Vista.
8. COMPENSATION STUDY (APPROVE)

SANDAG has completed the classification and compensation study with the objective of creating a classification and compensation structure that provides clear career ladders, with new entry-level positions and internal flexibility to manage an evolving agency, while remaining objective, competitive, and equitable across all SANDAG classes. This report presents the findings and recommendations of the compensation study, including the FY 2006 Position Classification/Salary Range Table. Merit or performance compensation adjustments will be managed within the SANDAG FY 2006 Program Budget. The Executive Committee has recommended Board approval.

Mayor Pro Tem Matt Hall (Carlsbad) expressed concern about the agencies with which we compared ourselves. He disagreed with the inclusion of agencies outside of the San Diego region, such as the Association of Bay Area Governments, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LAMTA), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), and SCAG. He asked for the numbers to be rerun with those agencies removed from the calculations. Mr. Hall felt that when we include these agencies we drive our pay scales upward because the cost of living might be higher in these other metropolitan areas.

Supervisor Slater Price supported Mayor Pro Tem Hall’s comments and said that we should exercise fiscal restraint.

Leslie Campbell, Director of Administration, explained that we included councils of governments (COGs) because we are a COG, and we provide similar services and compete in the same job market. She reiterated that the survey agencies had been chosen based on geographic proximity, size, provision of similar services, and competition in the same job markets.

Chair Cafagna asked how the results were achieved. Ms. Campbell answered that the Board hired a consultant who used a proprietary software program. The consultant used benchmark positions and an approved list of public entities for the survey. She noted that the compensation is related to salary ranges, not actual pay and added that this is not a budget item.

Mr. Gallegos said that this action sets the salary ranges. Through the annual budget process we set the budget that we have for salaries. If you look at actual salaries within those ranges, our staff is in the lower and middle of the salary ranges. He said that in the past SANDAG has primarily used performance-based increases, and the cities have provided cost-of-living increases as well as merit salary increases. He had asked staff to make comparisons with actual salaries, but we had problems obtaining that information from the cities.

Ms. Campbell stated that we did get some information on actual salaries. She said that other government agencies provide the cost-of-living plus automatic merit increases. At SANDAG, salaries are pay-for-performance based.

Mayor Art Madrid (La Mesa) noted that a lot of jurisdictions have been laying off employees. He asked how many applications we receive for job openings. Ms. Campbell replied that it has been anywhere from 30 to 100 applications. However, there have been a
number of candidates who have pulled out of the application process when they find out how serious we are about the salary scale.

Mayor Madrid commented that you have to take into consideration that public agencies pay for medical coverage when a lot of private companies do not.

Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) said that he would prefer to move this item today. What he fears is that SANDAG or other government agencies will become training grounds for other municipalities or other governmental entities. A recent San Diego Union-Tribune article indicated that the cost-of-living in San Diego outpaces that of the nation. That is the fiscal reality we are facing. He urged the Board to give greater consideration to this. He had no problem with staff reporting back with the additional information that was requested.

Mayor Pro Tem Hall said that he wanted to make an informed decision and wanted the Board to wait on taking action until the numbers were recalculated to remove those not in the San Diego region.

Mayor Steve Padilla (Chula Vista) said that the analysis conducted was appropriate and extensively reviewed. We have to remember that the analysis is multi-dimensional and there are other factors considered in the comparison such as the required skill sets, expertise, and the ability of this agency to compete in this market. The comparison to other COGs in this state is appropriate and is not driven by the size of the agency alone.

Deputy Mayor Guerin said that when the Board approved the study under this contract it was because this agency had changed due to consolidation. It was important that we compare ourselves with the other COGs. We are recruiting from some of those larger COGs. She was not comfortable with removing the COGs from the equation.

Vice Mayor Morrison echoed sentiments by Guerin. He said that we have to compare apples to apples.

Chair Cafagna stated that the last time we conducted this type of study was in 1991. We are in a situation where we have several senior people retiring and we want to do our best to replace them. Fiscal responsibility is a very important thing, and this agency has demonstrated fiscal responsibility. We are dealing with the current situation.

Mayor Madrid said that he would only support the salary ranges at the 75th percentile of the market but would abstain on this item because he felt there was insufficient information.

Supervisor Slater-Price didn’t think it was an unreasonable request to have the numbers rerun excluding the other COG numbers. To be responsible decision makers, we should examine the other set of numbers.

Chair Cafagna asked what it would cost for the consultant to do another set of numbers. Ms. Campbell estimated that it might be as high as $10,000. She noted that the contract has run out so it would take several months to develop another contract.

Supervisor Slater-Price thought that SANDAG staff could run the numbers.
Mayor Pro Tem Hall thought that it should be simple to generate the additional information.

Chair Cafagna asked if this recalculation could be done in-house. Ms. Campbell said she would ask the consultant about the cost to conduct the variations. She said that he charged us about $6,000-8,000 for a previous change order requesting additional computations, and she was not sure what the consultant would require to do the recalculations. She added that our staff does not have the skill to rerun the numbers, as this is a proprietary software program.

Chair Cafagna asked Ms. Campbell to find out what it will take to recalculate the numbers removing the agencies outside the San Diego region.

Mr. Gallegos pointed out that we hired the expert with a proprietary software program. We can bring the additional information back, but it won’t be appropriate. If it were that easy to calculate this in the first place, we would not have hired a consultant.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Deputy Mayor Christy Guerin (Encinitas), the SANDAG Board accepted the compensation study and approved the FY 2006 Position Classification/Salary Range Table. Yes – 16 (weighted vote, 79%). No – 2 (Carlsbad and County of San Diego) (weighted vote, 19%). Abstain – La Mesa (2%). Absent – 0.

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Cafagna and a second by Mayor Pro Tem Hall, staff was directed to determine if a simplified version of the calculation excluding agencies outside the San Diego region can be done in-house; if not, obtain information from the consultant about what it would take to remove the other COGs’ numbers and conduct a recalculation, and report back with that information to the Executive Committee. Yes – 13 (weighted vote, 85%). No – 6 (Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, National City, San Marcos, and Vista) (weighted vote, 15%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – 0.

CHAIR’S REPORTS

Chair Cafagna recognized Bill Hall, Chairman of the Port Commission, as the Ports new representative to the SANDAG Board.

9. RECOGNITION OF JESS VAN DEVENTER (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Jess Van Deventer is the longest serving member of the SANDAG Board of Directors. As a Councilmember from National City, Jess represented his city on the SANDAG Board from 1978 to 1992. He served as the Chairman of the SANDAG Board of Directors during 1984-1986. Following his city council tenure, his National City council colleagues selected Jess in 1993 to represent his city as a Commissioner on the San Diego Unified Port District. His fellow Commissioners immediately selected Jess to be their advisory representative on the SANDAG Board until the expiration of his Port term in December 2004.

Chair Cafagna reviewed the accomplishments of Jess Van Deventer during his service to the SANDAG Board and presented him with a plaque of appreciation.
Jess Van Deventer said that it has been a pleasure for him to serve the San Diego region, especially at SANDAG, and to be a part of the major accomplishments that have occurred. He stressed the need for regionalism from the SANDAG Board.

10. SUMMARY OF ANNUAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS RETREAT (INFORMATION)

This report provides a synopsis and potential actions based on the discussions during the retreat held on February 9, 10, and 11, 2005.

Chair Cafagna noted that almost every SANDAG member agency attended the Retreat, and a lot of ground was covered from projects contained in the TransNet Extension to implementing the Regional Comprehensive Plan and updating our Regional Transportation Plan. He added that it was very beneficial to have our law enforcement and fire officials participate. He pointed out that staff attempted to capture the essence of the retreat by denoting the “actions” in the Board report.

11. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRS AND VICE CHAIRS FOR THE TRANSPORTATION, REGIONAL PLANNING, BORDERS, AND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEES (INFORMATION)

Members and alternates for the Transportation, Regional Planning, Borders, and the Public Safety Policy Advisory Committees have been announced. The Chair will make his appointments to the Chairs and Vice Chairs of each Committee. A listing of appointments is included.

Chair Cafagna indicated that a blue sheet updating the chairs and appointments from each of the subregions to the Policy Advisory Committees was distributed due to changes to the Borders Committee and Public Safety Committee representatives.

Deputy Mayor Guerin noted one correction to the Public Safety Committee under the San Diego County Sheriff heading, in that Bill Gore is actually the Assistant Sheriff rather than Undersheriff. There also was a correction under the federal Public Safety position, in that Daniel Dzwilewski works for the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the U.S. Marshall’s Office.

Councilmember Monroe expressed his pleasure that the Vice Chair of the Borders Committee is Supervisor Victor Carrillo from Imperial County. He stated that this says a lot for Supervisor Carrillo’s participation in the Committee and our outreach to neighboring areas.
Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (Escondido) said that this is the public hearing for final adoption of the RHNA, which will help ensure that our regional plans better link transportation and land use. The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) calls for more housing in smart growth areas, and adoption of the RHNA is a big step toward implementing the RCP.

Susan Baldwin, Senior Planner, gave a presentation on the RHNA process and issues. She noted that the Board is being asked to make the final decision on the RHNA for the 2005-2010 housing cycle. There are three basic components to the RHNA: determining the overall housing need for this cycle, allocating the overall need by jurisdiction, and allocating each jurisdiction’s need by income category. Following the Board’s acceptance of the draft RHNA for distribution, staff has been making presentations to the cities and various organizations.

During the public review period, three issues were the focus of discussions: how should the region’s future lower-income housing needs be distributed among the region’s jurisdictions, what changes to the Draft RHNA can be made in the short-term, and what changes can be made in the long-term to improve the next RHNA process. This process is intended to ensure that the region plans for its housing needs.

Ms. Baldwin stated that the RCP Housing Chapter’s goal 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 Housing Chapter’s recommended actions are to identify and rezone appropriate sites for entry-level housing, and multifamily and mixed-use housing that is located close to public transportation, employment, and other services; and to identify and develop appropriate underutilized sites for housing, such as older strip commercial centers.

Ms. Baldwin said that under the housing element law, local jurisdictions are required to update their housing elements every five years. SANDAG is responsible for the RNHA process, which determines the number of units the region and local jurisdictions need to plan for. Local jurisdictions are required to identify adequate sites to accommodate their overall share of the region’s housing needs for all income levels; the most difficult aspect of this requirement is to identify multifamily-zoned sites to provide the opportunity for lower and moderate income housing units to be built. Although multifamily zoning does not ensure affordability, it provides the opportunity for local, state, and federal affordable housing resources to be used.

Ms. Baldwin said that four groups were involved in this process: the Regional Planning Committee, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, the Regional Housing Task Force, and the Regional Housing Needs Working Group.

Ms. Baldwin explained that the first step in the process was to determine the regional housing need. The second step allocated that need by jurisdiction based on SANDAG’s growth forecast. The third step determined each jurisdiction’s regional share by income category based on the region’s census. State law requires that the allocation must seek to
reduce the concentration of lower-income households in cities and counties that already have a disproportionate share of such households.

Ms. Baldwin reviewed the six income allocation alternatives: 1, 2, 3, ABAG, SCAG, and Modified Alternative 1. In their discussions of Alternative 3 and Modified Alternative 1, the Regional Planning Committee and Regional Planning Technical Working Group were not able to reach a clear consensus, although Modified Alternative 1 received somewhat more support from the groups.

Ms. Baldwin stated that currently incorporated in the numbers is a transfer between the City and County of San Diego, and that National City and Poway have been discussing a similar transfer.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler recognized that these numbers are difficult for all of us. The RCP will address how we undertake the next RHNA process early on, well before the next housing elements are due. Issues include how much money is available, and how much can we really do given the average affordable housing subsidies of $100,000-$150,000 per unit. There also are bigger issues than what we can deal with immediately, such as fiscal reform and infrastructure funding. She distributed and reviewed the contents of a memo from Mayor Padilla, Councilmember Madaffer, and herself that recommended support for Modified Alternative 1 with several provisions outlined in the memo.

Chair Cafagna opened the public hearing at 10:18 a.m.

Mitch Mitchell, representing the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, said that housing is the Chamber’s number one priority. In March 2000, 24 percent of those people in the median income bracket could afford to buy a home. Now it is only 12 percent. We build plenty of $600,000 homes and up. The economy is good, but we have not made the necessary progress for the future. Housing builders are looking in Imperial County for property. This is a regional crisis, and it has to be addressed by all of the cities. We have to do a better job in the City of San Diego and a better job as a chamber working with other city chambers throughout this region.

Susan Tinksy, Chair of the Chamber’s Housing Committee, said that the lack of affordable housing has reached dramatic proportions. The RHNA process will begin to address those issues. We are dependent upon one another for the economic sustainability of this region. We need to build housing close to employment opportunities and that which is affordable to our workforce to ensure economic prosperity in the region.

Renata Mulry, representing Bexen Press in Carlsbad, wondered why the State of California is putting the financial burden on the cities and the county for housing. She doesn’t understand the numbers for some of the jurisdictions. She said that the reason people cannot afford to live here is related to “sun dollars.” People earn substantially less in this city and county than other places. A lot of our revenue is generated by low-paying jobs. This is the intrinsic reason why we have this housing crisis. Until salaries are lifted through different employment opportunities, this will always be a crucial issue.

There were no other requests to speak, and Chair Cafagna closed the public hearing at 10:25 a.m.
Board Comment:

Motion Made: Mayor Holt Pfeiler moved to accept the Modified Alternative 1 as presented in the memo that was distributed. Councilmember Madaffer seconded the motion.

Discussion on the Motion:

Supervisor Slater-Price said that upzoning does not result in lower-priced housing. She didn’t know where the low-income housing that the city mandates is going to be placed. It looks as though you have to actually demonstrate that you can build low-income housing, not just zone for it. Fees of $6,000 won’t provide a unit. Item 2b. in the memo states that you have to demonstrate production of units, not just rezone. She stated that Lincoln Acres is a low-income area, and the County wanted National City to absorb it. She thought that the Lincoln Acres area would be penalized under this proposal.

Chair Cafagna said that jurisdictions need to plan for these numbers to get our housing elements approved, but no one can produce all of the units assigned to them. The intent of the amendment being proposed is to provide incentives for planning for and building housing. We should make sure we are doing our best to produce the numbers.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked if Lincoln Acres came in with a proposal to build would it get preferential treatment under this amendment. Mayor Holt Pfeiler explained that the County has an RHNA number and the closer it comes to achieving that number, the more chance it will have to compete for discretionary funds.

Councilmember Feller asked if all of the cities’ planning staffs have seen this memo. Mayor Holt Pfeiler replied that they had not.

Councilmember Feller asked about the possible transfer between National City and Poway. Chair Cafagna said that Poway and National City have been discussing a transfer. National City has a low allocation because of the amount of lower-income households living there, and it is intending to build more than its allocation. The two cities were trying to determine if there is a way that Poway, who doesn’t have the infrastructure or zoned land, could use redevelopment housing funds to help National City build low-income units. He noted that the region won’t get credit for any additional units that are built in National City. He said that we ought to think on a more regional basis, and those cities that can accommodate more affordable housing and/or are located along transportation lines could be allocated money from that pool to build those units. The idea is to produce the housing.

Councilmember Feller commented that it would seem to incentivize more low to very low income housing in one area. Chair Cafagna responded that that is not the intent. The idea is to get people out of their cars and into public transportation and to encourage housing around public transportation rather than putting additional low-income housing in areas already having low-income housing.

Vice Mayor Morrison asked how much is available for this smart growth incentive program. Mayor Holt Pfeiler said that it is about $17 million for the pilot program. Vice Mayor Morrison pointed out that low-income housing is already subsidized about $100,000 - $200,000 per unit, so that is not a lot of money for this purpose.
Vice Mayor Morrison clarified that in the discussions with Poway, National City was not considering taking other jurisdictions' lower-income housing units. What they have said is that they have opportunities to build more housing. Other areas’ plans do not allow them this same opportunity. We could help those jurisdictions that cannot meet their overall numbers, not just their lower income numbers.

Vice Mayor Morrison stated that with respect to the fiscal reform problem, the only way we can add density is through our redevelopment agencies. Two-thirds of National City is in a redevelopment area. The problem is that money comes back to the redevelopment agency for more housing rather than for the corresponding service needs. We cannot allow more construction to continue without money for services.

Councilmember Scott Peters (City of San Diego) commented that each of us should look for opportunities to provide housing to help improve our communities. He noted that the region is a victim of its own success and that it is difficult to build enough housing to affect prices. He reviewed activities accomplished by the City of San Diego. He asked that Fourth District Councilmember Tony Young be included in discussions about housing in the future. Councilmember Young wants to improve his district with residential development. Councilmember Peters also stated that pooling funds on a regional basis is a good idea and would allow for the use of cheaper land.

Deputy Mayor Guerin applauded Ms. Mulry’s comments on State mandates. She said that her city staff has not had a chance to evaluate the memo that was distributed and expressed concern regarding the wording, “all future discretionary funding” and how it would affect Encinitas. She stated that she was not concerned about the $17 million pilot smart growth program. Mayor Holt Pfeiler clarified that only discretionary transportation dollars that are allocated to local agencies on a competitive basis would be used as an incentive.

Deputy Mayor Guerin stated that this could have a negative impact on smaller cities without public transportation corridors. She expressed concern about trading transportation funding for housing.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler said that the memo provisions are trying to give jurisdictions in favor of Alternative 3 an incentive to vote for Modified Alternative 1.

Deputy Mayor Crawford expressed concerns similar to Deputy Mayor Guerin. Mayor Holt Pfeiler clarified that you only have to provide housing opportunities, you are not required to build the units to be eligible for the smart growth money.

Deputy Mayor Crawford noted that Del Mar has done well in qualifying for grant money for projects in the discretionary category on a practical level. She asked how that would affect Del Mar’s eligibility to qualify for smart growth funding. She would like her planning director to review what is being proposed.

Mayor Kellejian did not understand the point system described in the memo as it relates to Solana Beach. Mayor Holt Pfeiler explained that every year the city would send a report to SANDAG showing it has zoned property and what it has produced. About 25 percent of the criteria for discretionary funding would be based on how well we are producing housing.
When you are producing jobs and people then you should be producing housing, too. We should put our money where our housing is located.

Chair Cafagna added that if the Board approves Alternative 3, Solana Beach would be required to plan for 67 low-income units and would not get additional bonuses. If the Board approves Modified Alternative 1, Solana Beach would be required to plan for 51 units, but, if it built 67 units, it would be eligible for incentive points in the allocation of transportation funds. He said that Solana Beach is the most likely candidate to get the bonus points because of its plans to build around transit centers.

Mayor Kellejian expressed dismay for not getting credit for housing units that have already been built across the street from the train station.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that a recent housing affordability report indicated that San Diego is number 3 as the least affordable metropolitan area. It is time we get serious about addressing our housing needs in this region. He noted his chairmanship of the League of California Cities Housing/General Plan Task Force, which is tackling these issues on a statewide basis. We need to put a price on addressing the housing problems that exist today. Redevelopment areas provide opportunities to address our housing needs. This memo is a compromise based on the Board’s discussion a month ago. An alternative to the memo is Alternative 3.

Mayor Madrid asked about the condominium conversion phenomenon, which results in displacing people from their homes. He thought this should be considered in the RHNA numbers. Chair Cafagna said that conversions would show up in the next report because of the elimination of the existing stock of affordable housing. Mr. Gallegos clarified that the RHNA numbers do not include condominium conversions; only the need for new units is factored into the RHNA numbers. Condominium conversions are not new units. Mayor Holt Pfeiler suggested that this issue be considered in the next RHNA.

Mr. Gallegos suggested that the conversion of rental apartments to condominiums is a statewide issue that should be addressed.

Supervisor Slater-Price suggested that Alternative 3 might be better than Modified Alternative 1 with the memorandum.

Chair Cafagna stated that jurisdictions would not necessarily lose money; they could get bonuses through this carrot approach. The approach being proposed focuses on production of units, not just zoning.

Substitute Motion: Deputy Mayor Guerin moved to adopt Modified Alternative 1 without the amendment provisions. Mayor Pro Tem Hall seconded the motion.

Action: Yes – 4 (weighted vote, 29%). No – 13 (Chula Vista, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, and Vista) (weighted vote, 70%). Abstain – Coronado (1%). Absent – La Mesa. This motion failed.

Vice Mayor Morrison asked when the housing elements are due. Mr. Gallegos replied that the cities must have their housing elements adopted by July 1, 2005.
Chair Cafagna called for the question on the original motion to approve Modified Alternative 1 with the provisions in the memorandum.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Kellejian and a second by Supervisor Slater-Price, the SANDAG Board adopted Resolution No. 2005-17 approving the Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle using Modified Alternative 1a, including the amendment provisions. Yes – 14 (weighted vote, 74%). No – 4 (County of San Diego, Encinitas, Santee, and Solana Beach) (weighted vote, 26%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – La Mesa.

13. **STATUS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG) (APPROVE)**

Henry Abarbanel, Co-Chair of the Energy Working Group (EWG) reported that the Board of Directors approved the EWG, which started to meet in March 2004. It has representatives from the subregions and other stakeholders as well. The goal is to implement the San Diego Regional Energy Strategy. The Group has established a relationship with the San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E) and has agreed that the top priority is the development of the long-term resource plan that is prepared by investor-owned utilities. The plan will be submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) in July 2006. EWG has initiated with SDG&E a pilot energy efficiency program, which will commence in the spring of 2005. Each of the jurisdictions have been notified of this program and have been asked to submit proposals. To date, responses have been received from Poway, Vista, and Carlsbad. The selected agency will be provided with engineering expertise, grant-finding experience, and implementation assistance needed for energy efficiency programs in its area.

Councilmember Abarbanel stated that the EWG has initiated a working relationship with senior staff of the California Energy Commission. San Diego is the only region to have a regional energy policy.

The EWG will be sponsoring the first of quarterly workshops on the principal issues contained in the long-term resource plan. Topics to be discussed at these workshops include transmission, energy efficiency, renewables, and advance metering through wireless networks.

Mayor Kellejian expressed his appreciation for all of the hard work that this Group has done. He said that we are about to embark on a long-term resource plan in 2006 that will set the energy and resource needs for the next ten-year period. He asked why the County of San Diego has no representation on the Energy Working Group.

Councilmember Abarbanel replied that it has been difficult for members of the Board of Supervisors to find time to be involved in this group. They have agreed to have a senior staff person represent the County. The EWG also would like to have a South County representative.

Mayor Kellejian said that he wanted to make sure the County staff member has communication with the Board of Supervisors. **Supervisor Slater-Price stated that the County staff member would provide full reports to the whole Board of Supervisors.**
Deputy Mayor Crawford asked why Imperial County is not represented on the agenda for the Transmission Workshop. **Councilmember Abarbanel acknowledged that they looked locally and south and did not look east.** Deputy Mayor Crawford stated that we need to ensure we have someone there from Imperial County who can speak to those issues.

Councilmember Monroe agreed to work on a South County representative.

Mayor Madrid stated that it has been his pleasure being co-chair with Councilmember Abarbanel and said that Councilmember Abarbanel is the driving force behind this effort. The issue of energy is equal to water, transportation, or land use. The CPUC is mandating that energy providers have a bifurcated process. That will impact every one of our jurisdictions, and we cannot take this lightly. Every recommendation should be respected from that group.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Crawford and a second by Councilmember McCoy, the SANDAG Board approved support for the work program and the proposed approach to fund the continuing work of the Energy Working Group, and approved the proposed strategy for expedited review of EWG comments on regulatory issues through the Executive Committee. Yes – 16 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – Chula Vista, Oceanside, and San Marcos.

14. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next Policy Board meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 11, 2005, with a tour of north county coastal at 9:15 a.m., immediately after the Executive Committee meeting. The next regular Board of Directors business meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 25, 2005.

15. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:31 p.m.

DGunn/M/DGU
## ATTENDANCE

### SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS’ MEETING

**FEBRUARY 25, 2005**

<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>Matt Hall (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>Crystal Crawford (Member)</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>Christy Guerin (Member)</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>Art Madrid (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom, Vice Chair (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (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 Poway</td>
<td>Mickey Cafagna, Chair (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego – A</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer (Member A)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Scott Peters (Member B)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Pia Harris-Ebert (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale (Member)</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>Pam Slater-Price (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADVISORY MEMBERS LISTED BELOW (ATTENDANCE NOT COUNTED FOR QUORUM PURPOSES)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>Leon Williams (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Victor Carrillo (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>CAPT Daniel King (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Unified Port District</td>
<td>William Hall (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD County Water Authority</td>
<td>Marilyn Dailey (Member)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California/Mexico</td>
<td>Lydia Antonio (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The following actions were taken by the Policy Advisory Committees (PACs) since the last Board meeting. **Actions printed in bold typeface must be ratified by the Board of Directors to be effective.**

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (MARCH 4, 2005)

The Transportation Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Accepted the draft air quality conformity analysis of the 2030 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for distribution for a 30-day public comment period and **recommended that the Board of Directors schedule a Public Hearing at its meeting on April 22, 2005.**

- Approved a Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) request to transfer monies between capital projects to fund high-priority projects at the Cesar Chavez Station and the Imperial Avenue Bus yard. The MTS Board of Directors authorized the transfer of $360,100 of surplus funding from completed projects and projects with projected surplus funding to the above-mentioned projects that are now ready for construction.

- **Recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors adopt revised Policy No. 18, Regional Transit Service Planning, that reflects changes to the roles and responsibilities of SANDAG and the two transit agencies in the regional transit service planning and implementation process.**

- Accepted the draft FY 2005-2009 Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP) for a 45-day public review period and scheduled a public hearing on the plan for April 15, 2005.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (MARCH 4, 2005)

This meeting was cancelled.
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (MARCH 11, 2005)

The Executive Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Approved amendments to the FY 2005 Overall Work Program (OWP) and Program Budget to accept three Caltrans planning grants for a Bus Rapid Transit planning study in North County, continuation of a Transit Planning Internship program, and a Reservation Transit Feasibility Study, and approved amendments to begin the Independent Transit Planning Review called for in the TransNet extension, and to implement a Freeway Shoulder Lane Demonstration project.

- Approved the formation of the Regionwide Forecast Technical Working Group.

- Accepted the Draft FY 2006 Overall Work Program for distribution to federal, state, and member agencies, and other interested parties for review and comment.

- Recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the concept of forming a Service Bureau, including the use of the Executive Committee as its governing body, and directed staff to conduct the necessary steps to have it operational, effective July 1, 2005.

- Approved the March 25, 2005, SANDAG Board of Directors meeting agenda.

POLICY BOARD MEETING (MARCH 11, 2005)

This meeting was cancelled.

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE (MARCH 11, 2005)

This meeting was cancelled.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (MARCH 18, 2005)

The Transportation Committee is being asked to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

- Adopt Resolution No. 2005-19 approving Amendment No. 6 to the 2004 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

- Approve the Interstate 805/Interstate 5 (I-805/I-5) South Corridor Study recommendations and direct staff to consider them in the development of the 2030 RTP Update.
BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (MARCH 18, 2005)

The Borders Committee is being asked to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

- Approve the title, theme, format, location, and timing for SANDAG’s 2005 Binational Conference.

Staff will update the Board of Directors if the actual actions taken by the Transportation and Borders Committees on March 18, 2005 differ from those described in this report.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
REVISIONS TO POLICY NO. 18: REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION, AND POLICY NO. 25: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/INVOLVEMENT

Introduction

On February 4, 2005, the Transportation Committee endorsed changes to the regional transit service planning and implementation process spelled out in SANDAG Policy No. 18: Regional Transit Service Planning. The changes would shift the responsibility for conducting public hearings for transit service changes to the two transit agencies (Metropolitan Transit System and North San Diego County Transit Development Board), and establish a process for determining regional policy consistency by SANDAG prior to the public hearings for transit service changes with regional significance. SANDAG would have an advisory role for local and minor transit service changes.

On March 4, 2005, the Transportation Committee approved proposed revisions to SANDAG Policy No. 18 to reflect the Transportation Committee direction and recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors adopt revised Policy No. 18: Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation. Revisions to Policy No. 25: Public Participation/Involvement also are recommended to conform with the changes to Policy No. 18.

Attachment 1 includes a line-in, line-out version of Policy No. 18 that reflects the recommended revisions. Attachment 2 includes a line-in, line-out version of Policy No. 25 that reflects the recommended revisions.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the SANDAG Board of Directors adopt revised SANDAG Policy No. 18: Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation, which will shift responsibility for transit service change public hearings to the transit agencies. The Board also is asked to adopt revised Policy No. 25: Public Participation/Involvement.

Discussion

SANDAG Policy No. 18: Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation spells out the roles, responsibilities and process for planning and implementing changes to the regional transit system. The current policy places responsibility for conducting public hearings on transit service changes with SANDAG. After conducting a public hearing for transit service changes in December 2004, it became apparent that holding the public hearings at SANDAG resulted in duplication of effort and an inefficient service implementation process. The Transportation Committee expressed its desire to streamline the public hearing and service implementation process between the transit agencies and SANDAG by shifting the responsibility for conducting public hearings and implementing details
back to the transit agencies, leaving SANDAG to oversee the policy framework and operating standards. SANDAG’s role would focus on achieving and ensuring a transit system that meets regional mobility and land use coordination goals, objectives, and policies as set forth in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and the Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP).

On March 4, 2005, the Transportation Committee approved revisions to SANDAG Policy No. 18 to reflect its desire and recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors adopt the policy revisions. The key changes to the existing policy are:

- The transit agencies would conduct the service change public hearings.
- Prior to a public hearing for transit service changes with regional significance, SANDAG would conduct an administrative review to determine that the service change proposals are consistent with regional plans, goals, objectives, and policies, or make a finding of overriding considerations if service proposals are inconsistent with regional policies.
- Local and minor service changes would pass through SANDAG prior to a public hearing and/or implementation at the transit agencies to advise SANDAG on implementation actions planned by the transit agencies.
- Only those issues that result in a differing interpretation of consistency with regional plans, goals, objectives, and policies would be brought to the Transportation Committee for direction.

SANDAG’s role in conducting a consistency determination for proposed service changes with regionally significant implications is intended to ensure that the transit system is planned and implemented in a way that supports the RCP, RTP, and RSRTP, considers funding opportunities and constraints, is an efficient use of regional resources, and promotes an effective regional transit system throughout the county. SANDAG will evaluate annually through the short-range transit planning process how well the RSRTP goals and objectives are being met by the transit system, and will conduct ongoing monitoring of the transit system performance through the Quarterly Transit Operating Reports and the Annual Performance Improvement Program to assess system productivity and efficiency.

SANDAG Policy No. 25: Public Participation/Involvement establishes a process for obtaining input from and providing information to the public concerning agency programs, projects, and program funding to ensure the public is informed and has the opportunity to provide input so plans can reflect the public’s desire. Policy No. 25 will be revised to conform with revisions in Policy No. 18 that shift the transit service planning public hearings to the transit agencies.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Toni Bates, (619) 699-6950; tba@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #30023
REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

This policy specifies the transit service planning responsibilities of SANDAG (the consolidated agency) and the transit agencies (Metropolitan Transit System and North San Diego County Transit Development District), and outlines a framework for transit service planning. Figure 1.1 includes a flow chart, based on the framework, that documents the processes for transit planning and implementation, the delivery of services for new services and adjustments to existing services.

This policy will allow the transit system to quickly and efficiently respond to changes in travel demand and operating/fiscal environment, while ensuring that the system is adjusted and developed consistent with longer range regional transportation and land use goals as incorporated into the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan, and the Regional Short-Range Transit Plan (RSRTP). As a result, transit service changes that relate directly to implementation of regional policies, goals, and objectives (service changes with regionally significant service changes) are generally those that:

- ServiceSupport regional travel demand corridors that cross transit agency jurisdictional boundaries;
- Significantly affect passenger inter-jurisdictional trip making (i.e., are inconsistent with as defined by the guidelines contained in the RSRTP; for example, would be found to potentially have a detrimental impact on geographic connections, timed transfers, and the frequency/service span consistency of such services); and
- Require additional regional operating funds above the overall transit agency-adopted budget and projected budget capacity.

1. Agency Responsibilities – SANDAG Consolidated agency and transit agency responsibilities are described below and further specified in Figure 1.2. There is an inherent overlap of responsibilities between SANDAG the consolidated agency and the transit agencies in conducting transit service planning, as exhibited in Figure 1.2. Therefore, all transit service planning responsibilities should be conducted, whenever possible, in coordination and consultation between SANDAG the consolidated agency and the transit agencies.

1.1 Consolidated Agency SANDAG Responsibilities – carried out in collaboration with the transit agencies:

1.1.1 Preparation of long-range transit plans as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

1.1.2 Annual preparation of a five-year RSRTP that: (1) established the goals and objectives for short-range transit services; (2) defines the existing transit
(32) evaluates existing services and programs; (34) identifies service gaps and deficiencies; (45) establishes parameters for short-range (0-5 years) new and revised service development, as well as regionally significant and all other service adjustments; (56) defines a methodology for evaluating proposals for new and revised service; (67) identifies and prioritizes regional and subarea transit planning studies; and (78) evaluates and prioritizes new and revised services for implementation, including the adoption of an annual Regional Service Implementation Plan. The consolidated agency SANDAG will initially maintain the existing service concepts upon which the service is based in order to preserve and improve mobility. FY 2003 budgeted revenue hours/miles will be considered as minimum levels of service for each Transit Board and will assume net service levels to be added upon completion of the Oceanside to Escondido and Mission Valley East rail projects. If future funding shortfalls occur, necessitating cutbacks in service, then there will be a regionwide process of examination of service levels, protecting a “lifeline” system of services.

1.1.3 Conduct regional and subarea planning studies as prioritized in the RSRTP, RTP (Regional Transportation Plan), and RCP (Regional Comprehensive Plan).

1.1.4 Develop proposals for regionally significant service adjustments, with regional significance in response to changes in regional travel demand, to address regional service gaps and deficiencies, and to implement plans and programs identified in long-range Regional Transportation and Regional Comprehensive Plans and the RSRTP.

1.1.5 Develop proposals for new and revised services to be included in the Regional Service Implementation Plan.

1.1.6 Ensure that all new and revised services and service adjustments of regional significance are consistent with the goals and objectives of the RSRTP.

1.1.7 Coordinate with transit agencies to provide community outreach and conduct market research.

1.1.8 Conduct regional performance monitoring to provide input into the RSRTP and other short-range transit studies. The regional performance monitoring will be based on the type of service and type of service area. Any net service reduction in a specific transit agency area resulting from the service evaluation process that takes that Board below its FY 03 service level (pursuant to Section 1.1.2) will be reprogrammed to that transit agency service area for other improvements up to the FY 03 base level of service.

1.1.9 Provide technical assistance to transit operators for local route planning.
1.1.10 Develop a public input process and hold required public hearings for service changes. The consolidated agency should ensure that the public input process for public hearings on service changes would be conducted in a manner to facilitate public input from the affected area.

1.1.11 Develop a Regional Fare Policy that incorporates a uniform fare structure, a transfer policy, and agreement for revenue sharing of regional tickets, tokens, and passes, while also allowing the consolidated agency to adopt specialized fare procedures for travel within each operator’s service area. Additionally, adopt the Comprehensive Fare Ordinance setting forth all fares for all operators, including their special fares.

1.2 Transit Agencies Responsibilities – carried out in collaboration with SANDAG the consolidated agency:

1.2.1 Develop service and schedule adjustments to ensure system optimization and to respond to immediate operational issues (e.g., detours, overcrowding, on-time performance, and minor out-of-direction routing changes).

1.2.2 Conduct local transit studies and analyses within the transit agency’s service area in response to changes in local travel demand, to address service gaps and deficiencies, to develop service reductions/efficiencies, to address operating budget deficits, and to address goals and implement plans developed in the RSRTP.

1.2.3 Develop proposals for new and revised services to be included in the Regional Service Implementation Plan (RSIP).

1.2.4 Develop proposals to reallocate unproductive resources to implement unfunded services identified as high priority in the Regional Service Implementation Plan or consistent with the RSRTP guidelines.

1.2.5 Develop a public input process and hold required public hearings for service changes. The transit agencies should ensure that the public input process for public hearings on service changes would be conducted in a manner to facilitate public input from the affected area.

1.2.6 Coordinate with consolidated agency SANDAG to provide community outreach and conduct market research.

1.2.7 Develop operating plans for special event transit service and service contingencies.

1.2.8 Monitor existing operations and services to provide input into service analyses and short-range transit studies.

1.2.9 Conduct bus stop location planning.
1.2.10 Service implementation, including scheduling, run-cutting, operations, contract services, service management, and labor contract administration.

1.2.1 Provide input on long- and short-range transit plans, and regional performance monitoring.

2. **Transit Service Planning Framework** – This framework allows the transit system to quickly and efficiently respond to changes in travel demand and operating/fiscal environment, while ensuring that the system is adjusted and developed consistent with longer range regional transportation and land use goals.

**Step 1: Guidance**

A **RSRTP**, consistent with SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), will be drafted annually by SANDAG, in consultation with the transit agencies. The **RSRTP** will establish goals and objectives and provide guidance for service planning during the upcoming year and will balance the immediate needs of optimizing the transit system in response to operational and financial constraints, with the mid- and long-range system development goals established in the long-range plans.

**Step 2: Develop Service Adjustments**

Throughout the year, transit agency and SANDAG staff develop proposals, in accordance with the **RSRTP**, to adjust existing services and develop new **servicesones**. These service adjustments help to optimize existing services, reflect changes to the operating and fiscal environment, respond to customer comments and requests, and begin to implement and support services envisioned in the long-range plans. Service adjustments can be a result of such things as schedule analysis, trip and route level evaluation, and subregional and regional transit studies. **Regionally significant** service adjustments with regional significance should be developed as collaborative efforts between SANDAG and transit agency staff.

**Step 3: Evaluation and Approval**

Prior to approval for implementation, all service adjustments should be:

- Consistent with the **RSRTP**;
- Presented for public hearing in the impacted service area if required by SANDAG, appropriate transit agency, or by Federal Transit Administration (FTA) policies and regulations; and
- Fully funded either through a reallocation of resources or as part of the budget process.

**Regionally significant** service adjustments with regional significance should be endorsed by the appropriate transit agency and determined to be consistent with regional policies, goals.
and objectives by SANDAG approved by SANDAG’s Transportation Committee prior to public hearing and implementation, while local and minor all other service adjustments may be approved for implementation at the sole discretion of the transit agencies after advising SANDAG of the proposed changes.

Step 4: Implementation

As a general practice, service changes should be implemented during a regularly scheduled service change date (scheduled for winter, fall, and summer). Implementation should be preceded by community outreach, a marketing campaign, and public notices, as appropriate. Service implementation is the responsibility of the transit agencies.

Step 5: Monitoring

Performance monitoring will be conducted on an ongoing basis to evaluate new and existing services as well as newly implemented and service adjustments. SANDAG will monitor the transit system performance on a systemwide and transit agencyoperator level on an annual and quarterly basis, and at the route level on an annual basis. Transit agencies will monitor their operations performance on an annual, quarterly, and monthly basis, as appropriate. Performance measures will evaluate productivity, cost-effectiveness, and quality of service. Performance results will be used as a basis for developing the RSRTP, and other planning studies and analysis.

3. Policy Review – This policy was reviewed and revised by SANDAG, in collaboration with the transit agencies in March 2005. It shall be reviewed again by SANDAG, in collaboration with the transit agencies after one year, in the spring fall 2006.

Attachments: Figure 1.1 – Proposed Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation Process
Figure 1.2 – Roles and Responsibilities for Service Planning Activities

Revised March 25, 2005
**Delete and Replace with New Figure 1.1**

**FIGURE 1.1**
PROPOSED SERVICE PLANNING PROCESS (NEW SERVICES)

**Schedule**

**March - July**
Develop Part I of annual SRTP – Service Planning Guidance, including:
- Existing Conditions;
- Evaluate existing services and programs;
- Identify service gaps and deficiencies;
- Establish parameters for short range (0-5 years) service development and adjustment;
- Regional consistency checklist.

**Lead Agency**
SANDAG

**August-Sept.**
Develop new service proposals for consideration.

**Transit Agency, SANDAG**

**September - December**
Develop Part II of annual SRTP – Regional Service Implementation Plan, including:
- New service evaluation methodology;
- Prioritized list of service proposals.

**SANDAG**

**January - June**
Budget/funding process
- Identify available funding or funding deficits;
- Public hearing on service changes;
- Adopt Regional Service Implementation Plan.

**SANDAG**

**Operating Budgets**
- Prepare to reflect funded services.

**Transit Agency**

**Aug/Sept, Jan, May/June**
Implementation of new service.

**Transit Agency**

**Ongoing**
Performance Monitoring
- Annual route monitoring;
- Quarterly operations evaluation;
- TDA Performance Improvement Program;
- Transit agency performance reporting.

**SANDAG, Transit Agency**
**PROPOSED SERVICE PLANNING PROCESS (ADJUSTMENTS TO EXISTING SERVICES)**

**Schedule**

- **March - July**
  - Develop Part I of annual SRTP – Service Planning Guidance, including:
    - Existing Conditions;
    - Evaluate existing services and programs;
    - Identify service gaps and deficiencies;
    - Establish parameters for short-range (0-5 years) service development and adjustment;
    - Regional consistency checklist.
  - **Lead Agency**: SANDAG

- **Ongoing**
  - Develop minor service adjustments.
  - **Lead Agency**: Transit Agency
  - Develop regionally significant service adjustments.
  - **Lead Agency**: SANDAG, Transit Agency

- **Ongoing**
  - Ensure consistency with SRTP.
  - **Lead Agency**: SANDAG

- **Ongoing**
  - Transit Agency public hearing/approval.
  - Transit Agency approval, SANDAG public hearing, approval.
  - **Lead Agency**: Transit Agency, SANDAG

- **Aug/Sept, Jan, May/June**
  - Implementation of service change.
  - **Lead Agency**: Transit Agency

- **Ongoing**
  - Performance Monitoring
    - Annual route monitoring;
    - Quarterly operations evaluation;
    - TDA Performance Improvement Program;
    - Transit agency performance reporting.
  - **Lead Agency**: SANDAG, Transit Agency

**Notes**

- Ensure consistency with SRTP.
- Implementation of service change.
- Performance Monitoring
- Transit Agency approval, SANDAG public hearing, approval.
- Lead Agency: SANDAG, Transit Agency

---

**Lead Agency**

- Lead Agency: SANDAG
- Lead Agency: Transit Agency
- Lead Agency: SANDAG
- Lead Agency: Transit Agency, SANDAG
- Lead Agency: Transit Agency
- Lead Agency: SANDAG, Transit Agency
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ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR SERVICE PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Step 1: Establish Policy Framework
SANDAG
Transit Agencies

Step 2: Develop Service Proposals & Plan
SANDAG
Transit Agencies

Step 3: Develop Budgets
Transit Agencies

Step 4: Implement Service
Transit Agencies

New Figure 1.1
Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation Process

Service Changes Occur Three Times a Year:
- Feb-Aug/Sep
- Nov-May/Jun
- May-Jan/Feb

Regional Short Range Transit Plan
Service Planning Framework & Guidelines
- Goals and Objectives
- Needs and Deficiencies
- Parameters and Performance Standards
- Regional Consistency Checklist

Service Proposals
-New and Revised

RSRTP Adoption
- Consistency & Priority Determination
- Plan & Program Public Hearing

Transit Operating Budget Development

SANDAG Approves Transit Agency Budgets for Funding
- Budget Public Hearing

Administrative Review of Service Consistency or Finding of Overriding Considerations
(Refer to Transportation Committee, if necessary)

Public Hearings
- At Transit Agencies

Administrative Re-Review of Service Consistency or Finding of Overriding Considerations
- if public hearing results in a new service proposal
(Refer to Transportation Committee, if necessary)

Implement Service
- Driver assignments
- Bus stop preparation
- Timetable printing

Locally Significant Changes

Regionally Significant Changes

Advise SANDAG
**Delete and Replace with New Figure 1.2**

**FIGURE 1.2**

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR SERVICE PLANNING ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY AND GUIDANCE</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</td>
<td>Operations Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP)</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LONG-RANGE SERVICE DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subarea Studies</td>
<td>Operations Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID-RANGE SERVICE DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRT/Rail System Development*</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Centers</td>
<td>Operations Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit First Now (traffic engineering, traffic operations)</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT RANGE SERVICE RESTRUCTURING</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeder Bus Studies/BRT Supporting Networks**</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea Studies (e.g. Downtown, NB/PB/LJ, Univ. Ave)</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Service Optimization (e.g. COA)</td>
<td>Operations Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY OUTREACH</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer Plan Review - land use, regional plan conformity</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Plan Review - community liaison</td>
<td>Operations Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Liaison to Communities</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Community Service Requests***</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Operational Issues</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE MONITORING</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Route Monitoring</td>
<td>Operations Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Improvement Program</td>
<td>Operations Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Operations Evaluation</td>
<td>Operations Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Data Collection</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to Transit Operators (ATO) Data Collection</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Operations Reporting</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Transit Database (NTD) Reporting</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE SPECIFIC ADJUSTMENTS</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Location Planning</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Level Schedule Adjustments</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Route Changes</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Reductions - Minor</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Reductions - Regionally Significant</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runcutting/Scheduling</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Bids</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Implementation of Service Plans</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provision</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Mid-Coast, Super Loop, Showcase, I-15, North County (Mission Ave or Escondido Blvd/Bear Valley Pkwy), and Otay Mesa to Downtown
** Includes Nobel Coaster Station, Mission Valley East, Sprinter, and supporting networks for BRT/Rail projects listed above
*** Activities coordinated via the staff-level Planning, Operations, and Marketing Coordination Committee

Lead - Primary or Lead Function
Support Function
# FIGURE 1.2

## ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR SERVICE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subarea Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRT/Rail System Development*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit First Now! (traffic engineering, traffic operations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeder Bus Studies/BRT Supporting Networks**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea Studies (e.g. Downtown, NB/PB/LJ, Univ. Ave)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Service Optimization (e.g. COA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Plan Review - land use, regional plan conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Plan Review - community liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Liaison to Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Community Service Requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Operational Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Route Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and Enhanced Service Proposal Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Improvement Prgrm (Qtrly/Annual Evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Operations Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to Transit Operators (ATO) Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Operations Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Transit Database (NTD) Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Location Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Level Schedule Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Route Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Reductions - Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Reductions with Regional Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runcutting/Scheduling</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Bids</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Implementation of Service Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Mid-Coast, Super Loop, Showcase, I-15, Escondido Blvd/Bear Valley Pkwy, and Otay Mesa to Downtown
**Includes supporting networks for BRT/Rail projects listed above

---

Lead - Primary or Lead Function
Shared - Support Function
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/INVOLVEMENT POLICY

Purpose

This policy establishes a process for obtaining input from and providing information to the public concerning agency programs, projects, and program funding in order to ensure the public is informed and has the opportunity to provide SANDAG with input so plans can reflect the public's desire. SANDAG will review and update this plan every three years. Various federal and state laws and regulations require that an agency such as SANDAG conduct public participation programs to ensure that the public is involved and that community concerns are addressed. For example, planning of mass transit guideway capital projects, development of short range service policies and plans, and fare policy and structure changes to public transportation require public participation. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) also have public information components that require an agency such as SANDAG to conduct public participation programs to ensure that the public is involved and that community concerns are addressed. A significant component of SANDAG's mission is a strong commitment to public participation and involvement to include all residents and stakeholders in the regional planning process.

The public participation policy is consistent with the requirements of Public Utility Code Section 132360.1 established with the passage of Assembly Bill 361 which reads as follows:

(c) The agency shall engage in a public collaborative planning process; recommendations from that process shall be made available and considered for integration into the plan. A procedure to carry out this process including a method of addressing and responding to recommendations from the public shall be adopted.

Social Equity and Environmental Justice

Ensuring the meaningful involvement of low income, minority, disabled, senior, and other traditionally underrepresented communities is a key component of SANDAG's public participation activities. SANDAG's policies, procedures, and programs are consistent with federal and state environmental justice laws, regulations, and requirements, Title VI, related nondiscrimination requirements, and reflect the principles of social equity and environmental justice. Social equity means ensuring that all communities are treated fairly and are given equal opportunity to participate in the planning and decision-making process, with an emphasis on ensuring that traditionally disadvantaged groups are not left behind. Environmental justice means ensuring that plans, policies, and actions do not disproportionately affect low income and minority communities.
Scope

The policy addresses public participation policies and public information efforts in the following areas:

A. Overall Public Participation Process
B. Development Planning
C. Design and Construction
D. Short Range Transit Service Planning and Service and Fare Changes
E. Native American Consultation

A. Overall Public Participation Process -- Unless otherwise noted or required, these are SANDAG’s general policies for public participation for major planning initiatives such as the Regional Transportation Plan, Regional Comprehensive Plan, Regional Short Range Transit Plan, and other planning and programming projects.

1. SANDAG’s Public Participation/Involvement Program is designed to inform and involve the region’s residents in the decision-making process on issues such as growth, transportation, environmental management, housing, open space, air quality, energy, fiscal management, economic development, and public safety.

2. The Public Participation/Involvement Program seeks to involve all citizens, including but not limited to low income households, Hispanic, African American, Asian, American Indian, senior, and other communities, persons with disabilities, as well as community and civic organizations, public agencies, business groups and associations, environmental organizations, and other stakeholders.

3. SANDAG’s board meetings provide the public forum and decision point for significant regional issues. SANDAG Directors usually hold one or two board meetings each month: a Board Policy Meeting the second Friday of each month and a Board Business Meeting the fourth Friday of each month. Meetings held at the SANDAG office are accessible by public transit. During these meetings, Directors adopt plans, allocate transportation funds, approve transit construction plans, approve transit fare and service changes, and establish policies and develop programs that are used by local governments as well as other public and private organizations.

4. SANDAG’s Public Participation/Involvement Program shall comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). SANDAG shall hold public meetings in buildings, rooms, or locations that are accessible to persons with disabilities. SANDAG shall provide public meeting information in alternate formats and shall provide special accommodations at public meetings with three business days notice.

5. SANDAG’s Public Participation/Involvement Program is carried out as an integrated work element of the agency’s Overall Work Program and Budget and as part of other programming, development, and implementation processes such as the Regional Transportation Plan, the Regional Comprehensive Plan, Regional Short
Range Transit Plan, Environmental Impact Reports, transit capital project development, project construction, transit service implementation and fare changes, corridor studies, and other projects.

6. SANDAG shall proactively seek and promote public participation in SANDAG’s workshops and public hearings, as well as participation and attendance at committees, working groups, and task forces. SANDAG shall follow local, state, and federal guidelines for posting public meeting and hearing notices. Depending upon the specific project, SANDAG shall endeavor to hold meetings at times that can attract as many participants as possible, including evenings and weekends and at locations in communities throughout the region. SANDAG shall endeavor to hold these meetings in locations that are accessible by public transit.

7. SANDAG shall inform the public in a timely manner about regional issues, actions, and pending decisions through a number of efforts. As needed or required, SANDAG shall post public notices in newspapers of general circulation for publication of legal notices. Other publication and distribution efforts can include mail distribution to residents, agencies, and city/county governments, the SANDAG Web site, e-mail lists, and rEgion – SANDAG’s monthly electronic newsletter. As needed, SANDAG also shall distribute press releases and media alerts to local, regional, and Mexico border area print and broadcast media.


9. SANDAG shall use its Web site to provide the public with useful and timely information including meeting schedules and agendas; plans and environmental documents; reports and other publications; demographic profiles and data downloads; and interactive database and mapping applications.

10. As appropriate and depending on the specific project, SANDAG shall translate into Spanish, and other languages, publications, announcements, and Web content. In addition, numerous staff members are bilingual Spanish-English speakers and participate in public outreach and conduct presentations in Spanish. Translators shall be hired as needed to provide services in Spanish and other languages as appropriate.

11. SANDAG conducts periodic public opinion surveys as part of the outreach and citizen participation component of SANDAG’s work program. These surveys shall be designed to include the San Diego region’s residents in the regional planning process and to keep SANDAG officials aware of issues that are of concern to the people who live here.
SANDAG will endeavor to respond to general comments received by phone, fax, letter, or e-mail within five (5) business days of receipt. Comments shall be routed to the SANDAG staff person who is responsible for that issue. Comments may be responded to in writing (e-mail or letter) or may be resolved with the initial phone call. Some comments may need to be resolved by another agency or jurisdiction so the customer is referred to the appropriate entity. When a comment is submitted as part of a public review process (e.g., a plan or environmental report) the comment and response is logged into a database. Comments, concerns, and responses received as part of a public review process shall be included in the final plan or report.

B. Development Planning – Planning, environmental, preliminary engineering activities on major capital projects.

1. SANDAG shall follow current federal and state regulations regarding public involvement processes and procedures. SANDAG shall develop public involvement programs tailored to meet specific project needs which address the unique challenges presented by each project. Programs shall be developed using the joint Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration (FHWA/FTA) guidelines titled “Public Involvement Techniques for Transportation Decision-Making.”

2. The public involvement program shall set objectives, identify people to be reached, develop public involvement strategy, and define specific outreach techniques.

3. The public involvement program shall be developed so that critical community concerns and technical issues are identified in the study. The issues need to address the engineering, environmental, economic, and financial analyses that respond effectively to community needs and preferences and satisfy local, state, and federal environmental clearance requirements.

4. To facilitate community participation, lists of individuals, agencies, and organizations shall be developed for distribution of agency materials. These lists will include persons who have indicated an interest in transportation planning projects during previous public information efforts and/or focused on the specific project. Project information would be distributed to the persons on this list in conjunction with public meetings and workshops, to solicit comments and recommendations.

5. Environmental documents shall be prepared in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as appropriate, and in coordination and consultation with various federal, state, and local agencies, and with elected officials, community leaders, organizations, and other individuals from the neighborhoods and communities potentially affected by the proposed action. Coordination and public involvement shall be achieved through a variety of means, such as formal public hearings and meetings, circulation of draft documents, mailings, focus group meetings, workshops, and individual/group contacts.
6. Formal scoping meetings, public hearings, and/or other meetings during the comment period and environmental document certification shall be held in accordance with the requisite environmental document. As required, meetings shall be announced in the Federal Register, local publications, and on SANDAG’s Web site. Persons and organizations on the project mailing list also will be notified. SANDAG shall endeavor to hold public meetings in locations accessible by public transit.

7. SANDAG shall prepare and distribute appropriate notices and communications to comply with CEQA and NEPA requirements.

8. A public information program shall be developed to inform the community of factors related to the project. The information program may include briefings for the news media, informational meetings, presentations to include community and professional associations and educational institutions, business groups and associations, environmental organizations, and other public forums.

9. A project working group may be organized to review and comment on the project to build understanding and identify support for feasible alternatives. This group may consist of various elected officials/staff, community and neighborhood organizations, business organizations, property owners, and other stakeholders and interested parties. This group would be formed to provide comment and guidance regarding technical issues, review study alternatives and evaluation results, and provide community input regarding the alternatives. This iterative process would allow for identified issues and concerns to receive follow-up responses. Meeting summaries of project working group activities shall be produced. Meeting notices, agendas, and/or other information shall be posted to SANDAG’s Web site.

10. Other public input opportunities include SANDAG Board of Directors meetings and meetings of SANDAG’s five policy committees: Executive, Transportation, Regional Planning, Borders, and Public Safety. Other opportunities for public participation are at working group meetings, general public meetings, and presentations to planning and community groups.

C. Design and Construction – Design and construction of capital projects.

1. For all capital improvement projects with significant community impacts, SANDAG shall provide opportunities for members of the public to provide input and express concerns. SANDAG also shall implement a program designed to inform the public of progress, as well as safety and community impacts in the event of construction.

2. SANDAG shall hold publicly noticed meetings at key stages of project development and implementation in the area(s) being impacted. The location of the meetings shall depend upon the geographic location of the project. Meetings concerning projects exclusively within the North San Diego County Transit Development Board’s (NSDCTDB’s) service area shall be held in North County locations, and if appropriate, at SANDAG’s offices. Meetings concerning all other projects shall be held at SANDAG’s offices or other locations specified in SANDAG’s agendas. SANDAG, MTS,
and NCTD offices are accessible by public transit. SANDAG shall endeavor to hold off-site public meetings at locations accessible by public transit.

3. SANDAG shall solicit input from the representatives of interest groups of the local population, such as community groups, planning groups, business groups and associations, business improvement districts, environmental organizations, neighborhood associations, and senior and disabled riders. These stakeholders will be consulted during the design and construction of capital projects.

4. SANDAG shall work to advise the public regarding actual and perceived disruption during construction of capital projects by distributing informational, educational, and public information materials, and by using other traditional community relations tools.

5. SANDAG shall endeavor to meet citizen concerns as they arise and attempt to resolve those concerns.

6. For all projects requiring environmental review under CEQA and NEPA, such as major capital improvement projects, SANDAG shall provide opportunities for members of the public to provide input and comply with all related legal requirements.

   6.1 SANDAG shall solicit input from the representatives of interest groups of the local population, such as community groups, planning groups, business groups and associations, and neighborhood associations.

   6.2 SANDAG shall incorporate public input into project planning and development where practical and feasible.

   6.3 SANDAG shall hold a public hearing to seek public comment whenever required under CEQA and/or NEPA.

      6.3.1 Published notifications for such hearings shall be published in newspapers of general circulation for publication of legal notices. Notices also may be published in regional, community, or Spanish-language newspapers to reach the affected area.

      6.3.2 Any item subject to a public hearing will be listed and described in the Board’s published agenda, which shall be posted at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting at the Board’s meeting place and on SANDAG’s Web site.

      6.3.3 Public hearings shall be conducted by SANDAG at the published date, time, and place. The public hearing will allow for interested parties to be heard. The Board also will consider any written comments that were forwarded to the Board prior to the hearing.
D. **Short Range Transit Service Planning and Fare Changes**

1. SANDAG has adopted Transit Service Planning and Fare Setting policies to provide policy guidance for transit service and fare changes. This section of the policy is designed to inform and involve public transit riders, stakeholders, and the general public about proposed changes in transit fares and regionally significant transit services (as defined in the SANDAG Policy on Regional Transit Service Planning). Public information and involvement programs for other service changes would fall under adopted policies of the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NSDCTDB).

1.1. As appropriate, local jurisdiction staffs and/or community groups will be notified regarding proposals for regionally significant service changes prior to publishing a notice for formal public hearing.

1.2. A public hearing will be held by SANDAG for major transit service changes and fare changes. The public hearings will be held at the SANDAG offices during a regularly scheduled meeting of the SANDAG Transportation Committee and/or Board of Directors and/or in the general geographic area of the affected public at a special or relocated meeting of the SANDAG Transportation Committee or Board of Directors, as determined by the SANDAG Transportation Committee or Board. Public meetings shall be held at a time and location that is accessible by users of public transit. Public hearings for fare and service changes of regional significance affecting North County and/or NCTD service area residents shall be held by SANDAG in the North County area. Public hearings for fare and service changes of regional significance affecting MTS service area residents shall be held by SANDAG in the affected area.

1.3. **Take One**, Rider Alerts, or other public notices in both English and Spanish will be posted on all affected public transit vehicles within the affected area at least 21 calendar days prior to the public hearing and will include a description of the proposed fare change, the date, time, intent and location of the public hearing, and the deadline for written, e-mail and phone comments from the public. The notices will be posted to the SANDAG and Transit Agency Web site(s).

1.4. Print notice of public hearings will be provided at least 15 calendar days prior to the public hearing meeting date in newspapers of general circulation in the affected area(s), including appropriate minority and community publications. The public hearing notice will include a description of proposed fare changes, the date, time, intent, and location of the public hearing, and the deadline for written, e-mail, and phone comments from the public.

1.5. An open phone line will be made available to take public comments at least 15 calendar days prior to public hearing.
A SANDAG Policy Committee and/or Board report (as appropriate) will be completed and available for public review at least 72 hours prior to the public hearing and posted to the SANDAG Web site(s).

2. After a fare or service change is approved by SANDAG:
   
   2.1. The public will be notified via news release(s)
   
   2.2. Take One, Rider Alerts, or other public notices in both English and Spanish will be posted on all affected transit vehicles at least 15 calendar days prior to changes going into effect and posted to the SANDAG and Transit Agency Web site(s).

3. SANDAG shall follow federal Title VI and environmental justice requirements when implementing transit service or fare changes.

   3.1. Residential, employment, and transportation patterns of low-income and minority populations shall be identified so that their needs can be identified and addressed, and the benefits and burdens of transportation investments can be fairly distributed. SANDAG shall endeavor to involve the affected communities in evaluating the benefits and burdens of transportation investments.

   3.2. SANDAG shall evaluate and - where necessary - improve the public involvement processes to eliminate participation barriers and engage minority and low-income populations in transportation decision making.

E. Native American Consultation

1. SANDAG shall establish and adhere to government-to-government relationships when interacting with Tribal Governments, acknowledging these tribes as unique and separate governments within the United States.

2. SANDAG shall recognize and respect important California Native American rights, sites, traditions, and practices.

3. SANDAG engages in “consultation” with Tribal Governments prior to making decisions, taking actions, or implementing programs that may impact their communities.

4. To facilitate effective consultation with Tribal Governments, SANDAG has established a Tribal Government Liaison. The Liaison shall serve as an initial contact for Tribal Governments and communicates with tribal governments regarding SANDAG’s activities.

   4.1. “Consultation” is the active, affirmative process of: (1) identifying and seeking input from appropriate American Indian government bodies, community groups, and individuals; and (2) considering their interests as a necessary and integral part of the decision-making process.
NEW CONTRACT WITH STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

Introduction

The TransNet Ordinance extension approved by the voters in November 2004 requires SANDAG to contract with the State Board of Equalization (BOE) to collect the authorized sales and use tax. This same requirement was in the original TransNet Ordinance in 1987. The BOE contacted SANDAG last month to request that SANDAG enter into a new contract that will cover revenue from the 2004 Ordinance.

Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to authorize the Executive Director to sign an agreement with the State Board of Equalization, in substantially the same form as the contract attached to this report, by approving Resolution No. 2005-20, which also is attached.

Discussion

The proposed version of the new BOE contract has no significant differences from SANDAG’s contract with the BOE for the 1987 Ordinance. The Office of General Counsel has been in negotiations with the BOE for the last month to make minor modifications to the proposed contract due to the BOE’s boilerplate being written for cities versus agencies such as SANDAG. Those changes are reflected in the attached draft contract. The BOE’s legal counsel is currently reviewing the changes to its boilerplate suggested by SANDAG legal counsel, and approval by the BOE is expected in the next month. The BOE also requires the Board to approve the attached resolution, which authorizes the Executive Director to execute the final version of the contract.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Julie D. Wiley (619) 699-6966; jwi@sandag.org

No Budget Impact
RESOLUTION NO. 2005-20

AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE AGREEMENTS WITH THE STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION FOR THE IMPOSITION OF THE TRANSNET ORDINANCE EXTENSION

WHEREAS, on May 28, 2004, the Board of Directors approved Ordinance Number 04-01 providing for extension of the TransNet local transactions and use tax; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Equalization (BOE) administers and collects the transactions and use taxes for all applicable jurisdictions within the state; and

WHEREAS, the BOE will be responsible for administering and collecting the transactions and use tax on behalf of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (SANDAG); and

WHEREAS, the BOE requires that SANDAG enter into an “Administration Agreement” prior to imposition of said taxes; and

WHEREAS, the BOE requires that the Board of Directors authorize the Administration Agreement; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors does hereby approve the Administration Agreement in substantially the same form as attached in draft.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Directors that the Executive Director be authorized to execute the final version of the Administration Agreement in substantially the same form as the attached draft.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 25th day of March, 2005.
AGREEMENT FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION
OF COMMISSION TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAXES

The Board of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission has adopted, and the voters of the County of San Diego (hereafter called “Commission”) have approved by the required majority vote, Commission Ordinance 04-01, the San Diego Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan (hereafter called “Ordinance”), a copy of which is attached hereto. To carry out the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code and the Ordinance, the State Board of Equalization (hereinafter called the “Board”) and the Commission do agree as follows:

ARTICLE I
DEFINITIONS

Unless the context requires otherwise, wherever the following terms appear in the Agreement, they shall be interpreted to mean the following:

1. “Commission taxes” shall mean the transactions and use taxes, penalties, and interest imposed under the Ordinance, which is specifically authorized by Public Utilities Code sections 132300 et seq. and 132632, and in compliance with Part 1.6, Division 2, of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

2. “Ordinance” shall mean the Commission’s Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance referred to above and attached hereto, Commission Ordinance 04-01, the San Diego Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, as amended from time to time, or as deemed to be amended from time to time pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 7262.2.

ARTICLE II
ADMINISTRATION AND COLLECTION
OF COMMISSION TAXES

A. Administration. The Board and Commission agree that the Board shall perform exclusively all functions incident to the administration and operation of the Ordinance.

B. Other Applicable Laws. Commission agrees that all provisions of law applicable to the administration and operation of the State Sales and Use Tax Law, which are not inconsistent with Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, shall be applicable to the administration and operation of the Ordinance. Commission agrees that money collected pursuant to the Ordinance may be deposited
into the State Treasury to the credit of the Retail Sales Tax Fund and may be drawn from that Fund for any authorized purpose, including making refunds, compensating and reimbursing the Board pursuant to Article IV of this Agreement, and transmitting to Commission the amount to which Commission is entitled.

C. Transmittal of Money.

1. For the period during which the tax is in effect, and except as otherwise provided herein, all Commission taxes collected under the provisions of the Ordinance shall be transmitted to Commission’s designated trustee, US Bank, periodically, as promptly as feasible, but not less often than twice in each calendar quarter. Should Commission want to designate a different trustee, Commission shall send a letter of instruction to the Board that includes a certified copy of a resolution of the Commission appointing the new trustee and authorizing the Board to make transmittal to such trustee.

2. For periods subsequent to the expiration date of the tax, whether by Commission’s self-imposed limits or by final judgment of any court of the State of California holding that the Ordinance is invalid or void, all Commission taxes collected under the provisions of the Ordinance shall be transmitted to Commission not less than once in each calendar quarter.

3. Transmittals may be made by mail or electronic funds transfer to an account of the Commission designated and authorized by Commission. A statement shall be furnished at least quarterly indicating the amounts withheld pursuant to Article IV of this Agreement.

D. Rules. The Board shall prescribe and adopt such rules and regulations as in its judgment are necessary or desirable for the administration and operation of the Ordinance and the distribution of the Commission taxes collected thereunder.

E. Preference. Unless the payor instructs otherwise, and except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, the Board shall give no preference in applying money received for state sales and use taxes, state-administered local sales and use taxes, and Commission transactions and use taxes owed by a taxpayer, but shall apply moneys collected to the satisfaction of the claims of the State, cities, counties, cities and counties, redevelopment agencies, other districts, and Commission as their interests appear.

F. Security. The Board agrees that any security, which it hereafter requires to be furnished by taxpayers under the State Sales and Use Tax Law, will be upon such terms that it also will be available for the payment of the claims of the Commission for Commission taxes owing to it as its interest appears. The Board shall not be required to change the terms of any security now held by it and Commission shall not participate in any security now held by the Board.
G. Records of the Board. When requested by resolution of the legislative body of the Commission under section 7056 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, the Board agrees to permit authorized personnel of the Commission to examine the records of the Board, including the name, address, and account number of each seller holding a seller’s permit with a registered business location in the County of San Diego, pertaining to the ascertainment of transactions and use taxes collected for the Commission. Information obtained by the Commission from examination of the Board’s records shall be used by the Commission only for purposes related to the collection of transactions and use taxes by the Board pursuant to this Agreement.

H. Annexation. Commission agrees that the Board shall not be required to give effect to an annexation, for the purpose of collecting, allocating, and distributing Commission transactions and use taxes, earlier than the first day of the calendar quarter, which commences not less than two months after notice to the Board. The notice shall include the name of the county or counties annexed to the extended Commission boundary. In the event the Commission shall annex an area, the boundaries of which are not coterminous with a county or counties, the notice shall include a description of the area annexed and two maps of the Commission’s jurisdiction showing the area annexed and the location address of the property nearest to the extended boundary on each side of every street or road crossing the boundary.

ARTICLE III
ALLOCATION OF TAX

A. Allocation. In the administration of the Board’s contracts with all districts that impose transactions and use taxes imposed under ordinances, which comply with Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code:

1. Any payment not identified as being in payment of liability owing to a designated district or districts may be apportioned among the districts as their interests appear, or, in the discretion of the Board, to all districts with which the Board has contracted using ratios reflected by the distribution of district taxes collected from all taxpayers.

2. All district taxes collected as a result of determinations or billings made by the Board, and all amounts refunded or credited, may be distributed or charged to the respective districts in the same ratio as the taxpayer’s self-declared district taxes for the period for which the determination, billing, refund, or credit applies.

B. Vehicles, Vessels, and Aircraft. For the purpose of allocating use tax with respect to vehicles, vessels, or aircraft, the address of the registered owner appearing on the application for registration or on the certificate of ownership may be used by the Board in determining the place of use.
ARTICLE IV
COMPENSATION

The Commission agrees to pay to the Board as the Board’s cost of administering the Ordinance such amount as is provided for by law. Such amounts shall be deducted from the taxes collected by the Board for the Commission.

ARTICLE V
MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

A. Communications. Communications and notices may be sent by first-class United States mail to the addresses listed below or to such other addresses as the parties may from time to time designate. A notification is complete when deposited in the mail.

Communications and notices to be sent to the Board shall be addressed to:

State Board of Equalization
P.O. Box 942879
Sacramento, CA 94279-0073
Attention: Executive Director

Communications and notices to be sent to the Commission shall be addressed to:

San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission c/o SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
Attention: Director of Finance

B. Term. The date of this Agreement is the date on which it is approved by the Department of General Services. The Agreement shall take effect on April 1, 2008. This Agreement shall continue until December 31 next following the expiration date of the Ordinance, and shall thereafter be renewed automatically from year to year until the Board completes all work necessary to the administration of the Ordinance and has received and disbursed all payments due under that Ordinance.

C. Notice of Repeal of Ordinance. Commission shall give the Board written notice of the voluntary repeal of the Ordinance not less than 110 days prior to the operative date of the repeal.
ARTICLE VI
ADMINISTRATION OF TAXES IF THE
ORDINANCE IS CHALLENGED AS BEING INVALID

A. Impoundment of Funds.

1. When a legal action is begun challenging the validity of the imposition of the tax, the Commission shall deposit in an interest-bearing escrow account any proceeds transmitted to it under Article II. C., until a court of competent jurisdiction renders a final and non-appealable judgment that the tax is valid.

2. If the tax is determined to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the Commission shall transmit to the Board the moneys retained in escrow, including any accumulated interest, within ten days of the judgment of the trial court in the litigation awarding costs and fees becoming final and non-appealable.

B. Costs of Administration. Should a final judgment be entered in any court of the State of California, holding that the Ordinance is invalid or void and requiring a rebate or refund to taxpayers of any taxes collected under the terms of this Agreement, the parties mutually agree that:

1. Board may retain all payments made by Commission to Board to prepare to administer the Ordinance.

2. Commission will pay to Board and allow Board to retain Board's cost of administering the Ordinance in the amounts set forth in Article IV of this Agreement.

3. Commission will pay to Board or to the State of California the amount of any taxes plus interest and penalties, if any, that Board or the State of California may be required to rebate or refund to taxpayers.

4. Commission will pay to Board its costs for rebating or refunding such taxes, interest, or penalties. Board's costs shall include its additional cost for developing procedures for processing the rebates or refunds, its costs of actually making these refunds, designing and printing forms, and developing instructions for Board's staff for use in making these rebates or refunds, and any other costs incurred by Board which are reasonably appropriate or necessary to make those rebates or refunds. These costs shall include Board's direct and indirect costs as specified by section 11256 of the Government Code.
5. Costs may be accounted for in a manner which conforms to the internal accounting and personnel records currently maintained by the Board. The billings for such costs may be presented in summary form. Detailed records will be retained for audit and verification by Commission.

6. Any dispute as to the amount of costs incurred by Board in refunding taxes shall be referred to the State Director of Finance for resolution and the Director’s decision shall be final.

7. Costs incurred by Board in connection with such refunds shall be billed by Board on or before the 25th day of the second month following the month in which the judgment of a court of the State of California holding the Ordinance invalid or void becomes final. Thereafter, Board shall bill Commission on or before the 25th of each month for all costs incurred by Board for the preceding calendar month. Commission shall pay to Board the amount of such costs on or before the last day of the succeeding month and shall pay to Board the total amount of taxes, interest, and penalties refunded or paid to taxpayers, together with Board costs incurred in making those refunds.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

By ________________________ By ________________________
Gary L. Gallegos Executive Director
Executive Director

Office of General Counsel
UPDATE CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE

Introduction

Changes need to be made to SANDAG’s Conflict of Interest Code to reflect updates to existing job titles resulting from the recently completed Position Classification Study. The amendments will not result in adding any new positions to the list of designated positions, it will only change and add job titles resulting from changes to the classification structure.

Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to approve the Proposed Amendments to the Conflict of Interest Code.

Discussion

This Amendment reflects necessary updates to the list of designated employee positions subject to filing annual economic disclosure statements and the financial disclosure categories applicable to such designated positions as a result of the Position Classification Study approved by the Board on January 28, 2005. Nothing other than the list of designated positions is proposed for amendment. The other portions of the Code will remain unchanged but are attached for ease of reference.

Those employees who need to submit an update to their initial financial disclosure statement (Form 700) via an annual statement must do so no later than March 31, 2005. This amendment will not affect the employees who must fill out disclosure forms as the same employees must file under either the current list of designated employees or the amended version; it is only the job titles that are being updated.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Julie D. Wiley, (619) 699-6966, jwi@sandag.org

No Budget Impact
CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE

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 of Regs. Section 18730, which contains the terms of a standard model Conflict of Interest Code, which can be incorporated by reference, and which 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 the Conflict of Interest Code of SANDAG.

The persons holding positions listed in the Appendix are designated employees or officials. It has been determined that these persons make or participate in the making of decisions which may foreseeably have a material effect on financial interests. Designated persons shall file statements of economic interests with SANDAG when assuming or leaving their position and annually while holding the position. SANDAG will make the statements available for public inspection and reproduction. (Gov. Code Section 81008). Statements for all designated employees will be retained by SANDAG and the County of San Diego.
## 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 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>Department Directors</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Directors</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Economist</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Borders Program Manager</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Projects Director</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services Manager of Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resource Analyst/Associate Administrative Analyst</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Research Technician/Analyst</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Planner</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager of Contracts &amp; Procurement Manager</strong></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Associate Engineer</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research/Information Systems/Programmer Analyst/Technician</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services Manager</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Contracts and Procurement Analyst</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts and Procurement Analyst/Associate</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts/Procurement Specialist</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Office Services-Specialist III</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications Design-Supervisor of Graphic Design</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems Manager</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrative Analyst</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Planner/Principal Research Analyst/Project Manager</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Program Manager</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Development Program Manager-Government-Relations Director</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Manager/Coordinator</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Marketing Analyst</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Sales Manager</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Programming Manager/Planning Administrator</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Engineer</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Planning &amp; Budgeting Manager of Financial Programming and Project Control</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Financial Analyst</strong></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Program Business Development Manager</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Information Systems</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Office Supervisor</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Information Systems Manager/Administrator of Systems Integration</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems/Programmer Analyst/Associate</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Program Capital Development Manager</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Control Manager/Quality Control Management Specialist</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Consultant</td>
<td>Designated Firm Name / Job Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Advisor</td>
<td>Public Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Counsel</td>
<td>Orrick, Harrington, &amp; Sutcliffe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positions shall be listed by the name or job title of each person classified as a “designated employee or official” 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

(Included for reference only – not part of amendment)

When a designated person 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 person 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.

Persons 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>
REPORT ON NATIONAL CONFERENCES HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.:
AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION (APTA) AND
ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS (AMPO)

Introduction

During the month of March 2005, two national conferences, of the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) and the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO), were held in Washington D.C. As in previous years, SANDAG Board members, along with Board members from North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD) and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), attended these conferences. These conferences provide a forum for gaining up-to-date information, enable us to share materials with our Congressional delegation and receive recommendations, and provide us the ability to network with other agencies throughout the nation.

This year, the APTA Legislative Conference and the AMPO Policy Workshop were held in the same week, March 6-8 and March 9-10, respectively. Attendees were as follows:

**SANDAG**
- Mickey Cafagna, Chair; Mayor, City of Poway
- Ron Morrison, Past Chair; Vice Mayor, City of National City
- Joe Kellejian, Chair, Transportation Committee; Councilmember, City of Solana Beach
- Christy Guerin, Vice Chair, Public Safety Committee; Deputy Mayor, City of Encinitas
- Art Madrid, Mayor, City of La Mesa
- Gary Gallegos, Executive Director
- Ellen Roundtree, Director of Government Relations

**NCTD**
- Jack Feller, Chair; Councilmember, City of Oceanside
- Jerome Stocks, Vice Chair; Councilmember, City of Encinitas
- Dave Druker, Vice Chair, Planning Committee; Councilmember, City of Del Mar

**MTS**
- Tony Young, Councilmember, City of San Diego
- Shirley Kalternborn, Ex Officio, former Chair of San Diego Transit Corporation

It was an exciting time to be in the nation’s capital as while we were there, the House of Representatives was on the verge of passing its version of the multi-year transportation bill, the Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (TEA-LU). The $284 billion bill was passed on March 10, 2005, with a vote of 417 to 9.
Due to the timing of the conferences and the reauthorization of the transportation bill, both APTA and AMPO focused on issues related to the bill. Participation in these conferences had positive results as demonstrated by the failure of an amendment that could have had an impact on the region’s transportation plans. Specifically, Representative Mark Kennedy (MN) introduced an amendment that would have restricted the use of tolling/value pricing revenues to new highway construction and would have prohibited the use of such revenue for public transportation purposes. SANDAG, NCTD, and MTS Board members were able to educate our delegation on this issue and, as a result, all of the San Diego Congressional Delegation voted against this amendment.

Other discussions at the AMPO conference included the importance of grassroots advocacy efforts and strategies for developing these kinds of groups.

Meetings were held with members or their staff from the following Congressional offices:

- Senator Barbara Boxer, CA
- Senator Dianne Feinstein, CA
- Congressman Darrell Issa, 49th District
- Congressman Randy “Duke” Cunningham, 50th District
- Congressman Bob Filner, 51st District
- Congressman Duncan Hunter, 52nd District
- Congresswoman Susan Davis, 53rd District

In addition to discussions related to the reauthorization of the multi-year bill, Board members shared our 2005 Federal Transportation Agenda developed by SANDAG, NCTD, and MTS and the project funding requests submitted for the FY 2006 Appropriations cycle.

This year, SANDAG participated with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA), Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), San Bernardino Association of Governments (SANBAG), Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRRA), Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC), Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in hosting a reception for the Congressional members. The reception provided another forum to talk to members and their staffs on transportation and other issues.

Hon. Mickey Cafagna
Chair, SANDAG Board of Directors

Key Staff Contact: Ellen Roundtree, (619) 699-6960; ero@sandag.org
SANDAG SERVICE BUREAU

Introduction

The concept of a single Service Bureau to provide information and technical services to all public agencies, private organizations, and individuals was first proposed by the SourcePoint Board of Directors about a year ago. In the intervening months, staff has worked with that Board, affected agencies, and a consultant to evaluate the advisability and feasibility of this restructuring.

Currently, three separate programs provide informational and technical services to public and private agencies. SANDAG member agencies receive assistance through the Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program. The Assistance to Transit Operations and Planning (ATOP) program services the region's transit operators. SourcePoint provides services to clients in the public and private sectors for a fee that includes the direct project cost plus additional earnings that are reinvested into SourcePoint and SANDAG work programs.

Staff brought a concept to the Executive Committee on March 11, 2005, that the services provided through these programs be combined under one Service Bureau structure to improve customer service, better integrate staff resources, streamline administrative functions, and provide resources to maintain and enhance the Regional Information System (RIS). The RIS is a nationally recognized integrated system of data, computer models, state-of-the-art analytical tools, and staff expertise. It contains the most comprehensive databank of historic, current, and forecasted demographic, economic, land use, criminal justice, and transportation-related information for the San Diego region.

Recommendation

The Executive Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the concept of forming a Service Bureau, including the use of the Executive Committee as its governing body, and direct staff to conduct the necessary steps to have it operational effective July 1, 2005.

Discussion

Purpose and Benefits of a Service Bureau

In many cases, SANDAG does not recover the full cost of providing services through the LTA or ATOP programs. Under the current LTA program, projects under $1,000 are conducted at no cost to the member agency. Larger projects receive a $1,000 deduction. Through the ATOP program, assistance is provided at no direct cost to the transit operators, with Federal Transit Administration
(FTA) planning funds covering the costs. Many of the studies and projects conducted through these programs rely on the regional databases and technical capabilities of the RIS without assisting in its maintenance and enhancement.

It is important to recognize that the current fragmented structure of providing services is likely not sustainable. Many work elements, including the maintenance and enhancement of the RIS (which supports transportation projects), are being funded primarily by federal and state transportation funds that SANDAG receives as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the San Diego region. However, these transportation funds are not increasing as quickly as costs, and there are demands to use these funds for projects more directly related to transportation. Therefore, to maintain and enhance the information and services we currently provide, other funding sources are needed.

The benefits of a Service Bureau are anticipated to include:

- Better integration of services and marketing/outreach efforts.
- A team dedicated to business development, customer service, and improved service delivery.
- Increased revenue to help fund the maintenance and enhancement of information and technical services, independent of other agency funding. This will help ensure that we are able to continue to provide high-quality, comprehensive, and timely inter- and intra-agency support.

**Nonprofit Status**

SourcePoint was formed as a nonprofit primarily because, at the time, SANDAG could not legally provide services to private-sector clients. The provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 1703 remove that restriction. However, since certain grants and programs (including the Coordinated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA), which is administered by SANDAG) are available only to nonprofits, there are benefits to SANDAG in maintaining a nonprofit status for the Service Bureau. Additionally, there are some clients who prefer to work through the nonprofit arm of the agency.

**Governing Body**

SourcePoint has a Board of Directors to provide policy guidance, review, and approval of annual and long-term goals and objectives, and determine the general allocation of resources to the corporation’s activities and projects. The Board, which meets twice a year, is currently composed of three private-sector members and two members from the SANDAG Board of Directors.

The Service Bureau will need a governing body to perform the functions of the current SourcePoint Board of Directors and to oversee other Service Bureau activities. However, there is no requirement that the Board is separate from the agency’s existing structure. Under the proposed structure the SANDAG Executive Committee would serve as the Service Bureau’s governing body. This will further the agency’s desire to streamline the committee structure, with the added benefit of monthly meetings (rather than biannually) should the need arise for guidance or action in the short term.
Services and Fee Structure

The Service Bureau will continue to provide information and services similar to those currently provided through LTA, ATOP, and SourcePoint. These include demographic and economic analysis, custom mapping, transportation modeling, survey design and analysis, and housing studies. Charges for these services will be based upon competitive market rates, subject to full-cost reimbursement. These fees will include direct and indirect costs, plus a fee specifically earmarked for the maintenance and upgrade of the RIS. The same fee structure will apply to all agencies, organizations, and individuals requesting services through the Service Bureau.

Effects on Services to Member Agencies, Transit Operators, and the Public

Providing high quality, accurate, comprehensive, and timely response to requests for service will continue to be our highest priority. Through the Service Bureau, we will provide the information, services, data products, and analysis that have been fundamental to our service programs in the past. Over time, Service Bureau earnings will allow us to preserve the significant investment of time and money in the RIS over the past 30 years and further enhance the quality and extent of our information and technical services.

Many of the changes and efficiencies realized by forming the Service Bureau are internal, and therefore largely transparent to those using our services. Other changes are policy-oriented and will alter the way business has traditionally been conducted. The most significant changes to member agencies, transit operators, and the private and public sectors from existing policies are highlighted below.

Member Agencies: The LTA program provides for the first $1,000 of each project free of charge, with costs in excess of that amount being reimbursed by the requesting agency. Approximately two-thirds of all LTA projects fall under that limit and have therefore been conducted at no charge. A significant number of these “free” projects take less than a day of staff time to complete. Under the proposed Service Bureau, any project requiring three hours or less of SANDAG staff time will still be completed free of charge. Projects requiring more than three hours of staff time would be fully reimbursed, including the RIS maintenance fee, by the requesting agency. The attachment illustrates the estimated financial impact of the Service Bureau to each member agency, based on projects conducted over the past two years.

Transit Operators: A baseline level of service for the ATOP program (including the Passenger Counting Program and the Trolley Ridership Estimation Program) will be identified each year in the Overall Work Program and continue to be funded using transportation planning (FTA Section 5307) funds. Projects requested by the transit operators that fall outside of the scope of those services will be conducted under the Service Bureau, with costs (including the RIS maintenance fee) reimbursed by the requesting agency.

Non-Member Public Agencies and the Private Sector: Consolidating our assistance programs under one structure will be the least visible and have the fewest effects on these organizations, since they have been serviced under a similar structure through SourcePoint in the past.
Next Steps

The following schedule and actions would ensure that the Service Bureau would be operational effective July 1, 2005:

- **SANDAG Board of Directors**: Present Service Bureau concept for approval and direction to proceed.  
  - March 25

- **SourcePoint Board of Directors**: Present Service Bureau concept and approve amendments to the SourcePoint Bylaws.  
  - March 28

- **Executive Committee**: Present draft documents (Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation required to continue our nonprofit status, as well as the Service Bureau Board Policy that will define project priorities, pricing policies and fee structures, and other issues related to the operation of the Service Bureau) for review and comment.  
  - April 8

- **Executive Committee**: Recommend approval of Service Bureau policies and documents to the SANDAG Board.  
  - May 13

- **SANDAG Board of Directors**: Dissolve SourcePoint Board of Directors and approve the formation of the Service Bureau and supporting policies and documents.  
  - May 27

Pending SANDAG Board of Directors approval, the Service Bureau would begin operations on July 1, 2005. In the first year of operation, the focus will be on providing professional services to member agencies and SourcePoint’s established client base; identifying and targeting specific markets based on services and products that will provide the optimal return in terms of projects and revenue; and developing and implementing marketing and business development strategies for specific types of services.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Karen Lamphere (619) 699-6955; kla@sandag.org

No Budget Impact
COMPARISON: COST OF SERVICES THROUGH THE LTA PROGRAM
AND THE PROPOSED SERVICE BUREAU (ESTIMATED)

In a typical year, approximately 100 major projects are conducted for member agencies through the Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program. Just over two-thirds of these projects require less than $1,000 of SANDAG resources, and therefore have been conducted at no charge. For larger projects, costs exceeding $1,000 are reimbursed by the requesting agency.

Under the proposed Service Bureau structure, member agencies would not be charged for projects requiring three hours or less of SANDAG resources. All other projects would be fully reimbursed, including a Regional Information System maintenance fee.

The table below compares the cost of services to member agencies under the current LTA program and the cost that could be expected under the proposed Service Bureau (including a 10 percent Regional Information System maintenance fee). The information in the table was determined by averaging member agencies’ use of the LTA program over the past two years. However, this is purely illustrative, because the number and scope of projects requested by individual agencies varies considerably from year to year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Current LTA Program</th>
<th>Proposed Service Bureau</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$19,200</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$3,950</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$6,350</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$6,350</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$4,150</td>
<td>$2,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$22,200</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>$6,350</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>$7,100</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$5,900</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>$31,600</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td>$21,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Members *</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$11,550</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$101,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$175,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>$73,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Under the LTA program, advisory members reimburse SANDAG for all project costs and do not receive the $1,000 LTA deduction.
DRUG USE TRENDS AMONG LOCAL ARRESTEES

Introduction

Since 1987, SANDAG has conducted interviews with adult and juvenile arrestees about their recent and past drug use. Locally, this information has been used to assess drug-use trends, identify potential drug epidemics and treatment needs, and monitor drug use within population subgroups. Feedback from practitioners in the field has identified the extreme usefulness of having “hard numbers” to document community need and new trends that may not have been previously recognized. SANDAG’s Public Safety Committee (PSC) was briefed on this program in 2004 and members agreed that these data are a valuable resource for the region. Over the years, the Substance Abuse Monitoring (SAM) project also has served as a platform for other research with the inclusion of addenda pertaining to such topics as methamphetamine use, intravenous drug use, and domestic violence. In addition, SAM has enabled us to learn more about the use of illegal firearms by the juvenile population, which was instrumental in the development of the Project Safe Neighborhoods outreach message. Demonstrating their commitment to SAM, representatives from law enforcement, prevention, education, and drug treatment providers serve on a Local Coordinating Council (LCC) for this project and meet quarterly to discuss recent trends.

Recommendation

The report is provided for information purposes.

Discussion

Data collected from interviews with 703 adult males, 288 adult females, and 342 juveniles in 2003 are reported in three research bulletins. A fourth bulletin on methamphetamine use will be published in April 2005. Attachments 1 through 3 contain the three bulletins published to date. The collection of these data have been funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) (1987-2003) and the California Border Alliance Group (CBAG) (2003-2004), while the analysis and reporting is done through the Criminal Justice Clearinghouse (Attachment 4), funded through your member assessments. Data from 2004 interviews will be available in the mid-2005.

Adults

In 2003, 67 percent of adult arrestees tested positive for one or more of the major drugs (marijuana, cocaine, heroin, PCP, and methamphetamine). This rate has remained relatively constant over the past four years (when new sampling procedures were implemented). Marijuana was the most used illicit drug by both males and females (with 77% and 73%, respectively, reporting having used the drug) and was the only substance that males were more likely to test positive for. That is, female arrestees were more likely than males to test positive for cocaine (15% versus 10%), heroin (9% versus 6%), and methamphetamine (47% versus 38%). Recent feedback from law enforcement
to the Public Safety Committee (PSC) has revealed that this kind of information about methamphetamine use was instrumental in creating a drug endangered children’s program for at-risk youth living in households where one or both parents use the drug.

Additional analyses also revealed that:

- individuals with a prior record were more likely to test positive for any drug;
- females who were employed were less likely to test positive for cocaine and heroin;
- individuals who identified themselves as White non-Hispanic were more likely to test positive for methamphetamine; and
- individuals ages 18 to 24 were more likely to test positive for marijuana, and those ages 25 to 39 were more likely to test positive for methamphetamine.

New questions being added to the adult instrument in 2005, on the advice and direction of the LCC, pertain to measuring crimes arrestees have committed but have not been caught for, as well as issues related to reentry after incarceration and mental health.

**Juveniles**

During 2003, over half (56%) of juveniles tested positive for some type of substance, which was an increase from 46 percent in 2000. Reaction to this rise of substance use among youth is reflected in the focused efforts to increase prevention and intervention programs by law enforcement, treatment providers, schools, and probation.

With input from the LCC, the juvenile instrument was revised in 2003 with the addition of questions regarding perceived risk of drug use, as well as participation in what would be categorized as risk-tasking behavior. This information is useful to individuals and groups who work with at-risk and other youth to identify different types of service needs this population has and to seek funding to address the needs. Analyses of these data revealed that:

- while over three-quarters of individuals who use tobacco and methamphetamine feel that these drugs are “bad” or “very bad” for them, only around one-third (32%) of marijuana users perceive this same risk;
- three-quarters or more of the juveniles interviewed reported that alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and methamphetamine are “easy” or “very easy” to obtain; and
- girls and boys differ on a number of risk factors, including girls being less likely to have a stable residence and more likely to have been bullied, have run away from home, have had suicidal tendencies, and have parents who use drugs.

In 2005, additional interview questions, which are of particular local interest (and also were suggested by the LCC), will pertain to steroid use, gang involvement, and crossing the border to obtain alcohol and other drugs illegally.

**Methamphetamine Addendum**

Because of the relatively high rate of methamphetamine use in our region (compared to other U.S. cities utilizing these data and other national indicators) and to learn more about the drug in order to help curb its use, additional questions regarding methamphetamine use have been included since 1996. That same year, the San Diego County Methamphetamine Strike Force (MSF) was formed. The overall objective of the MSF is to reduce the manufacture, distribution, and use of methamphetamine in the County through the work of its multi-disciplinary network that includes
prevention, treatment, and law enforcement practitioners. The MSF relies on data from the addendum in its annual report card on the state of methamphetamine use in the County. It also uses these data in other efforts, such as investigating the enforcement of laws concerning the selling of chemical precursors in local stores.

Despite local efforts, 38 percent of adult males, 47 percent of adult females, and 15 percent of juveniles tested positive for methamphetamine in 2003. These rates were all higher than in 2000 (when they were 29%, 28%, and 11%, respectively). However, because use is increasing across the country, local experts feel that these increases could have been even larger without the concerted efforts focused locally on this problem.

Many of the methamphetamine users interviewed had initially tried the drug because of their friends’ use, and one-third felt they were not addicted. Some of the most common effects of using the drug reported by the arrestees included sleeplessness, weight loss, and legal and family problems because of the drug. Methamphetamine users also reported obtaining the drug in the eastern regions of the County, although they often lived along the coastal regions. These kinds of findings can help law enforcement aim their efforts to curb distribution and help treatment facilities when targeting potential clients.

In 2005, SANDAG will be working closely with the MSF’s media sub-committee to get the message out of the wide ranging impacts of methamphetamine use in our region. For example, 60 percent of arrestees charged with motor vehicle theft tested positive for methamphetamine, compared to 34 percent of other arrestees. Insurance rates can increase proportionally to the number of thefts in an area, and this statistic of “every day” relevance would not have been available without the SAM program.

Project Future

Originally sponsored by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), funding for SAM was terminated in 2004. Recognizing the importance of these data to inform local practice and policy on the current trends in substance use among adults and youth, CBAG took the initiative to sponsor both the youth and adult data collection for calendar year 2004. This funding allowed data collection to occur twice yearly (a 50% reduction from the NIJ-funded effort). In 2005, this funding was decreased by 65 percent, and the Public Safety Committee, recognizing the usefulness of this information, has directed staff to pursue necessary funding (an additional $50,000) to continue this program. Staff is currently in the process of doing so and is looking at options that include the use of ARJIS and local foundation funds.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Cynthia Burke, (619) 699-1910; cbu@sandag.org

No budget Impact
Drug Use Among Adult Arrestees in San Diego County

September 2004

Cynthia Burke, Ph.D., Division Director
DRUG USE AMONG ADULT ARRESTEES IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY

INTRODUCTION

This SANDAG CJ Bulletin presents statistics on drug use among San Diego arrestees. These data were collected through a program called “ADAM” – Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring. ADAM was funded in 39 sites across the country in 2003 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ). The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has been the site administrator in San Diego since the program’s inception in 1987. ADAM data are useful at both the national and local levels to law enforcement, treatment providers, and prevention programs to monitor the nature and scope of drug use over time.

As part of this project, arrestees are approached by non-custodial research staff (hired specifically for this project) within 48 hours of their arrest and booking into jail. If the arrestee is available and interested in participating, he/she is asked a number of questions related to his/her drug use history and is also asked to provide a urine sample for drug testing. In 2003, interviews with male arrestees were conducted at the Vista and Central Jails and interviews with female arrestees were conducted at Las Colinas.

For the first time, rather than presenting one report with ADAM statistics, SANDAG’s Criminal Justice Research Division is compiling data for a series of bulletins that will be more useful for policymakers and practitioners alike. This first bulletin, “Drug Use Among Adult Arrestees in San Diego County,” includes information about the past and recent drug use history of adult arrestees and presents past years’ data for comparison. Future bulletins will include information on juvenile drug use, drug markets, and methamphetamine use.

POSITIVE FOR ANY DRUG

Since 2000 (when a new random sampling procedure was instituted), about two-thirds of San Diego arrestees have tested positive for some type of drug (marijuana, cocaine, opiates/heroin, PCP, or methamphetamine) at the time of their arrest. As Figure 1 shows, in 2003, 67 percent of males and 69 percent of females were positive for at least one of these substances.

How does San Diego compare to other ADAM sites? In 2003, half of the other 38 sites that interviewed male arrestees had a higher percentage testing positive for some type of drug. As Figure 2 shows, Chicago, Illinois, had the highest rate of positive male arrestees at 86 percent and Woodbury, Iowa, had the lowest rate at 42 percent.
Compared to the other 24 sites that interviewed females in 2003, San Diego had the tenth highest rate of females testing positive for some type of drug, with 15 sites that were lower. As Figure 3 shows, Portland, Oregon, had the highest percent of females testing positive (82%), while Anchorage, Alaska, had the lowest (52%).

As Figure 4 shows, male arrestees were significantly more likely to report having ever had five or more drinks in one day in their lifetime, compared to female arrestees (85% versus 70%). They also were significantly more likely to have reported doing so in the past 30 days (52% versus 36%). Please note that urinalysis testing for alcohol was not included in these analyses.

Marijuana traditionally has been the most commonly used illicit substance among the U.S. population (SAMHSA’s 2003 National Survey on Drugs and Health). In 2003, about three-quarters (77% of males and 73% of females) of San Diego arrestees had ever tried marijuana, and 45 percent and 39 percent, respectively, reported using this drug in the last 30 days (Figure 5). In addition, 39 percent of males and 29 percent of females tested positive for marijuana. Marijuana was the only illegal drug that males were more likely to test positive for, compared to females.
Figure 5
MARIJUANA MOST COMMONLY TRIED DRUG AMONG ARRESTEES

![Chart showing marijuana use among arrestees.]

NOTE: Cases with missing information are not included.
SOURCE: SANDAG ADAM Program

METHAMPHETAMINE

In 2003, over half of both male and female arrestees (53% of males and 60% of females) reported ever trying methamphetamine and 32 percent and 38 percent, respectively, reported using it in the past 30 days (Figure 6). In addition, 38 percent of males and 47 percent of females tested positive for methamphetamine, both of which were higher than the percentages reporting use in the past 30 days.

Figure 6
ALMOST HALF OF FEMALE ARRESTEES TESTED POSITIVE FOR METHAMPHETAMINE IN 2003

![Chart showing positive methamphetamine tests among arrestees.]

NOTE: Cases with missing information are not included.
SOURCE: SANDAG ADAM Program

Methamphetamine traditionally has been a substance used more frequently in the western portions of the U.S., with use declining as one moves east. Compared to weighted data for other ADAM sites, San Diego had the fifth highest positive rate for males and the second highest positive rate for females in 2003. For males, the positive rate was surpassed only by Honolulu, Hawaii; Phoenix, Arizona; Sacramento, California; and San Jose, California. The national median for males was five percent positive. For females, only Honolulu, Hawaii, had more female arrestees positive for methamphetamine, and the national median was only nine percent.

COCAINÉ/CRACK

A little more than one-third (39% of males and 36% of females) reported ever trying cocaine and only 4 percent (of both groups) reported using it in the past 30 days (Figure 7). In contrast, females were significantly more likely to report ever using crack (36%), compared to males (28%), and also were more likely to report using it in the past 30 days (14% versus 7%). In 2003, 10 percent of males and 15 percent of females tested positive for cocaine/crack. There has not been any significant change in use for males or females over the past four years.

Figure 7
MORE ARRESTEES WHO HAVE TRIED CRACK USED IT IN THE PAST MONTH

![Chart showing cocaine and crack use among arrestees.]

NOTE: Cases with missing information are not included.
SOURCE: SANDAG ADAM Program
HEROIN

Less than one in five arrestees interviewed in 2003 (17% of males and 16% of females) reported ever trying heroin (Figure 8). Five percent and seven percent, respectively, reported using it in the past 30 days. In 2003, six percent of males and nine percent of females tested positive for heroin. There has been no significant change in use for males or females over the past four years.

Figure 8
LESS THAN ONE IN FIVE ARRESTEES HAVE TRIED HEROIN

NOTE: Cases with missing information are not included.
SOURCE: SANDAG ADAM Program

FACTORs RELATED TO DRUG USE

Additional analyses revealed that several arrestee characteristics are significantly related to drug use, in general, as well as drug of choice.

- Individuals who reported having a prior arrest or previously serving at least 24 hours in jail were significantly more likely to test positive for at least one drug, as well as marijuana, cocaine, and methamphetamine (but not opiates).

- Females who were employed were significantly less likely to test positive for cocaine and heroin. This difference did not exist for males.

- Individuals who identified themselves as White non-Hispanic were significantly more likely to test positive for methamphetamine and those who identified as Black were significantly more likely to test positive for marijuana and/or cocaine. Hispanics were significantly least likely to test positive for any of the five drugs.

- Individuals age 18 to 24 were significantly more likely to test positive for marijuana, those age 25 to 39 were more likely to test positive for methamphetamine, and those age 40 and older were more likely to test positive for cocaine.

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

A total of 1,194 adult arrestees were approached as part of the ADAM Program in 2003. Of these, 86 percent agreed to be interviewed and 14 percent declined. Of the 1,030 interviewees, 993 also provided a urine sample at the conclusion of the interview and these individuals are described here. Seven hundred four (704) of these arrestees were male and 289 were female. Other characteristics include:

- 41 percent were White non-Hispanic, 34 percent Hispanic, 20 percent Black, and 4 percent another ethnicity;

- 89 percent completed the interview in English and 11 percent in Spanish;

- 29 percent did not have a high school degree;

- 41 percent worked full-time;

- 56 percent were single and 23 percent were married;

- 14 percent were homeless;

- 28 percent had previously received in-patient drug treatment and 20 percent had received out-patient; and

- 78 percent had previously been arrested and 73 percent had spent prior time in jail.
Drug Use and Other Risk Factors Among Juveniles Arrested in San Diego County in 2003

December 2004

Cynthia Burke, Ph.D., Division Director
DRUG USE AND OTHER RISK FACTORS AMONG JUVENILES ARRESTED IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY IN 2003

INTRODUCTION

In 2003, 360 juveniles who were arrested and booked into San Diego County’s Juvenile Hall were interviewed (within 48 hours of booking) as part of SANDAG’s Substance Abuse Monitoring (SAM) project. Of these 360, 344 also provided a urine sample for analysis (282 boys and 62 girls).

SANDAG has conducted interviews with the arrestee population since 1987. When the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) discontinued funding for the juvenile component of the Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) project in 2003, the California Border Alliance Group (CBAG) provided financial support to keep this important data collection effort going. With this local funding, we were able to revise the juvenile interview instrument to include additional questions of interest pertaining to risk. This second in a series of CJ research bulletins on 2003 drug use among the arrestee population includes information regarding drug use among these juveniles, as well as other risk factors.

PERCENT POSITIVE TRENDS

The percents of juveniles who have tested positive for any drug, marijuana, and meth have all increased over the past four years. As Figure 1 shows, over half (56%) of the youth interviewed in 2003 tested positive for some type of drug, 49 percent were positive for marijuana, and 15 percent were positive for meth. Since juvenile arrests were down during the same time period, it may be the case that juveniles being booked into Juvenile Hall in 2003 have a greater number of issues, including substance use, that need to be addressed. In addition, three percent of the youth interviewed in 2003 tested positive for cocaine, one percent for PCP, and one percent for heroin (not shown).

LIFETIME SUBSTANCE USE

Overall, 76 percent of the youth interviewed in 2003 reported that they had ever tried tobacco, 88 percent alcohol, 82 percent marijuana, and 28 percent methamphetamine. Other drugs that had been tried at some time by less than one in five of the youth surveyed included cocaine (16%), mushrooms (14%), inhalants (13%), ecstasy (12%),...
rohypnol (10%), crack (9%), LSD (6%), and heroin (3%) (not shown).

However, lifetime experience varied with the age of the juvenile as Figure 2 shows. As one would expect, the percent of youth that had tried each substance increased with each older age group. However, it is worth noting that around two-thirds of youth ages 11 to 13 had tried alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana at least once. These statistics are disturbing due to the higher likelihood of dependency associated with early use (before age 15).\(^1\) The greatest increase across the age groups was for meth, with 39 percent of those 16 and older reporting they had tried this drug at least once.

![Figure 2](image1.png)

**Figure 2**

**YOUTH 16 YEARS AND OLDER MOST LIKELY TO HAVE TRIED ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11 to 13</th>
<th>14 to 15</th>
<th>16 &amp; Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meth</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL = 344

NOTE: Cases with missing information not included.

SOURCE: SANDAG SAM Program

How did this arrestee sample compare to youth in the general population? Figure 3 compares 2003 SAM data for youth ages 14 and older to data collected during the same time period through the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) in San Diego City high schools by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). While it is important to note that different methodologies (e.g., surveying versus interviewing the youth in person, phrasing questions in different ways, only surveying students in the City of San Diego) could affect the pattern of results, it is not surprising that the percents of SAM youth surveyed who had ever tried these substances and had used them in the last 30 days were higher than of those interviewed in the school setting since these youth were selected due to their contact with the juvenile justice system.
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**Figure 3**

**SAM YOUTH 14 YEARS AND OLDER MORE LIKELY TO REPORT DRUG USE HISTORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAM 14+</th>
<th>YRBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever Alcohol</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol 30 Day</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Marijuana</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana 30 Days</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Meth</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Cases with missing information not included.

SOURCE: SANDAG SAM Program, CDC Youth Risk Behavior Survey 2003 Data

**FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF DRUG USE**

To determine what other factors, besides age, were related to ever trying a drug or for testing positive for it, additional analyses were conducted. As the
following three figures show, we found three youth characteristics that were consistent predictors of drug use: not being enrolled in school, being involved in a gang, and having parents who use drugs. These findings suggest that it is important to identify these risk factors in youth so that substance abuse issues can be targeted at an early point in time and further justice system contact avoided.

Figure 4
YOUTH NOT IN SCHOOL MORE LIKELY TO USE DRUGS

![Bar chart showing drug use among youth currently enrolled and not in school.]

Source: SANDAG SAM Program
Note: Cases with missing information not included.

Figure 5
YOUTH IN GANGS MORE LIKELY TO USE DRUGS

![Bar chart showing drug use among youth in and not in gangs.]

Source: SANDAG SAM Program
Note: Cases with missing information not included.

Figure 6
YOUTH WITH PARENTS WHO USE DRUGS MORE LIKELY TO USE DRUGS

![Bar chart showing drug use among youth with and without parents who use drugs.]

Source: SANDAG SAM Program
Note: Cases with missing information not included.

OTHER RISK FACTORS

As previously noted, with the advent of the new SAM instrument, a number of new questions were added to the juvenile survey. From the responses to these questions, new indicators of risk among this population have become available, which are summarized in Table 1. The most common risk factor, reported by 88 percent, was having a history of truancy. In addition, over two-thirds (68%) had been arrested and over half (55%) had served time before.
Table 1
ARRESTED YOUTH INDICATE PAST RISKY BEHAVIOR IN A NUMBER OF AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Reported a history of truancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Had been arrested at least once before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Have served time before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Don’t like reading for fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Have gotten into trouble with their parents for drinking/using drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Have ridden in a car with a driver who was drinking/using drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Have gotten sick or had a hang-over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Have sold drugs or acted as a “middleman”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Later felt bad about something they did while drunk/high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Have gone to school drunk or high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Have gotten in a physical fight while drinking/using drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Have not remembered what happened while they were drinking or using drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Have brought a weapon to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Have missed school because of drinking or using drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Have driven a car while or after drinking/using drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Were diagnosed with Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Have passed out while drinking/using drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Have dropped out of school or been expelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Have a child or are currently pregnant (or have a girlfriend who is)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCEIVED RISK AND AVAILABILITY OF DRUGS

Two of the new questions on the 2003 revised instrument asked youth who had reported using a substance in the past year (1) how bad they thought it was for them and (2) how easy it was to obtain. Both ratings were made on a four-point scale. As Figure 7 shows, while almost nine in ten meth users thought this drug was “extremely bad” or “very bad” for them and three-quarters felt the same about tobacco, less than half (45%) gave these ratings to alcohol and only one-third (32%) gave it to marijuana. This finding suggests the need for more information campaigns regarding the negative health effects associated with marijuana. Equally disturbing, three-quarters or more reported that it was “easy” or “very easy” to get these substances.

Figure 7
YOUTH REPORT DRUGS ARE EASY TO OBTAIN AND DON’T THINK THEY ARE EQUALLY BAD FOR THEM

SOURCE: SANDAG SAM Program
GENDER DIFFERENCES

While there were no significant differences in drug use between the boys and girls surveyed through SAM in 2003 [with the exception that on average, girls tried meth approximately one year earlier in life (13.48) than boys (14.49)], the two did differ in other areas. Specifically, girls were:

- less likely to have a stable residence in the past 30 days (23% versus 6% of boys);
- more likely to have been bullied (31% versus 19% of boys);
- more likely to report having ever run away from home (71% compared to 38% of boys); and
- more likely to report that their parents had ever used drugs (33%) and had abused alcohol (39%) compared to boys (21% and 21%, respectively).

These increased risk factors for girls are important for those who work with this population to take into account when trying to meet the unique needs of female youth in the juvenile justice system.

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

- About half (46%) of the youth interviewed in 2003 were Hispanic, 24 percent were Black, 22 percent were White, and 8 percent identified with another ethnic group.
- About one-third (34%) of these youth were arrested for a violent offense, 27 percent for a property offense, 23 percent for some other type of offense (e.g., citation), 9 percent for a status offense (e.g., curfew violation), and 7 percent for a drug/alcohol offense.
- The average age of these youth was 15.93 years, with a range from 11.26 to 18.64 years old.

FUTURE BULLETINS

Future research bulletins will be released over the next few months summarizing 2003 SAM data related specifically to methamphetamine use and drug markets in San Diego County. Bulletins with 2004 data will also be available in early 2005.
Drug Market Dynamics Reported by Adult Arrestees in San Diego County in 2003

January 2005

Cynthia Burke, Ph.D., Division Director
INTRODUCTION

This is the third CJ Bulletin in a series from SANDAG summarizing data collected from local arrestees in 2003. As part of the Substance Abuse Monitoring (SAM) program, adults arrested in San Diego County are interviewed in one of three local detention facilities about their past and current drug use\(^1\). This current bulletin summarizes information shared by the arrestees about their drug purchasing behavior in the past 30 days. This information is useful to law enforcement and service providers in better understanding local drug market dynamics and creating effective interventions.

WHAT DRUGS DID ARRESTEES OBTAIN?

Overall, 61 percent of the arrestees interviewed in 2003 reported that they had obtained at least one illegal drug (marijuana, crack, powder cocaine, heroin, or meth) in the past 30 days. Marijuana and meth were the most frequently obtained (44% and 35% of the arrestees, respectively), with less than 10 percent obtaining one of the other three substances (9% crack, 6% heroin, and 5% cocaine). These proportions were almost identical to the percentages of arrestees reporting illicit drug use in the past 30 days (not shown). Because of this, these arrestees are referred to as drug purchasers and drug users interchangeably.

As Figure 1 shows, arrestees were significantly more likely to report they obtained marijuana, meth, and cocaine without paying cash, while crack users were more likely to pay cash. Heroin users were equally likely to obtain it either way. These differences could be related to the cost of the drug, the financial status of the users, as well as the situations in which the drugs are used, as discussed later in this bulletin.

Figure 1

ARRESTEES MORE LIKELY TO GET SOME DRUGS WITHOUT PAYING CASH

How did the arrestees obtain drugs when they didn’t pay cash? The most common way was that they received the drug as a “gift” (from 72% of heroin and meth users to 91% of cocaine users), most often when they were with the person at work or in a social situation. Others reported that they obtained the drug because they were somehow involved in the sale or transport of the drug (from 6% of cocaine users to 13% of heroin users), they traded merchandise or sex for it (from 1% of marijuana users to 10% of meth

\(^1\) More information about the SAM interview methodology is included in the first bulletin in this series which was released in September 2004.
users), or they obtained it some other way (not shown).

FROM WHOM DID THE ARRESTEES OBTAIN THE DRUGS? 2

Arrestees were asked if they had obtained an illicit substance from their “regular source” the last time they got it. As Figure 2 shows, there was variation across the drugs with powder cocaine users most likely to report using a regular source (72%) and crack and marijuana users least likely (47% and 49%, respectively). When these arrestees were also asked how many dealers they had used in the past 30 days, the average was lowest for marijuana (1.80, range 1 to 10) and heroin (1.98, range 1 to 10), and was highest for crack (3.17, range 1 to 30) (not shown).

WHERE DID THE ARRESTEES OBTAIN THE DRUGS?

Arrestees reported obtaining drugs in a variety of venues, including a house or apartment and on the street. As Figure 3 shows, these locations varied by the substance being bought. Arrestees buying marijuana and meth were more likely to report they most recently got it at a house or apartment (60% and 65%, respectively) and crack users were more likely to report they had obtained it from someone on the street (53%). Other places, not shown in Figure 3, included public and abandoned buildings.

NOTE: Cases with missing information not included.

SOURCE: SANDAG SAM Program, 2003

2 The remainder of this information pertains to cash drug transactions, unless otherwise noted.
When asked if they purchased drugs in their own neighborhood or went to another one, there was no significant difference across drugs. A little more than one-third (39%) of cocaine users got the drug in their own neighborhood, as did 44 percent of heroin users, 47 percent of meth users, 51 percent of marijuana users, and 54 percent of crack users (not shown).

HOW DID THE ARRESTEES OBTAIN THE DRUGS?

Arrestees reported a variety of means of contacting their dealer prior to conducting a cash transaction. Arrestees were consistently more likely to call the person, but there was variation, with marijuana (32%) and crack users (34%) least likely to use this mode of communication, compared to 47 percent of meth users, 56 percent of cocaine users, and 59 percent of heroin users. Rather, marijuana and crack users were more likely to report just seeing the person in public (21% and 31%, respectively). Cocaine (6%) and meth (13%) users were least likely to connect with a person in public and heroin users were more likely to page their dealer (15% versus 0% to 5% for other drug users). Cocaine, meth, and marijuana users were more likely to connect with a dealer at work or in a social situation (11% to 17% versus 3% for the other two) (not shown).

HOW OFTEN WERE ARRESTEES UNABLE TO BUY DRUGS?

About one in three of the arrestees reported that there was at least one time in the past 30 days that they tried to obtain a particular substance but were unable to do so for some reason (e.g., the dealer did not have any). These percentages ranged from 27 percent for heroin to 34 percent for marijuana and crack. The exception was cocaine, with only five percent (1 in 19) reporting this situation had occurred in the past month (not shown).

HOW MUCH MONEY DID THE ARRESTEES PAY FOR THE DRUGS?

Arrestees were asked how much money they had spent the last time they obtained a particular substance, as well as how often they had bought the drug in the past 30 days. As Figures 4 and 5 show, heroin, meth, and cocaine purchasers spent the greatest amount of money per transaction and were also among those who bought the drug with the greatest frequency. For heroin, the median buy was $30 (range $10 to $700) and the drug was purchased about every other day (15 days, range 1 to 30). Meth users spent an average of $40 (range $4 to $2,600) per buy and purchased the drug a little more than once per week (5 times, range 1 to 30). The median amount spent for cocaine was $50 (range $5 to $600) and the drug was purchased just under twice a week (7 times, range 1 to 30). While crack users spent less on each buy, they bought the drug with almost the same frequency as heroin users.

For non-cash transactions in the past 30 days, meth users reported receiving the drug more frequently than crack and heroin users at once a week (4.0 times, range 1 to 30). Cocaine users received the drug on a non-cash basis least frequently (1 time, range 1 to 12) (not shown).
WERE THERE ANY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE ARRESTEES?

While there were no gender differences in drug use in the past 30 days for marijuana or meth, there were some differences in how arrestees reported obtaining drugs in this same timeframe. Specifically, females who obtained marijuana or meth were significantly less likely to get it by paying cash (30% and 54%, respectively), as Figure 6 shows. In comparison, 47 percent of the males reported receiving marijuana by paying cash and 68 percent got meth this way.

NOTE: Cases with missing information not included.
SOURCE: SANDAG SAM PROGRAM, 2003

SAM BULLETIN SERIES

The fourth and final bulletin in the 2003 SAM data series will be available in February 2005 and will outline data from the meth addendum which is completed with adult and juvenile arrestees who report meth use in the past 30 days. If you have any questions or comments regarding the SAM data, please contact Lisbeth Howard in the Criminal Justice Research Division at SANDAG (619-699-1900). Thank you for your interest and support.
A regional resource for public health and safety information

SANDAG’s Criminal Justice Research Division, in conjunction with ARJIS (Automated Regional Justice Information System), is an essential source of information for local communities on public safety and public health, crime data, and crime-reduction strategies being implemented countywide. We publish comprehensive reports, information bulletins, and brief topical papers covering many aspects of the justice system including adult and juvenile arrest data, domestic violence incidents, drug abuse, resident opinion surveys, and regional crime statistics.

Division staff members also serve on taskforces and committees such as the Methamphetamine Strike Force, Domestic Violence Council, Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, Child Well-Being Subcommittee, and California Law Enforcement Association of Records’ Supervisors (CLEARs).

Public Safety Committee

The Division provides lead staff support to SANDAG’s newest committee, the Public Safety Committee (PSC), which is composed of elected officials and public safety representatives. This group meets on the second Friday of each month at the SANDAG offices. Meeting schedules and agendas are posted to the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org. The Public Safety Committee advises the SANDAG Board of Directors on major policy-level matters related to public safety. The goals of the group include improving the quality of life in the region by promoting public safety and justice through collaboration, information sharing, effective use of technology, and objective monitoring and assessment.

Information Source

Policymakers, criminal justice officials, and local service providers depend on the division’s research studies and mapping capabilities to assist them in determining “what works” to reduce crime and improve the effectiveness of the criminal justice system. With cooperation and assistance from the region’s law enforcement agencies, we compile and
maintain historic and current crime- and justice-related information, including crime and arrest rates by offense and jurisdiction, characteristics of victims of crime, and suspect characteristics. Annual publications on these topics include: Arrests in the Region; Crime in the Region; and the Substance Abuse Monitoring (SAM) report on drug use trends currently funded by the California Border Alliance Group (CBAG).

Research and Evaluation Services

SANDAG’s cooperative relationships with local justice agencies include access to records (e.g. police, prosecution, courts) needed to conduct locally-funded studies and fulfill national research contract commitments on a variety of topics pertaining to crime prevention, public health, and drug demand reduction.

One current SANDAG evaluation project, Family TIES (Targeted Intervention, Education, and Services), is a program being led by the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department in collaboration with three community-based service organizations. SANDAG is conducting a process and impact evaluation. This program is providing life skills development services to inmates in Las Colinas Women’s Detention Facility and George Bailey Men’s Detention Facility. In-custody services focus on pre-employment skills, substance abuse intervention, parenting skills and healthy relations, domestic violence treatment, and a process, and impact evaluations for this project.

The Division is also conducting an impact and process evaluation for the San Diego Teen Court. The goals of this project are to assess and document changes in recidivism, attitudes, and perceptions of the program for individuals who were mandated by Juvenile Court to attend and for student volunteers who are participating in the program.

For published reports and other information about the SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division, please visit www.sandag.org/cj.
PLEASE FORWARD TO THE FULL SANDAG BOARD AND TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE——

Recent concern on the Board that the TransNet plans should be thoroughly benefit/cost analyzed before rushing ahead with them is completely proper. There are better schemes that are more cost-effective than the Prop. A plan and that will provide more congestion relief - without attempting to force the public to change its traveling behavior. These employ movable barriers at congestion points on all freeways and eventual automation of the entire system when that becomes feasible - probably well before 2048 - as discussed by Gary Gallegos in his Metropolitan Magazine article in 1999:

http://www.sandiegometro.com/1999/apr/transportation.html

This schematic diagram compares the better schemes with the present HOV/managed lane approach, which is the least effective and most costly solution:
**COMPARISON - HOV/MANAGED LAKES VS. MOBILE BARRIERS VS. FULLY AUTOMATED OPERATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Scheme A:</strong></td>
<td>Has 4 HOV/managed lanes with movable barriers (MB) to adjust in/out lanes in the rush directions. These are separated from the general lanes by fixed barriers and thus require very expensive overhead direct access ramps and HOV-HOV connectors for convenient access and egress. 12 total lanes are provided with the HOV/managed lanes adjustable up to 4 lanes in one direction. The general lanes cannot be adjusted and will continue to be congested in the rush direction but continue to have the most convenient access and egress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Scheme B:</strong></td>
<td>Dispenses with the less efficient HOV/managed lane concept and relies instead on movable barriers to adjust the allocation of in/out lanes across the entire freeway according to demand - per Gallegos’ suggestion. All lanes are contiguous for most flexibility and allows the gain of 2 or more additional lanes without expanding freeway width. All lanes are general lanes; access and egess are convenient. No costly direct access ramps or HOV-HOV connectors are required. This is a far more flexible scheme than A., better able to adjust to rush hour demand and will be far less costly. It benefits all vehicles equally; it does not discriminate against SOVs or require a change in the public’s travelling preferences. And, it can be easily adapted to future automated operation as Gallegos envisioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Scheme C:</strong></td>
<td>Adds automated vehicle operation to Scheme B. Automated operation was successfully tested in 1997 and is expected to nearly double freeway capacity. It should become practical well before 2048 and could alone solve freeway congestion problems to and beyond 2048. No additional right of way need be acquired or new freeways built. Automated lanes can be narrower, so more lanes can occupy the same space. Lane widths can also be adjusted to accommodate larger vehicles as needed, preferably during non-rush hours. This would be the most flexible scheme to adapt to varying rush hour demand and would benefit all classes of vehicles equally. Dual-mode operation is possible, with vehicles under driver control on local feeder roads but switching over to automated operation on freeways and principal arterials. Inductive electric power transfer could be accomplished from cables in the pavement of each lane. These would not only power the vehicles on the freeway, but charge their batteries at the same time for off-freeway operation. This would make electrically powered vehicles practical again. No hydrocarbon fuels or expensive hydrogen would be required, so this would be the best solution environmentally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hard-nosed engineering analysis would show schemes B and C the most cost-effective and also the most acceptable to the public. They should replace the HOV/managed lanes Prop. A scheme as the best use of taxpayer funds.

Bus rapid transit can benefit as well from both schemes B and C. Dedicated bus lanes, traffic signal priority, queue jumpers and other measures obstructing general traffic flow would not be necessary. Attempts to force the public to ride transit could be abandoned, as they are apt to fail and result in more congestion rather than less. This combined transit and general use in B and C would then provide the maximum total travel capacity, unlike scheme A.

John Suhr
619-461-1246
To all Mayors, Council Members and Members of the Board of Supervisors:

Proposition A, was advertised as necessary to solve San Diego's transportation needs, leading many to think that this forty-year TransNet sales tax extension would solve San Diego’s transportation needs. This is, as you know, not true.

On November 23, 2004, the North County Times in an editorial, “GRIDLOCK FIXES NOW ENTRUSTED TO OUR LEADERS,” noted “The TransNet extension will raise $14 billion toward $42 billion in total spending by 2030. The $42 billion figures include a hoped-for hike in gasoline taxes and massive infusions of federal transportation money. Yet even that boatload of cash is insufficient to solve the county’s existing traffic woes and to manage growth--$67 billion is needed.”

I agree with this editorial, and believe that a Region Wide Development Impact Fee is necessary to help make up this difference. The voters have agreed to pay an additional $14 billion for regional transportation. It’s time for developers to pay their fair share too. Please don’t tell me they already are. If growth were paying its fair share we would not have this gridlock nightmare.

On January 20, 2005, in an editorial: “URBAN AGGRAVATION, Transportation facing $1 billion funding cut,” the San Diego Union stated “For San Diego...it will mean a loss of more than $403 million.” That is for this year alone. At the same time Riverside County is increasing its Regional Transportation Impact Fees to make future growth pay its fair share. When will political leaders in San Diego County do the same thing?

Please respond to me at the address below.

Sincerely

[Signature]

Address: 650 PAUL ST
ESCONDIDO, CA 92027-3948

Our view: North County Nine must fix TransNet plan

It's time to celebrate: 67 percent of our county's voters wisely approved Proposition A, the 40-year extension of the local TransNet sales tax that was too important to fail.

Much credit for this public policy victory goes to seven local mayors and two city council members. All nine are members of the regional transportation board that will spend many billions in the name of easing gridlock. Before the election, the North County Nine promised voters to work for a better plan to spend more on freeways. We suspect that is why North County voters, who comprise 29 percent of the county's population, climbed aboard a scheme that will fail to fix the region's traffic congestion.

Now begins the hard work of repairing the plan.

The TransNet extension will raise $14 billion toward $42 billion in total spending by 2030. The $42 billion figure includes a hoped-for hike in gasoline taxes and massive infusions of federal transportation money. Yet even that boatload of cash is insufficient to solve the county's existing traffic woes and to manage growth — $67 billion is needed.

In short, regional politicians have bought themselves, and us, little breathing room. Voters know that traffic already is a mess. We deserve clear solutions to the congestion that degrades our standard of living and threatens the local economy.

Under the existing plan, just 11 percent of the TransNet $14 billion goes to fixing North County's four critical arteries: Highways 78 and 76, and Interstates 5 and 15. This is where congestion is worst. Of the anticipated $42 billion in total spending, a staggering 38 percent is allocated to public transportation projects. Most are poorly concived.

The first order of business is to flip these priorities. The plan must be reviewed every three years, a process that begins soon. In addition, we suspect voters will need to approve a new, larger TransNet tax in a few years. If North County leaders keep their promise, voters may trust planners with more cash to fix regional traffic woes.

Above all, our county needs vision and leadership. Inaction has created a slow-moving but inexorable crisis that Prop. A will ultimately fail to resolve. Voters can feel proud they took this first step. Their leaders must not let them down.

---

Urban aggravation

Transportation facing $1 billion funding cut

On the long list of problems that Californians look to government to solve, or at least keep from getting worse, traffic gridlock is among the very top. Bumper-to-bumper freeways are the epitome of California's urban aggravations.

Voters statewide proved that in 2002 when they overwhelmingly passed Proposition 42, which requires Sacramento to put all revenues from the state sales tax on gasoline into a special fund that, supposedly, can only be used for transportation projects. San Diego County voters proved it again just two months ago when they defied the odds and approved, by a two-thirds margin, a 40-year extension of the existing one-half-cent sales tax for local transportation needs. Six other communities throughout the state enacted their own "self-help" transportation sales tax measures in November.

For what other government services or programs have voters continually demonstrated a willingness to tax themselves ever more? Education comes to mind, but not many others.

So it was little surprise when key transportation officials and a coalition of labor and business leaders went to Sacramento last month, in advance of the release of Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's budget proposal for the fiscal year that begins July 1, to beseech him to stop siphoning off the earmarked transportation money for other state programs. At the time, a spokesman said the governor had not yet decided whether to try to seize "transportation money" for the new budget and that he was waiting for new economic figures.

Evidently, the economic figures did not bring good news.

The Schwarzenegger budget proposal calls for the state to use a loophole in Proposition 42 to at least partially suspend its earmarking provisions for the third consecutive year. For the current fiscal year, $1.2 billion was diverted to the general fund. For next year, the governor is proposing to seize $1.3 billion as a "loan," promising that the transportation fund will be repaid over 15 years. The budget plan indicates he will do it a fourth time in fiscal 2006-07, but promises to remove the enabling loophole after that.

For San Diego, according to a report by Andrew Poat, the city's chief, Sacramento lobbyist, it will mean a loss of more than $40 million in transportation funding for the region. And for five other Southern California counties — Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura — it reportedly will mean the loss of more than $700 million for transportation.

If approved by the Legislature, the ramifications of that will be staggering.

Among the funding now at risk is $112 million for state Route 905 near the border, $80 million for the Sprinter rail line in North County, $20 million for state Route 52 through Santee and $14.6 million for the I-15/1-805 merge project.

In other words, freeway aggravations will worsen:Jobs will be lost. California's economy will suffer. It will be even tougher to attract new businesses to the state.

We sympathize with the governor. He's got a tough job trying to balance a badly out-of-whack budget without raising taxes — a goal we heartily endorse. So what should be cut instead? Education has been hit hard enough. But anything and everything else should, sadly, be fair game.

1/20/05 6:15
ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The following actions were taken by the Policy Advisory Committees (PACs) since the last Board meeting. Actions printed in bold typeface must be ratified by the Board of Directors to be effective.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (MARCH 4, 2005)

The Transportation Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Accepted the draft air quality conformity analysis of the 2030 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for distribution for a 30-day public comment period and recommended that the Board of Directors schedule a Public Hearing at its meeting on April 22, 2005.

- Approved a Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) request to transfer monies between capital projects to fund high-priority projects at the Cesar Chavez Station and the Imperial Avenue Bus yard. The MTS Board of Directors authorized the transfer of $360,100 of surplus funding from completed projects and projects with projected surplus funding to the above-mentioned projects that are now ready for construction.

- Recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors adopt revised Policy No. 18, Regional Transit Service Planning, that reflects changes to the roles and responsibilities of SANDAG and the two transit agencies in the regional transit service planning and implementation process.

- Accepted the draft FY 2005-2009 Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP) for a 45-day public review period and scheduled a public hearing on the plan for April 15, 2005.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (MARCH 4, 2005)

This meeting was cancelled.
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (MARCH 11, 2005)

The Executive Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Approved amendments to the FY 2005 Overall Work Program (OWP) and Program Budget to accept three Caltrans planning grants for a Bus Rapid Transit planning study in North County, continuation of a Transit Planning Internship program, and a Reservation Transit Feasibility Study, and approved amendments to begin the Independent Transit Planning Review called for in the TransNet extension, and to implement a Freeway Shoulder Lane Demonstration project.

- Approved the formation of the Regionwide Forecast Technical Working Group.

- Accepted the Draft FY 2006 Overall Work Program for distribution to federal, state, and member agencies, and other interested parties for review and comment.

- Recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the concept of forming a Service Bureau, including the use of the Executive Committee as its governing body, and directed staff to conduct the necessary steps to have it operational, effective July 1, 2005.

- Approved the March 25, 2005, SANDAG Board of Directors meeting agenda.

POLICY BOARD MEETING (MARCH 11, 2005)

This meeting was cancelled.

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE (MARCH 11, 2005)

This meeting was cancelled.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (MARCH 18, 2005)

The Transportation Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Adopted Resolution No. 2005-19 approving Amendment No. 6 to the 2004 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, including extending the I-805 preliminary engineering analysis down to SR 905 or at a minimum to Olympic Parkway.

- Approved the Interstate 805/Interstate 5 (I-805/I-5) South Corridor Study recommendations, and directed staff to consider them in the development of the 2030 RTP Update.
BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (MARCH 18, 2005)

The Borders Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Approved the title, theme, format, location, and timing for SANDAG’s 2005 Binational Conference.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director