

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

December 9, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF NOVEMBER 4, 2005

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:10 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) noted a correction to the minutes from the October 21, 2005, meeting related to item No. 11 on the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Development Guidelines. The action on that item indicated that Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) made the motion and that the motion was approved unanimously, which is incorrect. Staff was directed to determine the correct maker of this motion and the vote. [Subsequent to this meeting, the clerk determined that Councilmember Jerome Stocks (NCTD) was the maker of this motion, and there were two votes against the motion (Councilmembers Emery and Rindone)].

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the October 21, 2005, meeting with the corrections to be made. Xema Jacobson (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority) abstained.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, commented on two items. The first is that on Channel 8, on the 11 p.m. news this past Wednesday, a San Diego State University (SDSU) co-ed made the statement that the trolley has brought crime to the campus. However, no supporting evidence was given; it was just this reckless comment. The second item has to do with a news item by Channel 7/39 on Thursday at 4:30 p.m. and 6 p.m. about the toll road from Orange County that this Committee approved that could have significant environmental impacts no matter which route is selected. He said that expanding this toll road from six to eight lanes will create a significant impact to San Diego County because more traffic will be directed to Interstate 5 (I-5). He suggested that we build a parking structure in Old Town with reasonable fees so that visitors will use public transit to get to places like the beaches. He suggested perhaps we should build an elevated tram system to the beach areas.

Councilmember Monroe stated that he saw the same newscasts as Mr. Lungerhausen, and further on in those newscasts an SDSU security officer said there was no supporting documentation to the co-ed's statement.

Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) indicated that the incidents of crime at SDSU has nothing to do with the trolley and a lot to do with gangs.

Chair Kellejian called on Toni Bates to talk about Councilmember Judy Ritter's request for information from a previous Committee meeting.

Ms. Bates, Division Director of Transit Planning, stated that at the September 16 Committee meeting staff presented a report on the development review process in which SANDAG works with jurisdictions to incorporate transit facilities and accommodations into new developments. Councilmember Ritter had asked for a list of the development projects and the jurisdictions in which they were located that contributed transit improvements as part of the development project. A list and map of these developments was distributed, with the development project name, projects grouped by jurisdiction, and the type of transit facility provided.

Councilmember Stocks said that out of 240 development projects, only 28 improvements were not in North County Transit District's (NCTD's) area. He encouraged SANDAG to be in tune with this information.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 THROUGH 4)

3. LOS ANGELES–SAN DIEGO–SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY (LOSSAN) BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING REPORT (INFORMATION)

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Known as Amtrak's Pacific Surfliner corridor, it is the second busiest intercity passenger rail corridor nationwide and Amtrak's fastest growing. This report summarizes the actions from the LOSSAN Board meeting on September 14, 2005.

4. CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE HIGH-SPEED PASSENGER RAIL SYSTEM QUARTERLY UPDATE (INFORMATION)

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is the state agency responsible for planning, constructing, and operating a high-speed train system serving California's major metropolitan areas. The proposed system stretches over 800 miles and would connect San Diego, Los Angeles, the Central Valley, San Francisco, and Sacramento using a state-of-the-art, electrified system capable of speeds in excess of 200 miles per hour. SANDAG continues to monitor and comment on the work of the CHSRA. This report is the regular quarterly update to the Transportation Committee.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 3 and 4.

CHAIR'S REPORT

5. UPDATE ON COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS (COA) BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE (INFORMATION)

Chair Kellejian stated that he and Councilmember Monroe have served on this Blue Ribbon Committee. The last meeting of this Committee was held on October 12. The Blue Ribbon Committee reviewed the service proposals to focus resources on urban areas, provide commuter services along major corridors, reduce/eliminate traditional transit services in areas of low ridership, and introduce the concept of market-based services, with these services designed to address the unique community needs of specific markets. SANDAG's interest will be to link the COA strategy and services to its regional policies through the Regional Short-Range Transit Plan (RSRTP), work with MTS to develop innovative ways to address service needs in the areas without traditional transit service, and address park-and-ride needs along the proposed commute corridors.

Chair Kellejian said that the Blue Ribbon Committee expressed concern about the ability to fund the COA proposals. MTS staff indicated that the urban and corridor services would require about 90 percent of the available funds, leaving 10 percent for community-based services.

Chair Kellejian said that the next step is for MTS to take the recommendation to the public and to the MTS Board. There will be a series of public open houses to share the proposed service changes and to solicit input. A presentation to the Transportation Committee will be scheduled following the public open houses.

Councilmember Monroe asked for a briefing on the COA's objectives and goals as the workshops occur.

Chair Kellejian mentioned that the proposed service reductions amount to about \$4 million out of the \$8 million shortfall. Paul Jablonski, MTS Chief Executive Officer, said it was premature to quantify an amount. He said that we are building the system from the ground up, and there are still some areas needing refinement.

Chair Kellejian commended MTS for taking this comprehensive system look and for reviewing the needs of the people of San Diego County.

REPORTS

6. DRAFT *TransNet* PLAN OF FINANCE FOR THE EARLY ACTION PROGRAM (APPROVE)

Chair Kellejian stated that in 2005 shortly after passage of the *TransNet* Extension, we told the public that we would get started on projects right away. Staff came to the Transportation Committee and SANDAG Board for comprehensive input into the Early Action Plan. We are now looking at the financial piece to proceed with implementation.

Councilmember Emery indicated that a letter from MTS Chair Leon Williams was distributed requesting that this item be tabled to the December meeting due to action taken by the MTS Executive Committee related to long-range capital improvement shortfalls. This request was based upon the timing of the COA, the Blue Ribbon Committee report, and the Early Action Projects before us. The Transportation Committee members from MTS have supported the Early Action Projects and the concept of getting on line early. That was prior to the identification of the capital improvement shortfalls, which total about \$30 million per year. We want more time to look at this to be sure that the dollars being expended on the Early Action Projects are not at the expense of capital improvement projects.

Chair Kellejian stated that we would move ahead with this item. There is some financial background that MTS needs to provide to the Committee with regard to this request. Staff can take up that issue as we go along.

Craig Scott, *TransNet* Program Manager, reported that the *TransNet* Plan of Finance provides the financial strategy for paying for the projects in the Early Action Program (EAP). There are 47 major highway and transit projects included in Proposition A. The EAP is a big first step that includes work on 20 of those 47 corridors. This work ranges from environmental document preparation on some corridors to completing the entire corridor improvement as identified in the ballot measure. We will look at cost estimates and schedules for the balance of the 47 corridors in concert with the development of the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This Plan of Finance process provides the baseline for the *TransNet* program and will be continuously reviewed and refined. The initial financial strategy that the Transportation Committee approved in May 2005 included expanding the *TransNet* commercial paper program from \$135 million to \$335 million to help pay for the expenditures on the EAP in the early years of the program; issuing short-term notes, if needed through 2008; issuing long-term bonds in 2008; and investigating interest rate hedging opportunities to lock in today's low rates. By the end of next week, the expanded commercial paper program will be in place to fund the EAP projects, and an interest rate hedging proposal will be presented to the Board for consideration at its November meeting.

Mr. Scott said that the EAP was approved in January 2005, with the idea to "jump start" these major projects before the *TransNet* Extension starts in FY 2009. In May 2005, additional transit components were included in the EAP. He reviewed the EAP projects.

Mr. Scott explained that the Plan of Finance process included updating all costs and revenues to future year (escalated) dollars; developing updated cost estimates, schedules and detailed cash flows for each EAP project; updating the *TransNet* revenue forecast; and updating estimates for potential state/federal/other matching funds. The financial model calculates the amount of borrowing needed to meet the identified project cash flows. This financial analysis can be conducted for the overall *TransNet* program, as well as for each of the major program components. He showed the 40-year *TransNet* revenue assumptions.

Mr. Scott reviewed three major policy choices for the Transportation Committee: (1) to bond or not to bond, (2) what share of *TransNet* Major Corridor funds should go to the EAP, and (3) what share of available state and federal matching funds (primarily State Transportation Improvement Program [STIP], Congestion Mitigation Air Quality [CMAQ], and Surface Transportation Program [STP] funds) should go to the EAP. Mr. Scott reviewed

the use of STIP/CMAQ/STP funds in four major categories for the FY 1998-2009 time frame. He described the *TransNet* Extension Expenditure Plan update for revenues and costs based on the assumed use of STIP/CMAQ/STP funds at the 85 percent and the 100 percent levels. He noted that the ballot measure included the assumption that we would fund the projects on a 50/50 (*TransNet*/other funds) basis. If we funded the projects at an 85 percent level, there would be an 8 percent shortfall; if we funded at the 100 percent level, there would be a 3 percent shortfall. He showed a diagram of the key funding assumptions for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan to show how we will pay for the shortfall.

Mr. Scott reviewed the funding scenarios that were analyzed:

Scenario 1 – 100 percent of STIP/CMAQ/STP, using 100 percent of *TransNet* for the EAP

Scenario 2 – 85 percent of STIP/CMAQ/STP, using 100 percent of *TransNet* for the EAP

Scenario 3 – 85 percent of STIP/CMAQ/STP, using 90 percent of *TransNet* for the EAP

Scenario 4 – no bonding, using 85 percent of STIP/CMAQ/STP and 100 percent of *TransNet* for the EAP

Mr. Scott showed the EAP project delivery schedule and described a chart showing the costs and revenues through 2015, based on one of the bonding scenarios. He noted that an important question is: can we afford the EAP construction schedules? The answer is that we can afford them with all of the bonding scenarios but not if we don't bond. If we don't bond, there will be an average four-year delay in completing the EAP.

Mr. Scott also reviewed for each scenario the total bonding required, the financing costs associated with the bonds, and the available remaining funds for non-EAP projects. He provided additional information related to the three policy choices including the cost of bonding compared to the benefits of accelerating project implementation and avoiding cost escalation. In addition, on the question of what share of *TransNet* Major Corridor funds should go to the EAP, he said that the Committee should determine if the focus is on completing the EAP or spreading the funds to other projects. Should more projects be completed or more projects started? The other key issue to consider is whether to use state and federal funds to match the EAP or other projects.

Mr. Scott reviewed the staff recommendation of Scenario 3. The benefits of that scenario include maintaining the focus on the EAP while leaving funding available for other non-EAP and non-*TransNet* projects. The benefits of accelerating the projects through the use of bonds exceed the cost of bonding. He noted that the assumed matching fund levels and fund set asides will be reconsidered in future updates based on updated information.

Mr. Scott said that following approval of one of the scenarios, the next steps would be to present the final Plan of Finance to the SANDAG Board in December, coordinate the next major update to the Plan of Finance with the 2007 RTP, develop a program office for cost/schedule management, closely monitor all key assumptions, and update the Transportation Committee as issues arise.

Chair Kellejian stated that part of the *TransNet Extension* Ordinance and Expenditure Plan was the formation of an Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC). He asked that a member of this committee provide a report.

Maryam Babaki, ITOC member, indicated that they held a special meeting last Wednesday to look at the draft Plan of Finance and a proposal regarding interest rate hedging. In general, the ITOC was in favor of moving forward with the use of bonding based on Scenario 3 in the draft Plan of Finance. The ITOC found the plan to be well laid out and the hedging proposal to be innovative. The ITOC will be discussing both topics further at its November 9, 2005, meeting.

Chair Kellejian said that there was one request to speak.

Jay Powell, representing the City Heights Development Corporation, spoke in support of staff's recommendation to accelerate the completion of the Interstate 15 (I-15) bus rapid transit (BRT) from downtown San Diego to the State Route (SR) 163 merge as part of the EAP. He expressed appreciation for SANDAG and the Transportation Committee for including this project in the EAP. He mentioned a concern about the project delivery schedule. The schedule calls for this project to be completed by 2012, and they would like this project to be accelerated before that time.

Board Comments:

Councilmember Madaffer asked that a copy of the presentation graphics be distributed to Committee members. He said that we have to remind ourselves what we promised to the voters when we asked them to approve *TransNet*. There are a lot of transit-related components in the EAP. He asked what percent of the EAP is transit related. Mr. Gallegos replied that about 43 percent of the funding was for major transit projects. He said that MTS expressed some concerns about whether this would be enough money.

Councilmember Emery said that it isn't a question about being enough; it is more a question of where the funds will be directed. The request from MTS for a delay in no way suggests getting away from the EAP or the other proposed projects in *TransNet*. We should look at this funding for all the projects. There are two operating agencies with significant operating deficiencies. In a perfect world, we would direct 100 percent of the funds for the EAP, but we don't have that latitude. We have to operate and restructure capital improvement projects.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that it is obvious our regional transportation needs far outweigh the *TransNet* funds. He thought it was good to hear that the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee recognizes the intelligence of bonding now to avoid the added costs of delay, which is huge. The public is expecting transportation solutions today. Members of the Committee previously received a map that showed the major facilities in the region. If we don't approve the staff recommendation we will be breaching our promise to the voters.

Chair Kellejian clarified that a hedging proposal with regard to Scenario 3 will go to the SANDAG Board in November rather than December. The reason for moving this action forward is to anchor the interest rate as soon as possible. We have firms standing by waiting for this decision.

Mr. Gallegos said that the key is whether you're going to bond or not. If you look at the hedging proposal and you choose not to bond, then you take a risk. What we are hearing is that the timing is important because both short- and long-term interest rates are headed up. The Transportation Committee and Board indicated that we should take advantage of the low interest rates. We need to know what direction to take.

Councilmember Stocks commented that a big part of our job is to watch the public purse strings. By bonding, we can avoid costs and a four-year delay. He supported the staff recommendation. He understood that MTS is concerned about deferred major maintenance for capital investment. We do need to find a way to pay for those projects. This is a concern but not appropriate when discussing *TransNet*. This action is about the EAP.

Supervisor Slater-Price expressed strong support for staff's recommendation. We need to move in a timely fashion. The voters are waiting to see what will happen.

Mayor Pro Tem Ed Gallo (NCTD) asked about the 10 percent set aside. Mr. Gallegos responded that the EAP is a subset of the *TransNet* projects. The 10 percent set-aside funds is money available for other *TransNet* projects.

Mayor Pro Tem Gallo said he understood Mr. Emery's comments on the request to delay action on this item, however, he agreed with Mr. Stocks that we need to act.

Councilmember Scott Peters (City of San Diego) agreed that MTS raised some important issues. We should know what the answers are before we take this action. He asked MTS to come back with information before the SANDAG Board acts. We should at least understand the implications before we act.

Mr. Gallegos said that this is not a cast-in-concrete decision. He said that you are not going to spend all of the money tomorrow. You will review this plan on a year-by-year basis. Additionally, there is \$1.2 billion for transit improvements in the EAP. He suggested moving forward with a caveat that the transit agencies report back with their needs identified. That will give us a chance to evaluate those needs and review the funding opportunities. He reminded Committee members that there are choices to make.

Councilmember Peters asked why the Super Loop project cost was reduced to \$21 million. We have been talking about a 2008 timeline and now it says 2010. Ms. Bates stated that the \$30 million in the RTP includes both capital and operating. Mr. Gallegos said that the timeline is what was assumed for the Plan of Finance analysis. Councilmember Peters said that staff should reconcile the timeline with the community group that has been working on that project.

Supervisor Roberts said that the issue is not the amount of money. The key is that there is flexibility in the way we draw down the dollars. MTS has issues, and it is not just replacing equipment. There is money to get things done. There is enough flexibility to move forward today. He asked for a copy of this presentation and requested that Transportation Committee members have color copies of the PowerPoint presentations from this point on.

Mr. Gallegos noted that there are tradeoffs, but the key is to get the major corridors completed.

Chair Kellejian reiterated that there is a 10 percent set aside for other purposes. We need to have some sort of comprehensive plan for future transit needs.

Mayor Art Madrid (East County) said that this has been a work in progress and hasn't been presented at the last minute. The voters' confidence with elected officials is slipping. We have to follow-up on those commitments. It is critical that we move forward. He would like to see the rationale for the letter from MTS.

Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, said that the transit agencies had no knowledge that this item was going to this meeting until the agenda package came out. The first opportunity to review this item was on Wednesday, and NCTD had no time to develop anything more comprehensive than the one-page letter that was distributed. We need to look at what the 10 percent set aside for non-EAP projects will buy, and how much of the need it will cover. The analysis of the transit operators' capital improvement needs should be part of this report.

Ms. King asked about the difference in financing costs listed in two places in the staff report. Mr. Scott replied that the costs shown as part of the scenario analysis were in future dollars, while the costs discussed as part of the cost-benefit analysis related to bonding was in today's dollars.

Councilmember Monroe mentioned that he had been informed about a meeting of city engineers yesterday when they were discussing this item. He was relieved when he understood we are only talking about one piece of the pie. He asked if the city engineers were shown these slides. Mr. Gallegos answered that they had received the same presentation. It comes down to discretionary spending. The *TransNet* Extension included a \$2,000 impact fee, which is new money. In addition, Proposition 42 dollars weren't around for the first *TransNet* ordinance. The engineers are concerned about tradeoffs and wondering if they will be losing projects. Mr. Gallegos noted that the *TransNet Extension* has some provisions that are different than the first *TransNet* Ordinance.

Councilmember Monroe stated that the \$2.5 billion in savings is both "hard" and "soft" dollars. The "soft" dollars are a result of reduced commuter time and accidents. Mr. Scott agreed that those dollar estimates for travel time savings and accident reductions are social costs and not direct cost savings for the *TransNet* program; however, they are costs to those stuck in traffic.

Mr. Jablonski said that a lot of the transit infrastructure improvement projects are contained within *TransNet*. It is important to understand that everyone wants the projects to be done as soon as possible. We are looking at \$1.25 billion in bonding costs to avoid \$309 million in construction delay costs. We are showing this benefit as \$2.4 billion. The analysis is not done until you take those dollars you save, see what projects you can do with those savings, and see what money will be saved from getting those projects done.

Marney Cox, SANDAG Chief Economist, stated that the public basically has an understanding about focusing expenditures on key projects. We collect money to provide the facilities and the benefits of those improvements that are broadly distributed. We have focused expenditures to achieve those benefits. If you focus the expenditures, the entire system benefits in two ways: system benefits and time-savings benefits. In the I-15 corridor, a one-way trip will have a 24 percent reduction in trip time. That's about 12 minutes off the normal trip time. On SR 52, it is more significant...a 40 percent improvement. You are knocking off time for those commuters on that roadway. It allows people on I-5 to take advantage of the improvements on I-15. Even with additional trips transferring from I-5 to I-15, you will have time savings on I-15 and SR 52. Those savings are significant. If we could move forward on all improvements, we would make similar improvements in all corridors.

Councilmember Emery commented that time savings on a freeway doesn't buy catenary wire or new buses. The MTS system has to rely on its budget. A cut in service will put more people back onto the freeway system. There is a significant shortfall in the MTS system.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Councilmember Stocks, the Transportation Committee directed staff to further develop the final *TransNet* Plan of Finance based on Scenario 3 for consideration by the SANDAG Board of Directors at its December Board meeting. Scenario 3 uses bonding to complete the projects in the Early Action Program (EAP) on the proposed schedules, sets aside 10 percent of *TransNet* Major Corridor funds for other non-EAP *TransNet* projects, and leaves 15 percent of future STIP/CMAQ/STP funds available for other non-*TransNet* projects.

Pedro Orso Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director, said that one of the next steps of the Early Action Program is to have Early Action Corridor Managers, and we are already working on that piece. We are in the interview process, and some Early Action Corridor Managers have been appointed.

Councilmember Madaffer requested a quarterly monitoring report on the key assumptions and asked that staff pass items through the ITOC. Mr. Gallegos agreed to provide that quarterly report.

7. DRAFT FY 2006-FY 2010 REGIONAL SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN (APPROVE)

Dan Levy, Senior Transit Planner, said that under Policy 018, SANDAG is responsible for preparing a consolidated Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP). This report is an update on the plan development. The purpose of the RSRTP is to provide a five-year blueprint for the growth and development of the regional transit system. The elements of the Plan include a system inventory, development of a regional policy basis for service, identification of deficiencies and solutions, and an action plan. There are a number of concurrent major plans and policies such as the Regional Comprehensive Plan's (RCP) Smart Growth Concept Map, the RTP Update, the Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR), and the agency planning initiatives including the COA and the Sprinter Bus Redesign Action Plan.

The following are challenges for the five-year RSRTP planning period: regional congestion is a major concern, funding continues to be limited, ridership has been falling, *TransNet* has raised the public's expectations, and consolidation is expected to bring improved planning

and service. In addition, there are several other initiatives underway that will affect the RS RTP: the RCP Smart Growth Concept Map development, the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Update, the Independent Transit Planning Review, the MTS Comprehensive Operational Analysis, and the NCTD Sprinter bus plan.

The RTP Transit First Vision provides a family of services to meet the diverse needs of the region. The COA has introduced a "tiers of service" concept that assigns different types of service to particular areas or markets and may also be used by NCTD to help redesign bus services for the Sprinter. The approach of the RS RTP will be to develop Service Design Guidelines that support this framework by identifying regional deficiencies, permit regional evaluation of services, and define appropriate levels of service. They must be applicable across the region; responsive to differing markets and needs; understandable by the public; and consistent for SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD.

The Service Design Guidelines and Transit Agency Planning will build on the tiered approach of the COA: the urban network, commuter services, and community-based services. Service zones will be developed to provide areas having similar patterns of development with similar levels of service. The Guidelines will address financial performance, productivity, access (walking distance), comfort (crowding), convenience (frequency and service span), reliability (schedule adherence), and warrants for new service.

The Service Design Guidelines would be structured as a hierarchy with objectives, indicators, and targets. The objectives would define the service goal, the indicators would describe the best method of measuring attainment of the goal, and the target would set the level to be attained. In future years, it should only be necessary to adjust the target value if the policy objectives change or funding levels are significantly altered.

SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD will jointly develop guidelines for each zone, consistent with the RCP, RTP, COA, and Sprinter Bus Redesign.

He reviewed the schedule and the recommended action.

Councilmember Emery stated that this is a good process to integrate all of the efforts. He expressed interest in how the zones will be developed.

Councilmember Stock agreed that it is good and correct to identify various service zones. He asked about our obligation for lifeline service. He thought this type of discussion would occur as we move forward. He thanked staff for a good report.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee endorsed the purpose, regional context, and approach for developing the FY 2006-2010 Regional Short Range Transit Plan as described in the report.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, December 9, 2005, at 9 a.m.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
NOVEMBER 4, 2005**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ ORGANIZATION	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	COMMENTS
North County Coastal	City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Chair)	Member	Yes	
	City of Oceanside	Jim Wood	Alternate	No	
North County Inland	City of Poway	Mickey Cafagna	Member	No	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	Yes	
East County	City of Santee	Jack Dale	Member	Yes	
	City of La Mesa	Art Madrid	Alternate	Yes	
South County	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Member	Yes	
	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Alternate	Yes	
City of San Diego	----	Jim Madaffer	Member	Yes	
	----	Scott Peters	Alternate	Yes	
County of San Diego	----	Ron Roberts	Member	Yes	
	----	Pam Slater-Price	Alternate	Yes	
	----	Dianne Jacob	Alternate	No	
Metropolitan Transit Development Board	City of Poway	Bob Emery	Member	Yes	
	MTS	Leon Williams	Alternate	Yes	
North County Transit District	City of Encinitas	Jerome Stocks	Member	Yes	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	No	Will be attending for North County Inland
	City of Escondido	Ed Gallo	Alternate	Yes	
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority	City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom	Member	No	
	Governor's Appointee	Xema Jacobson	Alternate	Yes	
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	Yes	
	—	Bill Figge	Alternate	No	
Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group	—	Sandor Shapery	Member	Yes	